TRAITS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT IN THE SELECTION OF A MARRIAGE PARTNER AMONG YOUNG MATRICULATED BLACKS

BY

STANLEY KUNENE

submitted to the Faculty of Arts in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the department of Psychology of the University of Zululand

October 1982
DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation (Traits considered important in the selection of a marriage partner among young matriculated Blacks) represents my own work both in conception and execution.

S Kunene
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Dr H M de Vetla, former Head of the Department of Psychology, University of Zululand. Dr de Vetta acted as my supervisor, and her friendly attitude and continuous encouragement enabled me to complete this study.

I am also indebted to my colleagues and Psychology honours students who edited the questionnaire.

I also wish to express my gratitude to all the students who participated in this study.

S KUNENE
KWA-DLANGEZWA
October 1982
SUMMARY

In several studies conducted mostly in the United States of America it was found that members of both sexes were attracted towards each other for different reasons. Traits mentioned in different studies are physical attractiveness, material possessions and certain personality characteristics, such as pleasantness, sociability, trustworthiness, etc. With regard to race and socio-economic status investigators differ.

It was also found that males and females have different opinions on some factors and the same opinion on others.

The aim of this investigation was to find out what young matriculated Blacks look for in a future marriage partner.

The following hypotheses were formulated:

(i) Males and females do not emphasize the same characteristics in the choice of a life partner.

(ii) The choice of a marriage partner depends on the religious commitment of the prospective spouse.

(iii) Social status plays an important role in the selection of a marriage partner.

(iv) Physical attractiveness is regarded as an important characteristic in the choice of a life partner.

(v) The tribal background of the opposite sex member is considered important in the choice of a life partner.

(vi) Having children is considered important in marriage.

(vii) Submissiveness of the wife is considered important in marriage.

(viii) Home-making (domesticity) is considered important in marriage.
To gather the relevant information, a questionnaire was constructed, consisting of thirty-six items in its final form. The methods of Summated Ratings, and the Split-half coefficient were used to test the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire.

The validated questionnaire was administered to two hundred first-year university students; ninety-one males and one hundred and nine females.

The following conclusions were arrived at:

(i) Males and females tend to emphasize the same characteristics in the choice of a life partner.

(ii) The choice of a marriage partner does not depend on the religious affiliation of the prospective spouse.

(iii) The great majority of subjects expressed themselves against social class as a criterion in the choice of a marriage partner.

(iv) Physical attractiveness is not regarded as an important characteristic in the choice of a life partner.

(v) The tribal background of the opposite sex member is not considered important in the choice of a life partner.

(vi) Children are considered important in marriage.

(vii) Submissiveness of the wife is considered important in marriage.

(viii) Home-making is not considered important in marriage.

The findings of the study indicate that there is scope for future research, in which the views of urban and rural, educated and uneducated communities may be compared.

Also, it is recommended that in a future study the causes of divorce should be compared with the traits considered important in the selection of a marriage partner.
OPSOMMING

In verskeie studies wat meesal in die Verenigde State van Amerika uitgevoer is, is gevind dat lede van die twee geslagte om verskillende redes tot mekaar aangetrokke gevoel het. Faktore wat in verskillende studies gemeld is, is fisiese aantreklikheid, materiële besittings en sekere persoonlikheidseienskappe, soos opgeruimdheid, geselligheid, betroubaarheid, ens. Met betrekking tot ras en sosio-ekonomiese status verskil ondersoekers in hul bevindings.

Ook is gevind dat mans en vroue oor sommige faktore verskillende menings huldig en oor ander saamstem.

Die doel van hierdie ondersoek was om vas te stel wat jong gematrikuleerde Swartes in 'n toekomstige huweliksmaat verlang.

Die volgende hipoteses is geformuleer:

(i) Mens en vroue benadruk nie dieselfde karaktertrekke in hul keuse van 'n huweliksmaat nie.

(ii) Die keuse van 'n huweliksmaat hang af van die godsdienstige oortuiging van die toekomstige eggenoot/eggenote.

(iii) Status speel 'n belangrike rol in die keuse van 'n huweliksmaat.

(iv) Fisiese aantreklikheid word as 'n belangrike karaktertrek by die keuse van 'n lewensmaat beskou.

(v) Die stamagtergrond van die lid van die teenoorgestelde geslag word as belangrik beskou in die keuse van 'n lewensmaat.

(vi) Om kinders te hê word as belangrik beskou in die huwelik.

(vii) Onderdanigheid van die vrou word in die huwelik as belangrik beskou.

(viii) Huislikheid en die vermoe om goed huis te hou word as belangrik geag in die huwelik.
Ten einde die tersaaklike inligting in te win, is 'n vraelys, bestaande uit 36 items in sy finale vorm, opgestel. Die metodes van Sommeertaksering en die Halveerkoeffisient is aangewend om die geldigheid en die betroubaarheid van die vraelys te toets.

Die bekragtigde vraelys is aan 200 (tweehonderd) eerstejaaruniversiteitsstudente, van wie 91 mans en 109 vroue was, voorgelê met die versoek om die vrae individueel te beantwoord.

Daar is tot die volgende gevolgtrekkings geraak:

(i) Mans en vroue is geneig om dieselfde eienskappe in die keuse van 'n lewensmaat te benadruk.

(ii) Die keuse van 'n huweliksmaat hang nie af van die godsdiensverband van die toekomstige eggenoot/eggenote nie.

(iii) Die meerderheid van die studente het hulle teen sosiale klas (stand) as 'n kriterium in die keuse van 'n huweliksmaat uitgespreek.

(iv) Fisiese aantreklikheid word nie as 'n belangrike eienskappe in die keuse van 'n lewensmaat beskou nie.

(v) Die stamagtergrond van die lid van die teenoorgestelde geslag word nie as belangrik beskou in die keuse van 'n lewensmaat nie.

(vi) Kinders word as belangrik in die huwelik beskou.

(vii) Onderdanigheid van die vrou word as belangrik in die huwelik beskou.

(viii) Die vermoë om goed huis te hou word nie as belangrik in die huwelik beskou nie.

Die bevindings uit die studie dui daarop dat nog navorsing in die toekoms gedaan kan word waarin die menings van stedelike en plattelandse, opgevoede en onopgevoede gemeenskappe vergelyk kan word.
Ook word aanbeveel dat in 'n toekomstige studie die oorsake van egskeiding vergelyk behoort te word met die faktore wat as belangrik in die keuse van 'n huweliksmaat geag word.
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CHAPTER ONE

COURTSHIP AMONG TRADITIONAL BLACKS

1.1 Introduction

Entry upon the role of husband or wife depends on being chosen as a life partner. In order to be chosen as a marriage partner one should have certain traits favoured by a member of the opposite sex. According to Stagner (1974), relationships between a child and his parents, relationships with peers, his cultural background, and his religious affiliations play an important role in the choice of a marriage partner.

It has been stated that every young man knows that his important duty to his family of origin and lineage is to acquire a wife from an unrelated family (Mbatha, 1960). Before acquiring a spouse some considerations have to be made by both boys and girls, including their parents. There are characteristics which are considered to be very important in the choice of a marriage partner. People lacking these characteristics fail to attract the members of the opposite sex. Now, the question is, who is more favoured as a marriage partner and what are the most important characteristics that will make him or her attractive to the members of the opposite sex?

A close scrutiny of the Zulu Culture brings to light that there are two groups of people, the traditionalists and those who have been Westernized. In many Zulu homes the traditional way of life has gradually made way for a more Westernized way of doing things, with new aims and a new value system. But, the so-called traditionalists have had contact with Christianity, and so, there is no longer such a thing as a typical Zulu society (Dreyer, 1977). The group referred to as the traditional group is actually a transitional group. The practices of this group are different from those of the Westernized group and thus it may be assumed that the values of the traditional group are different from those of the Westernized group. Thus mate expectations are also expected to differ.
The traditional Zulu believes that whatever happens to him is caused by some external force, for instance, witch-craft. It is thought that a young man who does not have a girlfriend or who happens not to be attractive to girls has been bewitched, and other characteristics which play an important role in mate selection are relegated to the background. It is claimed that black magic has been used against them so that they will be disliked by girls. They consider themselves to be enshrouded in a blanket of darkness (Vilakazi, 1962). The same belief is held by young women. To cleanse themselves of this ill-luck they go to a medicine man for a remedy, and usually they are given an emetic which will, supposedly, cleanse them of the ill-luck and make them popular with the members of the opposite sex. According to Bryant (1949), Nkabinde et al (1975), and Vilakazi (1962), these young people take emetics which are supposed to remove ritual impurities which may lead to "unloveliness".

1.2 Social class

When the literature available on Zulu marriage patterns amongst the traditionalists is studied, we find that material possessions, inter alia, play an important role in the selection of a life partner, although the prospective spouses do not have a say in this matter. Parents want their children to marry into a well-to-do family, irrespective of the wishes of the boy or girl. According to Bryant (1949), Nkabinde et al (1975), and Vilakazi (1962), there is nothing wrong for a father of a girl to give his daughter away to even an old man, as long as he has cattle; and the girl is not expected to object. Her duty is to get cattle from any rich man for her father. Also, polygamy depends on the availability of cattle. It is not possible for a poor man to have many wives. Bryant (1949) says that having many wives depends on the possession of many cattle which proves the wealth of the man. People such as Reader (1962) are of the opinion that when a boy is courting a girl, he presents her with gifts of food and other things. This is not true because among the traditionalists at least, the boy would be accused of trying to bribe the girl or of having added love charms, especially in the food.
In the traditional setting a young man does not choose a woman he likes, but his bride is chosen for him by his parents (Schapera, 1933). Mbatha (1960) says that mothers, sisters and other members of the extended family play an important role in the choice of a bride. The boy's parents pay attention to the future bride's family background. It is necessary for the boy's family to have all available facts about the family background of the prospective spouse. The basic information necessary for a correct assessment of a young woman as a suitable wife includes the economic circumstances of her home. Usually a girl from a well-to-do family is preferred. Vilakazi (1962) says that commonly this is expressed as marrying a daughter of people who do not starve, because a woman who comes from a poor or starving family will not be able to give a friendly and liberal reception to guests. She will have developed the habit of hoarding food. According to Brandel (1958) the custom of "lobolo" (bride price) plays an important role in the selection of a mate, because it is proof that the boy is able to raise and save money.

The most prominent law in traditional society is the law of complete submission to those in authority (Bryant, 1949; Dreyer, 1976). This influences the adolescent's relationships with his peers. The boy or girl may only entertain and visit those friends which are approved by the parents. It also influences the boy's choice of a marriage partner. Marrying a girl against parental wishes usually leads to ostracism, and it is taboo to do so (Vilakazi, 1962). This gives one the impression that boys' parents consider primarily girls of their own class or village, because it is not possible to know a person who comes from another village or chieftainship very well. Also members of other villages are regarded with a degree of suspicion and contempt. They are invariably referred to as "small animals" (Izilwanyana).

Radcliffe-Brown and Forde (1950) found that among the Nayar of India marrying outside the sub-caste was not allowed; also the spouses were of the same generation, with the boy slightly older. Among the Tswana marriages between cousins are preferred. According to Schapera (1950), the Tswana usually say "one's cross-cousin..."
is one's rightful spouse" (Mtsoala wa motho ke mogatse). There
are no such marriages on record as far as the Zulus are concerned.
And even though marriages between cousins are encouraged among the
Tswana, they are not compulsory, because other considerations come
into play as well, such as the personality of the wife-to-be.
Marriages between cousins are also common among the Ashanti of the
Congo, but many young men are against this and say that the cousin
might not be as attractive as an unrelated girl (Fortes, 1950).

Some people are of the opinion that the Zulu boy prefers a profes-
sional woman, but this is not the case when it comes to the tra-
ditional Zulu. An educated woman would be at a disadvantage here,
because she would not know how to work the fields and she would
demand too much freedom and independence, whereas the traditional
Zulu woman is a perpetual minor (Seedat & Nyembezi, 1975). Bryant
(1949) says that a wife is considered a property of her husband and
has no say in the running of the family.

One of the most important characteristics today is that the pro-
spective spouse must have had some education. The higher the edu-
cation the more likely it is that the person will be chosen as a
life partner. Professional women such as nurses and teachers, are
the most preferred. They are regarded as an asset because they will
augment the man's income. Also, according to Brandel (1958), women
anticipate a marriage with an educated man.

A close study of the Zulu culture shows that considerable changes
have taken place over the past one hundred years. It is common for
the modern boy to choose his own wife and present her to his parents,
so that they can start the necessary negotiations on his behalf.
Girls, too, are no longer willing to accept any man chosen by their
parents. More often than not, they succeed in getting their own
way. Boys often deliberately encourage their beloveds to fall preg-
nant, thus forcing their parents to allow them to get married (Bryant,
1949; Dreyer, 1976; Reyher, 1948; Schapera, 1933). According to
Vilakazi (1962) the question is no longer "Into which family did
so-and-so marry?" but, "what is her husband doing?" That is, what
is important is the status of the husband, and not of the husband's family per se.

1.3 Personality

In a study conducted by Dreyer (1976) among Zulu adolescents it was found that besides the desire for higher intellectual abilities, the adolescents showed a desire to change their personalities. Most of them wanted to develop the ability of making friends more easily. Only an insignificant group showed concern about their physical appearance. Being selfish, snobbish, unco-operative, disloyal, dominating, and bad-tempered, were considered the most important characteristics likely to lead to being unpopular with peers.

According to Reyher (1948), Mbathe (1960) and Vilakazi (1962), the traditional Zulu does not look at physical beauty as the most important characteristic, but considers other personality qualities, such as diligence, faithfulness and respect in a woman. What a man wants from a woman is that she will be able to establish herself as a wife in the boy's family. Usually the girl visits the boy's home to see for herself what the family is like, and she brings presents with her. The boy's people will get a chance of studying her very closely. If she wins the affections of the boy's people (especially those of the children and the womenfolk), that is, if the women are impressed by her manners and the gifts she has brought, she is likely to be recommended as a suitable wife. The boy's family does not base all its decisions on the girl's visits, but the boy's sisters reciprocate the visits in order to study her home setting, paying particular attention to her cookery, the way she carries out her duties and whether she is of a pleasant disposition.

The whole approach among the Zulus is based upon a woman's humanness. The theory is that a person makes herself beautiful by being humane. Although outstanding physical beauty is very much admired and praised publicly, people are warned not to rely on it when
choosing a marriage partner. According to Mbatha (1960) and
Vilakazi (1962), to discourage people from placing too much stress
on physical beauty the saying: "Ikhiwane elihle ligmwala izibungo".
(The fine fig gets full of maggots) is often quoted. Bryant (1949)
says that in addition to being beautiful, the girl must also be
diligent, respectful, and fertile.

1.4 Beauty (Physical attractiveness)

It is evident from what has been said above that beauty is not re-
garded as the most important characteristic in the choice of a
marriage partner. Dreyer (1976) says that looks do not play an
important role in making someone popular with friends and others.
This does not mean that beauty is altogether discarded. According
to Nkabinde et al (1975) traditional women use red clay to keep
their faces smooth and beautiful. The colour of the skin is not
important. A dark-skinned girl is appreciated as much as a lightер-
skinned one. According to the modern trend however, a lighter
complexion is preferred. This is often confused with beauty, and
this has led to the use of bleaching creams. Vilakazi (1962) is
of the opinion that when a young man chooses a life partner, he
takes the opinion of his peers into consideration. He says that
his friends will laugh at him if he marries an ugly girl. This
gives one the impression that a beautiful wife is something a man
can display and boast about.

In addition to a "beautiful face" other physical characteristics
are important. Qualities such as physical robustness, a well-
built and well-proportioned body, with good legs, are considered.
Bryant (1949) says that men who are unable to get marriage partners
are usually not handsome, too short or too tall, and with small
buttocks (having big buttocks is considered a feminine characteris-
tic by modern youth). Also, dirty-looking and clumsy men have a
limited chance of being selected as marriage partners.

Traditionally, beauty is admired in terms of a clear skin (and not
its colour), decently sized legs and thighs, and well developed
breasts and buttocks (Mbatha, 1960). In addition to these characteristics, Bryant (1949) mentions the following: the woman must be plump, but the flesh must be firm and not flabby; the face must be broad and round, and not oval or long; the eyes must be large; the eye-brows black and shiny; and the lips must be full.

Clothes play an important role in enhancing the beauty of an individual, thus making him or her more attractive to the opposite sex. This increases the individual's chances of being selected as a marriage partner. Schapera (1933) says that young men on their return from work in the big cities are well-dressed and perhaps have money to spend. They appear desirable to girls, whom they seduce fairly easily, and promise to marry.

1.5 Children

The most important thing in a marriage, especially in a traditional setting, is procreation. In addition to other qualities a woman must be fertile in order to be happy in marriage. The ability to beget children is stressed by many Blacks. Physical appearance plays a less important role than woman's fertility (Vilakazi 1962). Radcliffe-Brown and Forde (1950) are of the opinion that although beauty as well as character and physical fitness are sought for in the choice of a wife, the rearing of children is regarded as the most important factor in a marriage. This becomes evident when the "lobola" (bride-price) practice and the levirate systems are studied.

Brandel (1958) and Schapera (1933) say that the "lobola" transaction transfers the woman's child-bearing capacity from her family of origin to the prospective husband's family. This indicates that a woman is expected to be fertile. Thus, traditionally, women are there for the sole purpose of bearing children. Usually a barren woman is substituted by her younger sister to bear children on her behalf. When a man dies and his wife has not passed the child-bearing age, the brother of the deceased co-habits with the widow in order to raise children for the deceased. As far as Schapera (1950) and Stafford (1935) are concerned, one of the original parties in a marriage is replaced by another person of the same sex.
who will in actual fact act only as a bodily substitute to en-
gender children on behalf of the former spouse.

Mbatha (1960) studied the Nyuswa tribe of Bothas Hill and found that a wife was acquired not only for the immediate family but for the lineage group as a whole. It is the duty of each male member of the lineage to increase its members through marriage and bring forth offspring. In this context it is obvious that male children are preferred because they are permanent members of the lineage, and through them the lineage may be increased when they get married. Schapera (1933) found that among the Tswana the opinion that marriage is a means of increasing the members of a lineage prevailed.

According to Gluckman (1950), among the Lozi of Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) barrenness in a wife is not regarded as an essential impediment to the marriage contract. The husband is, however, free to divorce her on the ground of being barren, and a woman is allowed to divorce a man on the ground of impotency. With some of the Congolese tribes the bride-price is returned when the woman is found to be barren.

1.6 House-keeping

Traditionally, cooking is considered a very dull and uninteresting affair; thus it is not rated highly in the selection of a life part-
ner. Vilakazi (1962) says that being an expert in cooking is not rated highly among the traditionalists. This is deduced from the fact that a ten year old child can cook for the household because it only involves boiling and stirring. But a woman who makes good beer is highly valued.

Among modern Blacks the ability to cook and entertain strangers is a strong recommendation. Usually, the mother of the girl is stu-
died very closely, and if she is "civilised", a good cook and a good entertainer, it is concluded that the daughter has the same quali-
ties. The duty of the boy is to get a woman who must come into his family, cook for them, sow and tend the crops, and help to keep the kraal clean and respectable (Mbatha, 1960; Vilakazi, 1962). This means that an industrious woman is more likely to be chosen as a life partner than an indolent one.
According to Dreyer (1976) women are taught from an early age how to be good wives and housekeepers. Diligence is usually stressed more than physical attractiveness. Some men avoid very beautiful women because they claim that beautiful women are usually lazy (Mbatha, 1960).

1.7 Religion

It has been observed that hostility exists between Christians and pagans, and between Roman Catholics and Protestants. This hostility was perpetuated by missionaries, and today it is perpetuated by African ministers of religion (Vilakazi, 1962). Among Christians, the family of the prospective spouse and the locality from which he or she comes play an important part in mate selection. For instance, a girl from a pagan home or surroundings is less likely to be chosen as a marriage partner by a Christian boy, compared to a girl who comes from a mission station. An important consideration among Christians is that the woman must definitely be a Christian.

Vilakazi (1962) is of the opinion that Roman Catholics and Protestants behave differently, even though they recognise that they follow one leader. They do not mix, and interfaith marriages are discouraged, especially by the Roman Catholics. This leads to the formation of two social groups, as it were, which have different views. This incompatibility between the Roman Catholics and Protestants plays an important role in the choice of a marriage partner.
MATE SELECTION IN THE WEST

2.1 Introduction

During adolescence and early adulthood, the individual comes in contact with many members of the opposite sex who are, theoretically, potential marriage partners. Now the question arises: How does it happen that the individual narrows his choice down to a few, and eventually one person is selected as a marriage partner? Many factors are operative here. Mihanovich, Schnepf and Thomas (1952) have divided these factors into two groups, namely: "false" and "correct" theories in mate selection.

The false theories are capsuled in the saying "love at first sight." But the first impression should be complemented by other factors in order to be able to make a correct choice of a marriage partner. The factors which are usually considered in addition to the first impression are referred to by Mihanovich et al. (1952), as the correct theories in mate selection.

Several studies have been conducted, especially in the USA, concerning characteristics considered important in the choice of a marriage partner (e.g. Lock, 1951; Hurlock, 1968; Mussen et al., 1969; Stagner, 1974; Conger, 1977). Hurlock (1968), for instance, says that in the past materialistic factors played an important role. The girl who had beautiful clothes, a nice home, a car and money, rated higher with boys than the girl who did not have many material possessions. The girls valued the same factors with regard to the boys.

Research has shown that interpersonal responses are partly determined by such variables as clothing and race (Bryne, London & Reeves, 1968). That is, people are attracted towards one another because of the way they dress, and whether they belong to the same racial group.

Steyn & Ripp (1968) are of the opinion that wealth, education and occupation are important in the choice of a marriage partner.
Burgess and Locke (1945) have grouped the factors operative in the selection of a marriage partner into five categories: Propinquity, parental image, personality needs, conception of the ideal mate, and similarity of qualities.

2.2 Propinquity
Propinquity means closeness or nearness in space, and, as applied here, means that there is a strong tendency for individuals to select as marriage partners persons who reside nearby; who work near them; or who belong to the same social class, racial group, religion, etc.

2.2.1 Residential propinquity
Studies have revealed that residential propinquity plays an important role in mate selection, to a much greater degree than chance. In a study of five thousand marriage licenses issued to the residents of Philadelphia, Bossard (1932) found that 16.7 per cent of the couples concerned lived less than a block away from each other; about one out of every four partners lived within two blocks from each other, and one out of every three partners lived within five blocks from each other.

Katz and Hill (1958) stated that the probability of interaction is affected by distance. That is, people living close together tend to be attracted to each other. These people may show a tendency to selecting marriage partners from within the same geographical location (Rogers and Havens, 1960).

2.2.2 Social class
Different people have expressed different views with regard to the importance of social class in the selection of a marriage partner. Hurlock (1968) states that social class differences are not important. But according to Conger (1977) and Popenoe (1957) social class does influence the
choice of a prospective mate; boys and girls of all classes tend to date within their own social class. According to Nimkoff (1947) the tendency is for people of the same socio-economic status to congregate in the same or similar areas.

As people rise on the social ladder they become less bound by the factor of locality. The tendency is for them to marry someone who lives outside the group, but who is more or less of the same socio-economic status. This means that the rich tend to marry the rich and the poor the poor. Stagner (1974) says that young people choose as mates persons of similar economic background. In a study conducted by Nimkoff (1947) in Allentown, U.S.A., in 1930 it was found that the higher the socio-economic status of the individual, the greater was the tendency to marry someone who resided outside the city, because rich people can travel and extend their social contacts.

Another factor considered important in the selection of a marriage partner is education. But this factor is related to other factors such as the socio-economic status of the individual. Nimkoff (1947) found that 40.9 per cent of the husbands who completed the first year in high school married girls who had the same educational standard; 51.6 per cent of high school seniors married within their own ranks, etc. This indicates that intelligence also plays an important role in mate selection, because it may be assumed that people with approximately the same educational standard have more or less the same intelligence. That is why men and women in the same occupation tend to intermarry (Popenoe, 1957). Beigel (1957) is of the opinion that equal intelligence in the chosen female is desired by men because it may help in the acquisition or maintenance of a high social status. According to Hunt (1940) 56 per cent of semiskilled men married semiskilled women.
Nimkoff (1947) states that in a study of fifty couples correlation coefficients for intelligence of mates ranged from 0.42 to 0.74. But he goes on to say that this is misleading, because it has been found that men tend to select women who have less schooling and lower intelligence quotients. This is very common with professional and business men. Some men have stated that the preferred woman’s intelligence must not be above average, or the woman’s intelligence or education must not exceed their own (Beigel, 1957).

Dinitz, Bank, & Pasamanick (1960) are of the opinion that there are at least three well-defined positions with regard to the interclass or intraclass problem. It depends on how a particular society is organised. Mate selection tends to be more intraclass in rigidly stratified societies, and less so in an open class society. Further it was observed that males marrying upwards in the social structure were on the increase. Men who married upwards increased from 36.9 per cent in 1933 to 39.2 per cent in 1939, 41.5 per cent in 1949, and 44 per cent in 1957-1958.

2.2.3 Racial background

Marriages across the colourline are illegal in some states in the USA and hence such marriages are not recorded (Mihanovich, Schnepp, & Thomas, 1952). This has made it difficult for researchers to compile a complete list of such marriages. The number becomes very small if the discussion is limited to those inter-racial marriages which have been performed legally.

In a study conducted in New York City, covering 388,970 marriages from 1900 to 1930, it was found that inter-racial marriages numbered less than one in every 1,000 marriages. Los Angeles, from 1924 to 1933, had the highest rate of inter-racial marriages - 12 per every 1,000 marriages (Mihanovich, Schnepp, & Thomas, 1952). In 1959, Burma (1963) estimated
2.2.4 Religious affiliation

The concern about marriages involving people of different religious affiliations is not new. Throughout history the different religious groups have applied sanctions against those who married outside their faith and more especially those who gave up their own religion (Lantz and Snyder, 1969).

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards mixed marriages has been one of strong condemnation (Selfors, Leik & King, 1952). Such marriages were tolerated only if certain conditions, designed to protect the faith of the Roman Catholic party and the offspring, were fulfilled. Mihanovich et al (1952), and Lantz and Snyder (1969), say that a non-Catholic marrying a Roman Catholic had to sign a contract before marriage, guaranteeing that the faith of the Roman Catholic partner will not change and that all the children born to the union will be baptized and brought up in the Roman Catholic faith.

Research has shown that in spite of the traditionally strong feeling against mixed marriages, they are increasing in
number. Heiss (1960) in New York City found that 18 per cent of Jews, 21 per cent of Roman Catholics and 34 per cent of Protestants had contracted interfaith marriages.

According to Leslie (1967), of the marriages contracted by members of the United Lutheran Church in America between 1941 and 1945, 47 per cent were interdenominational. From 1946 to 1950 the percentage increased to 58. This study shows an increasing acceptance of interfaith dating and marriage.

Studies conducted among college students indicated that about 50 per cent would accept a mixed marriage, and in one study, Leslie (1967) found that up to 97 per cent of college students approved of interfaith dating. According to Selfors, Leik, and King (1962), what is important here is the type of college. Students from schools with no religious affiliation will place less emphasis on religion in selecting a mate than religion orientated schools.

Heiss (1960) found that many interfaith marriages involving Roman Catholics were due to early family experiences. The parents of the Roman Catholics involved in interfaith marriages tended to be non-religious. Also these individuals showed more dissatisfaction with and emancipation from their parents at the time of marriage.

Divorce and separation rates have been found to be lower in marriages contracted within the same religious groups than in mixed marriages. The divorce rate was found to be especially high in marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and in particular where a Roman Catholic man married a Protestant woman (Leslie, 1967; Hurlock, 1968).

According to Mihanovich et al (1952) differences between different Protestant Churches are not so great as to cause difficulties in marriage, because members of these churches
are allowed individual interpretation of the Bible. This makes adaptation easier than in other interfaith marriages, and there is thus less friction between these couples than occurs in marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Nevertheless, sometimes friction does arise in marriages between couples of different Protestant denominations as well. A Protestant who has deep personal convictions and is bound to a particular denomination by, for instance, a strong family tradition, may find it difficult to adjust to a mate of different religious affiliation, who also is a staunch supporter of his or her denomination. Mihanovich et al (1952) say that this happens especially when members of certain smaller religious groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists, and other sects are involved. Interfaith marriages involving such groups may lead to serious difficulties. Harmonious relationships between husband and wife belonging to the same denomination are more likely to be experienced because this guarantees a sameness of aims regarding life (Schmiedeler, 1947).

3 Domesticity

The term domesticity in this instance will be used to mean an interest in the home for both the man and the woman. That is, both should show interest in making the home an attractive place to live in for the whole family; there should be peace, security, affection and happiness within the family. The wife should be willing and able to rear children, and the husband should be able and willing to support the family financially.

Mihanovich et al (1952) are of the opinion that the modern man lays little stress on the culinary virtues of a prospective marriage partner. Instead, the rearing of children is taken as one of the principal domestic functions. According to the Purdue Opinion Poll (1961), quoted by Hurlock (1968), the desire for a normal family life with children was emphasised by both boys and girls, but girls did not expect their prospective spouses to know how to cook, and
some boys emphasised cooking ability in their future spouses.

According to Hewitt (1958), and Hurlock (1968), the modern woman prefers a man who is industrious, dependable, and who has a stable job. To the modern man affection and housekeeping play an important role in the selection of a mate. Hewitt (1958) goes on to say that men and women seem to be in agreement concerning the relative importance of most traits, that is, there are no important differences between the sexes concerning the traits emphasised as far as the selection of a mate is concerned.

Many researchers have expressed different opinions as far as marital happiness and having children is concerned. Terman (1938) is of the opinion that children are the strongest link in a normal marriage. Marriages that were first unhappy became less so after the birth of children.

By contrast, in a study conducted in Sweden by Locke and Karlson (1952), it was found that no relationship existed between the presence or absence of children and marital happiness. Terman (1938) found that childless couples seemed to be drawn more closely together by the absence of offspring. In such cases the husband is less likely to look upon paternity as one of the major goals of life. Instead, the absence of offspring affords him more luxuries, he escapes many annoying domestic cares and does not have to share the mate's attention with children.

According to Schmiedeler (1947) the modern couple is no longer family orientated because work and recreation outside the home before marriage have led to many social contacts and interests which have made life within the home appear dull and uninviting.

2.4 Physical attractiveness

Physical attractiveness is not a characteristic to be despised, in spite of the fact that it usually ranks last in any list of items checked by students. Physical attractiveness plays an important role in the development of the self-concept which in turn plays an
important role in interpersonal relationships. According to Schmiedeler (1947), few subjects have rated physical attractiveness very high in comparison with other characteristics. Mihanovich et al (1952) are of the opinion that the primary function of beauty is to attract a prospective mate. The prospective spouse will look into the other qualities only after having been attracted by the beauty of the opposite sex member.

Hurlock (1968) is of the opinion that a person who is attractive is more sought after for dates. Boys and girls discover that an attractive appearance increases their chances of acceptance by members of the opposite sex. In a study conducted by Baber (1936) at New York University, it was found that most of the male students preferred to marry for health and beauty, rather than for wealth.

In a study conducted by Perrin (1921) at the University of Texas in 1921, it was found that the correlation between "physical attractiveness" and "liking" was 0.6. This shows that physical attractiveness was considered one of the most important characteristics in interpersonal relationships. Nimkoff (1947) says that the average American boy and girl stress health, appearance and personality, rather than money. This attraction may lead to subsequent dating, which may be followed by marriage. At the University of Minnesota it was found that the largest determinant of "liking" and subsequent dating was physical attractiveness (Byrne et al, 1968).

From the above studies it would seem therefore that physical attractiveness is an important attribute in interpersonal relationships. Both males and females would prefer to be attractive, to love attractive friends, to have an attractive spouse and to have attractive children. Nimkoff (1947) found no significant differences between males and females; both sexes rated physical attractiveness highly as a selective factor. Mihanovich et al (1952), and Roff and Brody (1953), say that adolescent boys and girls are disturbed by such unwanted attributes as fatness, unattractive features, poor complexion, shortness in boys and tallness in girls.
Lerner, Karabenich, and Stuart (1973) say that both males and females agree that what they think is important in determining their own attractiveness is in agreement with what the members of the opposite sex think is important in making them physically attractive. Males consider the shape of legs, hips and thighs more important in determining a woman's beauty. Females too regard these features more important in determining their own physical attractiveness. Females consider height and width of shoulders more important in judging physical attractiveness in men.

2.5 Personality

The person will perceive as attractive, and will seek to marry, an individual with a good disposition. A person with an even temperament is more likely to be selected as a life partner than one who is impulsive, unstable and oversensitive. According to Schmiedeler (1947) an intelligent person is likely to choose as a marriage partner a person who has good habits or a good character. In a survey conducted at Notre Dame University, USA, (1945) it was found that 203 students emphasised good character as compared with eighty who showed preference for a homemaker.

The basic personality needs of both sexes are much the same. Strauss (1945) found that young married couples expected their mates to show them affection, respect for their ideals, appreciation of their achievement wishes, help in making important decisions, support in difficulties, and consideration which would relieve loneliness. Thus an eligible partner is one whose attributes will evoke expectations of need gratification. According to Hurlock (1968) women prefer good-mannered, trustworthy, and dependable men. To the man, pride in appearance and manners, and affection, are regarded more important than physical attractiveness and the possession of material things.

Stagner (1974) is of the opinion that a woman with a need to feel protected will be selectively attracted to a man with a need to dominate and protect. A man who yearns for a mother substitute
will be attracted to a motherly woman. A socially awkward person might value a mate who is socially adroit, and a person who is not managing his affairs intelligently would gain much from a wiser partner.
CHAPTER THREE

THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Aim of the study

As indicated in the previous chapter, in several studies, conducted mostly in the USA, it was found that members of both sexes were attracted towards each other for different reasons. Traits mentioned in the various studies are physical attractiveness, material possessions and certain personality characteristics, such as pleasantness, sociability, trustworthiness, and so on. With regard to race and socio-economic status investigators differ. Some found that these two factors were important in the selection of a life partner and others found that they were not important. Also it was found that young men and women had different opinions on some factors and held the same opinion on others.

The question arises as to whether young Black adults hold the same opinions as the American youth? The aim of this study was to find out what young Black people look for in a future life partner. Are they attracted by physical beauty, or the personality of the opposite sex member? What part do religious affiliations, social class and ethnical background play in the selection of a life partner? Is the idea of having children an important factor in the choice of a marriage partner?

To answer these questions, the following hypotheses were initially formulated.

3.2 Hypotheses

(i) Males and females do not emphasize the same characteristics in the choice of a life partner.

(ii) The choice of a marriage partner depends on the religious commitment of the prospective spouse.
Social status plays an important role in the selection of a marriage partner.

Physical attractiveness is regarded as an important characteristic in the choice of a life partner.

The tribal background of the opposite sex member is considered important in the choice of a life partner.

Having children is considered important in marriage.

Submissiveness of the wife is considered important in marriage.

Home-making (domesticity) is considered important in marriage.

3.3 Method of study

For the purpose of carrying out a pilot-study first, a random sample of one hundred subjects was selected from the first-year Arts students of the University of Zululand. The age-range of the subjects was not taken into consideration; it was assumed that the majority of first-year students range in age from approximately eighteen to twenty-five years. Thirty-six males and sixty-four females were interviewed.

The sample consisted of a mixed group; subjects came from rural as well as urban backgrounds. The majority belonged to the Nguni ethnic group.

The aim of the pilot study was to test the validity and the reliability of the attitude-scale, constructed for the purpose of this study (see section 3.4 below).

The research group, per se, consisted of two hundred subjects ranging in age from sixteen years to twenty-eight years. Only those who were not married and had never been married were interviewed.
All the subjects were first-year Arts students at the University of Zululand. This was a group which entered university a year after the students interviewed in the pilot study. Ninety-one males and one hundred and nine females were interviewed.

3.4 Construction of the attitude-scale used in this study

Seventy-five Likert-type statements were formulated to test the hypotheses mentioned in section 3.2.

The initial inventory including these 75 statements appears as Appendix A on pages 71 – 78.

Eleven statements were formulated to test hypothesis (ii). These statements are numbered, 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36, 43, 50, 58, 66 and 71.

Twelve statements were formulated to test hypothesis number (iii). These statements are: 2, 9, 16, 23, 30, 37, 44, 52, 59, 67, 72 and 75.

Eleven statements, formulated to test hypothesis number (iv), are: 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 38, 45, 53, 61, 68 and 73.

Ten statements, formulated to test hypothesis number (v), are: 4, 11, 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 54, 62 and 69.

Thirteen statements, formulated to test hypothesis number (vi), are: 5, 12, 19, 26, 33, 40, 47, 51, 55, 60, 63, 70 and 74.

Nine statements, formulated to test hypothesis number (vii), are: 6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 56 and 64.

Nine statements, formulated to test hypothesis number (viii), are: 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49, 57 and 65.

The subjects in the pilot study were requested to express their responses in terms of the following categories: strongly agree (SA); agree (A); undecided (U); disagree (D); and strongly disagree (SD).
The following procedure was used to score the statements.

The response strongly agree to a favourable statement was scored five, agree four, undecided three, disagree two and, strongly disagree one. Strongly disagree to an unfavourable statement was scored five, disagree four, undecided three, agree two, and strongly agree one.

Five response categories were chosen, as the response variance will be greater than when dealing with only two categories (Kerlinger, 1966).

3.5 Validation of the scale

The measurement of attitudes is a very complex matter, and this is largely on account of the measures involved in the validation of the scale. When constructing a measuring instrument it should first be tested for validity and thereafter for reliability. A rating scale should be scrutinized to ascertain whether it measures what it purports to measure (Anastasi, 1968; Kerlinger, 1966; McCormick, 1958).

3.5.1 Validity of the scale

As a first step, before the scale was subjected to statistical analysis for reliability and validity, it was administered to two Psychology Honours students and some of the researcher's colleagues to ascertain whether the statements were clear and unambiguous, as ambiguity in the wording of the items may seriously affect the validity of the responses obtained.

To obtain an estimate of the discriminatory validity of the items in the questionnaire, the method of "Summated ratings," appropriate to the Likert type of scale construction, was used. This method has been described by Edwards (1957).
The scores for each subject in the pilot study on the items in the questionnaire, were added together to obtain the total score for each respondent. The total scores were then arranged in an ascending order. Twenty-five per cent of the subjects with the highest scores (i.e. \( N = 25 \)) and twenty-five per cent of the subjects with the lowest scores, (i.e. \( N = 25 \)) were selected for item analysis. It is assumed that these two groups at the extreme ends of the score distribution provide criterion groups in terms of which one can evaluate individual statements by finding the value of \( t \) obtaining between the two groups for each statement. The higher the value of \( t \) the more different the two groups are from each other, and hence the greater the discriminatory power of the item concerned.

The following formula, suggested by Edwards (1957), was used to determine the \( t \) values of the statements:

\[
t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum(X_H - \bar{X}_H)^2 + \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n(n-1)}}}
\]

where \( \bar{X}_H \) = the mean score on a given statement for the high group.

\( \bar{X}_L \) = the mean score on the same statement for the low group.

\( \sum(X_H - \bar{X}_H)^2 = \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2 = \frac{n}{n} \)

the sum of the squared deviations from the mean for the high group.
\[ \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2 = \sum X_L^2 - (\sum X_L)^2 = \frac{n}{n} \]

the sum of the squared deviations from the mean for the low group.

\[ n = \text{the number of scores in each group.} \]

To illustrate the procedure, the computation of \( t \) for the first item in the questionnaire is given hereunder:

**TABLE 3.1**

The calculation of \( t \) for evaluating the difference in the mean response to statement No. 1 by the high group and the low group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>HIGH GROUP</th>
<th></th>
<th>LOW GROUP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>fX</td>
<td>fX²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X}_H = \frac{105}{25} = 4,20 \]

\[ \bar{X}_L = \frac{70}{25} = 2,80 \]

\[ \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2 = 475 - \frac{(105)^2}{25} \]

\[ \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2 = 220 - \frac{(70)^2}{25} \]

\[ = 34 \]

\[ = 24 \]
\[ t = \frac{4.20 - 2.80}{\sqrt{\frac{34 + 24}{25 (25-1)}}} = 4.50 \]

All the \( t \) values equal to or greater than 1.75 were taken as indicating that the responses of the "High" group and the "Low" group differed significantly on a given statement.

From the seventy-five statements appearing in the initial questionnaire thirty-six statements yielded \( t \) values greater than 1.75. Hence these thirty-six items were included in the final format of the questionnaire. The remaining thirty-nine items were rejected.

The questionnaire, in its final format, appears as Appendix B on pages 79 - 83.

Six statements of the thirty-six included in the final questionnaire relate to hypothesis number (ii); these are: 1, 4, 11, 17, 21 and 32.

Three statements refer to hypothesis number (iii); these are: 8, 15 and 33.

Seven statements refer to hypothesis number (iv); these are: 5, 9, 12, 16, 18, 24 and 34.

Seven statements refer to hypothesis number (v); these are: 2, 6, 10, 13, 25, 30 and 35.

Four statements refer to hypothesis number (vi); these are: 23, 26, 29 and 35.
Three statements refer to hypothesis number (vii); these are: 7, 19 and 27.

Six statements refer to hypothesis number (viii); these are: 3, 14, 20, 22, 28 and 31.

3.5.2 Reliability of the scale

The reliability of consistency of the scale containing the thirty-six selected items was determined by means of the split-half method suggested by Dunn (1960), Fox (1969), Likert (1967), Nunnally (1967), and others. According to Nunnally, the split-half method may be used when the items are scored on three or more points. The split-half coefficient is also referred to as the coefficient of internal consistency, because the two halves of the scale are actually two parts of the same inventory.

One of the main advantages of the split-half technique is that all the data for estimating the reliability of the scale are obtained in only one application. Variations brought about by differences between two testing situations are thus eliminated. Hence the split-half method requires only one form of a scale and there is no time-lag involved in the application of the two halves of the scale. The same mental and physical influences operate on the subjects during the administration of the two halves.

A marked disadvantage of the split-half technique lies in the fact that chance errors may affect scores on the two halves of the scale in the same way, thus tending to make the reliability coefficient spuriously high.

The statements were divided into odd-numbered and even-numbered items and the Spearman rank-order correlation technique was used to calculate the correlation between the two halves of the inventory. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (rho) obtained was .995.
The Spearman rank-order correlation technique was used because Garrett (1958) holds that Likert-type scales should be treated as ordinal scales. According to Snodgrass (1977) however, the Spearman rank-order correlation technique is not applicable when there are tied ranks. He suggests that the correlation should be computed by means of the Pearson \( r \) formula, in which the ranks are used as raw scores. When this method was applied to our questionnaire the correlation coefficient was reduced to .98.

As in the split-half method the correlation is computed between two halves only of the total number of items in the inventory, the correlation coefficient obtained is an underestimation of the reliability of the total inventory. Hence a correction-formula, known as the Spearman-Brown Formula, needs to be applied to the correlation coefficient obtained between the two halves of the items in the inventory, in order to estimate the reliability-coefficient for the total number of items (Garrett, 1958; Hardyck, 1969).

The Spearman-Brown Formula applicable here is as follows:

\[
\rho_{tt} = \frac{2\rho_{1/2}}{1 + \rho_{1/2}}
\]

- \( \rho_{tt} \) = the reliability coefficient for the total inventory.
- \( \rho_{1/2} \) = the correlation coefficient between the two halves of the inventory.

After applying this formula to the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (rho) obtained between the two halves of the inventory \( \rho_{tt} \) was .997. On application to the Pearson \( r \) obtained between the two halves, \( r_{tt} \) was .993.

We therefore conclude that the scale has high internal consistency.
CHAPTER FOUR

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCALE, ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES AND RESULTS

4.1 Administration

As mentioned in the previous chapter the final version of the inventory was administered to 200 first-year Arts students, 91 of whom were males and 109 females. They ranged in age from sixteen years to twenty-eight years. None of the subjects were married or had ever been married.

The subjects were requested to fill in all the required background information, as indicated on the questionnaire, namely: sex, religion, parents' occupations, combined income of parents and age. But unfortunately when the questionnaires were returned it was found that only seventy-six subjects had indicated their ages. The subjects probably overlooked this category in the questionnaire because it was inserted by hand after the questionnaire had been typed.

No time limit was set for completion of the questionnaire and complete confidentiality of responses was assured.

4.2 Statistical analyses

Each of our hypotheses was tested through application of the chi-square test to the responses obtained on the items in the questionnaire pertaining to that hypothesis. The chi-square index expresses the size of the difference between observed and expected frequencies of responses obtained in the different response categories provided in the inventory - i.e. five in our case.

Since in the testing of our hypotheses our main concern is to determine whether a significantly larger proportion of the responses evoked is in agreement than is not in agreement with the statements concerned, the response categories with scores 5 and 4 were combined into one category, termed "Agreement," whilst the responses scoring 3, 2 and 1 were combined into another category termed "Non-agreement."
Where the scoring of some items is reversed, the combined categories 1 and 2 denote "Agreement," whilst categories 3, 4 and 5 denote "Non-agreement." This concerns items 4, 5, 6, 13, 19 and 36 in the final questionnaire. Since, however, agreement with such items implies, in fact, non-agreement with the relevant hypothesis (these being the so-called "negative" items), in the contingency tables, constructed for the computation of chi-square, the observed frequencies of responses in categories 1 and 2 on these items are given under "non-agreement," whilst the responses in categories 3, 4 and 5 appear under "agreement" in the tables. This is done in order to enable ascertaining in the final analysis the overall agreement or support received over all items pertaining to the hypothesis concerned.

The items to which reverse scoring applies are marked in the tables. For these items, therefore, the frequencies of responses in the categories "agreement" and "non-agreement" to these items must be read in the reverse order from that of the other items.

Chi-square tests of significance were, then, applied to determine the differences in the frequencies of responses in the two broad categories "agreement" and "non-agreement" to any one hypothesis.

For each hypothesis, chi-square was calculated separately for each relevant item:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females agreeing or not agreeing with that item;

b) to test the significance of differences in the responses of the total group as regards agreement to that item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all items pertaining to a particular hypothesis, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group, to ascertain whether the hypothesis was confirmed or not.
Two methods of calculating chi-square have been used in this study:

a) For testing the significance of differences between males and females on any one item, a $2 \times 2$ table was used, and chi-square computed according to the formula:

$$X^2 = \frac{N(ad-bc)^2}{k \cdot l \cdot m \cdot n}$$

where $a, b, c, d =$ the four cells in the contingency table.

$k, l, m, n =$ the four totals of the cells in the margins of the contingency table

$N =$ total number of subjects.

b) To test the difference between agreement and non-agreement responses for the whole group on any one item, as well as for computing the overall chi-square for all items pertaining to a particular hypothesis, the traditional method was utilized, given by the expression:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

where $E =$ expected frequencies of responses.

$O =$ observed frequencies of responses.

4.2.1 Hypothesis (i)

"Males and females do not emphasize the same characteristics in the choice of a life partner."

All the items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (i) (See Appendix B, pages 79 - 83).
Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of the total of observed frequencies of responses for males and females, with regard to all items relating to the subsequent hypotheses formulated in this study. For interest's sake, the distribution of responses to these hypotheses for the whole group is also given.

**TABLE 4.2.1.1**

Hypotheses (ii) - (viii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 416</td>
<td>1 860</td>
<td>3 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 698</td>
<td>2 226</td>
<td>3 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3 114</td>
<td>4 086</td>
<td>7 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square was computed to test:

a) the significance of differences between the proportion of males and females for all subsequent hypotheses.

b) the significance of differences for the total group for all hypotheses.

**Results:**

**TABLE 4.2.1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs non-</td>
<td>131.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the tests indicate that:

Overall, there is no difference between the responses of males and females.

The stated hypothesis is therefore rejected.

With regard to the difference between agreement and non-agreement with the subsequent hypotheses formulated in this study, there is a significant difference. The majority of subjects' responses lend no support to most of these hypotheses.

The amount of support for each hypothesis separately is indicated in the next sections.

4.2.2 Hypothesis No (ii)

"The choice of a marriage partner depends on the religious commitment of the prospective spouse."

Six items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No (ii), namely:

Item 1: To make family life most successful, my spouse will have to join my church.

Item 4: Every normal healthy couple should allow the children to go to any church they like.

Item 11: A woman who does not belong to her husband's church should not be allowed to give religious instructions to the children.

Item 17: If there is a difference of opinion, my children will have to attend my church.
Item 21: Religion will play a more important role in my marriage than other characteristics.

Item 32: It would be undesirable for my spouse to belong to a different church.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

**TABLE 4.2.2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (reversed scoring)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all six items for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

Results:

TABLE 4.2.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>32,00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>15,68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement (scoring on this item is reversed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 11</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>11,90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Males agree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>109,52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Strong disagreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 17</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>10,974</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Females disagree more often than males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>23,12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the tests indicate that:

**Item 1**: The great majority of subjects agree with this statement.

There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.

**Item 4**: The majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

There is no difference in the responses of males and females.

**Item 11**: Both males and females reject this proposition, and females even more unanimously than males.
Item 17: Most subjects were not in agreement with this statement; females less so than males. Approximately one-third of both males and females were undecided about it.

Item 21: The majority of females agree with this statement, whilst less than half of the males agree with it. The overall chi-square for agreement vs. non-agreement is not significant.

Item 32: By far the majority of females agree with this item, whereas the males are almost equally divided between agreement and non-agreement.

Overall chi-square:

The overall chi-square for both sexes on all six items is not significant, and neither is the overall chi-square for males versus females significant. It is apparent from the analysis of separate items, however, that the overall chi-squares mask significant differences between males and females, as well as among the whole group, on single items. As the differences are often in the opposite direction for the various items, they tend to cancel each other out, and hence the overall chi-squares are insignificant.

This being the case, however, the stated hypothesis has not been confirmed.

4.2.3 Hypothesis (iii)

"Social status plays an important role in the selection of a marriage partner."

Three items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (iii), namely:

Item 8: I would not marry a person who comes from a lower social class.
Item 15: For most successful family-life, my spouse will need more than a high school education.

Item 33: My future spouse should have a car.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

**TABLE 4.2.3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.
Finally, chi-square was computed over all three items for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

Results:

**TABLE 4.2.3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0,20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>70,08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0,79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>8,82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 33</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>20,14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Males disagree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>14,58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall chi-square</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>8,711</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>Females agree more often than males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>47,04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the tests indicate that:

**Item 8**: By far the majority of subjects do not agree with this statement. There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.
Item 15: The majority of subjects do agree with this statement. There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. (It is of interest to note that the respondents are all first-year university students. One would therefore expect them to agree with this item).

Item 33: The males strongly disagree with this statement, whilst the opinion of the females is almost equally divided between agreement and non-agreement. Overall, the majority of subjects do not agree with it.

Overall chi-square:
The overall chi-square for both sexes on all three items indicates a significantly larger proportion of non-agreement than of agreement with the items. The difference between males and females is significant with the females agreeing more often than males.

The stated hypothesis has not been upheld.

4.2.4 Hypothesis (iv)

"Physical attractiveness is regarded as an important characteristic in the choice of a life partner."

Seven items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (iv), namely:

Item 5: Spending precious time in trying to make oneself attractive is not important in marriage.

Item 9: To ensure most successful family-life, my mate will need to be spick and span all the time.
Item 12: Height is an important characteristic in the selection of a marriage partner.

Item 16: My spouse's physical attractiveness should be such that it is appreciated by my friends.

Item 18: I would not marry a person who is physically deformed.

Item 24: In my marriage I expect to spend time with my spouse choosing beautiful clothes for the whole family.

Item 34: The most important thing in a future marriage partner is physical attractiveness.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

**TABLE 4.2.4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (reversed scoring)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all seven items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.
### Results:

#### TABLE 4.2.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001 Non-agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001 Non-agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001 Non-agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2.4.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 34</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi-square

| a) Males vs. females  | 1.317      | 1  | NS    | -                       |
| b) Agreement vs. non- | 67.76      | 1  | 0.001 | Non-agreement            |
| agreement             |            |    |       |                         |

The results of the tests indicate that:

Item 5 : The difference between agreement and non-agreement is not significant. The difference between the responses of males and females is not significant.

Item 9 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The chi-square for agreement versus non-agreement is also not significant.

Item 12 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The chi-square for agreement vs. non-agreement is significant. The majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

Item 16 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The difference between agreement and non-agreement is significant, with the majority of the subjects disagreeing with this statement.
Item 18: The majority of the subjects do not agree with this statement. The difference between males' and females' responses is not significant.

Item 24: There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females, and neither between agreement and non-agreement on this item.

Item 34: The majority of subjects disagree with this statement. The difference between males' and females' responses is not significant.

Overall chi-square:
The overall chi-square for all seven items indicates a significantly larger proportion of non-agreement than of agreement with these items. There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.

The stated hypothesis has not been confirmed.

4.2.5 Hypothesis (v)
"The tribal background of the opposite sex member is considered important in the choice of a life partner."

Seven items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (v), namely:

Item 2: It is a sin to marry a person of a different tribe.

Item 6: The children of a person who is married to someone of a different tribe should not encounter any problems in their social lives.

Item 10: I expect to marry a person who belongs to my tribe.
Item 13: Inter-tribal marriages should be encouraged so as to neutralise hatred between tribes.

Item 25: The person's tribe should be used as the only criterion for selecting a marriage partner.

Item 30: Marrying a person of a different tribe is sure to lead to disharmony.

Item 35: Marrying a person of a different tribe may lead to problems in the upbringing of children.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

TABLE 4.2.5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reversed scoring)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reversed scoring)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all seven items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.
Results:

**TABLE 4.2.5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>169.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2.903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>124.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2.5.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 35</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>23,12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall chi-square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0,002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>354,011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the tests indicate that:

Item 2 : By far the majority of subjects do not agree with this statement. There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.

Item 6 : The responses of the subjects are almost equally divided between agreement and non-agreement. There is no difference between the responses of males and females.

Item 10 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The difference between agreement and non-agreement is significant, with the majority of subjects disagreeing with this statement.

Item 13 : The difference between males' and females' responses is not significant. The difference between agreement and non-agreement is significant, with the majority of subjects agreeing with this statement.
Item 25: The overall chi-square between agreement and non-agreement is highly significant. The great majority of subjects do not agree with this statement. There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.

Item 30: By far the majority of subjects do not agree with this statement. The responses of males and females are not significantly different.

Item 35: There is a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement, and the difference is in the direction of non-agreement. The responses of males and females do not differ significantly.

Overall chi-square:

The overall chi-square for both sexes on all seven items indicates a significantly larger proportion of non-agreement than of agreement with these items. The difference between the responses of males and females is not significant.

The stated hypothesis has therefore not been upheld.

4.2.6 Hypothesis (vi)

"Having children is considered important in marriage."

Four items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (vi), namely:

Item 23: A woman who is unable to bear children has failed in her duty.

Item 26: A woman who refuses to have children has failed in her duty as a wife.
Item 29: The absence of children in a marriage is one of the most important factors leading to divorce.

Item 36: If the wife prefers a career to having children she will have the right to make the choice.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

**TABLE 4.2.6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (reversed scoring)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all four items for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

Results:

TABLE 4.2.6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 23</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>4.907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Females disagree more often than males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 26</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 29</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 36</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>7.996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Males disagree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2.6.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall chi-square</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,025</td>
<td>Males agree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>31,205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the tests indicate that:

**Item 23**: There is a significant difference between the responses of males and females, with females disagreeing more often than males.

The difference between agreement and non-agreement is significant. The majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

**Item 26**: There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. There is a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement. By far the majority of subjects agree with this statement.

**Item 29**: The difference between males and females is not significant. There is a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement. The majority of subjects agree with this statement.

**Item 36**: The difference between males and females is significant. Males disagree more often than females with this item. There is also a significant difference between agreement and non-
agreement, with the majority of subjects not in agreement with this statement. (About 21% were undecided).

Overall chi-square:

The overall difference between males' and females' responses indicates a significantly larger proportion of males than females in agreement with the hypothesis.

There is a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement on all four items. Overall, the majority of subjects agree with the hypothesis, when these are related to the hypothesis.

The stated hypothesis has therefore been confirmed.

4.2.7 Hypothesis (vii)

"Submissiveness of the wife is considered important in marriage."

Three items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (vii), namely:

Item 7: Women who want to remove the term "obey" from the marriage service, do not understand what it means to be a wife.

Item 19: The wife should be the "boss" who says what is to be done and what is not to be done.

Item 27: In marriage the man should have the main say in family matters.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

- **a)** to test the significance of differences between the proportion of males and females for each item;

- **b)** to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all three items for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.
### TABLE 4.2.7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>10,163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>Males disagree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>40,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0,562</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>165,62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>14,598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Males agree more often than females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>9,68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall chi-square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0,186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>30,827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the tests indicate that:

**Item 7**: There is a significant difference between the responses of males and females. Males disagree more often than females with this item.

By far the majority of subjects disagree with this statement. The difference between agreement and non-agreement responses is significant.
Item 19: There are no significant differences between the responses of males and females. There is a very significant difference between agreement and non-agreement. The overwhelming majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

Item 27: The responses of males and females are significantly different. Males agree more often than females. The majority of subjects agree with this statement, however. There is a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement for the total group to this item.

Overall chi-square

The overall chi-square for the subjects on all three statements indicates a significant difference between agreement and non-agreement. When the statements are related to the hypothesis, the majority of subjects' responses support the hypothesis. Overall, there is no significant difference between the responses of males and females, although this overall chi-square masks significant differences between the sexes on two individual items.

The stated hypothesis has therefore been upheld.

4.2.8 Hypothesis (viii)

"Home-making (domesticity) is considered important in a marriage."

Six items in the final inventory refer to hypothesis No. (viii), namely:

Item 3: If my spouse can cook well, other characteristics are not important.

Item 14: A woman who continues to work outside the home after marriage is neglecting her basic duty to husband and children.
Item 20: The care of the children should be entirely the wife's responsibility.

Item 22: Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.

Item 28: Cooking and keeping the house clean are solely the woman's duties.

Item 31: The wife should be thrifty and skillful in housekeeping.

Following is the contingency table showing the distribution of observed frequencies of responses to the above items, for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.

**TABLE 4.2.8.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>NON-AGREEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square was computed for each item separately:

a) to test the significance of differences between the proportions of males and females for each item;

b) to test the significance of differences for the total group for each item.

Finally, chi-square was computed over all six items for males and females separately, as well as for the total group.
### Results:

**TABLE 4.2.8.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>184.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 20</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 22</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 28</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>5.671</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Females agree more often than males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 31</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>115.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2.8.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall chi-square</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Males vs. females</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agreement vs. non-agreement</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Non-agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the tests indicate that:

Item 3 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The difference between agreement and non-agreement for all subjects is highly significant. By far the majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

Item 14 : The difference between the responses of males and females is not yet significant, although more females than males tend to disagree with this statement. Overall, however, there is no significant difference between agreement and non-agreement on this item.

Item 20 : There is no significant difference between the two sexes on this item. The difference between agreement and non-agreement for the whole group is significant. The majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.

Item 22 : There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The difference between agreement and non-agreement is significant. The majority of subjects do not agree with this statement.
Item 28: The responses of males and females are significantly different. Females agree more often than males with this item. The difference between agreement and non-agreement for the whole group is also significant. By far the majority of subjects agree with this statement.

Item 31: There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The great majority of subjects agree with this statement.

Overall chi-square

There is no significant difference between the responses of males and females.

The overall chi-square for both sexes on all six items indicates a significantly large proportion of non-agreement with these items.

The stated hypothesis has therefore not been upheld.
5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION'S AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion and conclusions

This study was intended to find answers to the following questions:

(i) What do Black young men and women look for in a future life partner? Are they attracted by physical beauty or the personality of the opposite sex member?

(ii) What part do religious affiliations, social class and tribal background play in the choice of a life partner?

(iii) Is the idea of having children an important factor in the choice of a marriage partner?

5.1.1 Differences in attitudes of males and females

Hewitt (1958) found that there were no important sex differences concerning the characteristics considered important in the choice of a marriage partner. The present study supports Hewitt's finding. On almost all the hypotheses stated, the differences between males' and females' responses are not significant.

We, thus, conclude that, by and large, males and females tend to emphasize the same characteristics in the choice of a life partner.

5.1.2 The religious commitment of the prospective spouse

This study corroborates the findings of Heiss (1960), Leslie (1967) and Selfors, Leik & King (1962), who claim that interfaith marriages are actually on the increase. The religious affiliation of the prospective spouse is not considered important by the present sample, as far as the welfare of the whole family is concerned. The children can go to either of the churches to which their parents belong.
Most of the subjects have also indicated, however, that they do not consider it advisable for couples to belong to different churches. This may lend support to the findings of Vilakazi (1962), Lantz & Snyder (1969) and Mihano-vich et al (1952) who claim that interfaith marriages are discouraged. It may also mean that the subjects consider that if the spouses belong to different religious affiliations, this may at least constitute a potential source of friction. This view would be in accordance with that expressed by Schmiedeler (1947).

On the whole, however, the choice of a marriage partner does not depend on the religious commitment of the prospective spouse, as far as the subjects of the present study are concerned.

5.1.3 The social status of the prospective spouse

It was found by several researchers that social status is important in choosing a marriage partner as far as women are concerned. For example, Brandel (1958) found that women anticipated marrying educated men, and Dougherty (1978) holds that girls tend to avoid boys who do not freely offer financial assistance when out on a date.

In the present study females, more often than males, expressed themselves in favour of their prospective spouse having at least a car. On the other hand, however, about half of the women did not think even this necessary.

Contrary to the notions that a girl from a poor family will not be able to get married (Vilakazi, 1962), and that the woman looks for a man of means (Brandel, 1958), most subjects in this study indicated that they would marry a person from a lower social class.
On the other hand, however, both males and females considered higher education of their prospective spouse as an important contributing factor to successful family-life. It is interesting to note that the respondents are all first-year university students. One would therefore expect them to agree with this item, because they probably anticipate to get married to university educated partners.

Finally, Hurlock (1968) is of the opinion that social class is no longer considered important in the choice of a marriage partner. It is evident from the present study that also among the Black educated youth, social class is no longer an important consideration. The great majority of subjects expressed themselves against social class as a criterion in the choice of a marriage partner.

5.1.4 Physical attractiveness of the prospective spouse

Physical attractiveness was not found by subjects to be important in the choice of a marriage partner either. This agrees with the findings of Mbatha (1960) and Vilakazi (1962) who concluded that beauty was not held in high esteem by the Nyuswa tribe. Beauty is not emphasized because it is claimed that a beautiful woman may be lazy and dishonest. Thus beauty is considered unimportant in comparison to other characteristics (Schmiedeler, 1947).

Contrary to the opinion that men who are too short or too tall have difficulty finding marriage partners (Bryant, 1949; Mihanovich, 1952), it is evident from the present study that height is not considered an important criterion of physical attractiveness.

In fact, none of the items relating to the hypothesis under consideration elicited the support of the majority of the subjects. The conclusion therefore is that physical attractiveness is not regarded as an important characteristic in the choice of a marriage partner.
5.1.5 Tribal background of the prospective spouse

The results of the present study show that the great majority of the subjects interviewed is of the opinion that the tribal background of a future spouse is not important. This supports the finding that inter-tribal marriages are on the increase, especially in urban areas (Steyn & Ripp, 1968).

The conclusion from this study is that modern educated Black youth rejects the idea that the tribal background of a prospective spouse should be of consequence in the choice of a marriage partner.

5.1.6 The importance of children in a marriage

Contrary to the view that a barren woman or a woman who is unable to bear children has failed in her duty (Brandel, 1958; Mbatha, 1960), most of the subjects do not agree with this statement. Females disagree with it even more often than males.

Both males and females are of the opinion, however, that children are important in a marriage. Most of them also hold that the absence of children in a family is one of the most important factors leading to divorce. This lends support to the view that the ability to beget children is considered very important in marriage (Mbatha, 1960; Vilakazi 1962). Actually, people such as Brandel (1958) are of the opinion that lobolo is paid to transfer the child bearing capacity of the woman to the husband's family.

As far as the opinion of the majority of subjects is concerned, therefore, children are regarded as very important in marriage.
5.1.7 Submissiveness in marriage

The majority of the subjects were of the opinion that submissiveness in a woman is important in marriage. It is thereby surprising to note that males more often than females disagreed with the statement:

"Women who want to remove the term 'obey' from the marriage service, do not understand what it means to be a wife."

This finding may lend some support to such statements as: a woman with a need to feel protected will be selectively attracted to a man with a need to dominate and protect (Stagner, 1974); women prefer dependable men (Hurlock, 1968) and respect is considered important in a woman (Bryant, 1949). According to Bryant (1949) and Dreyer (1976) the female has learnt that complete submission to those in authority is important. On the other hand, it needs to be pointed out also that although the proportion of males in our sample who disagreed with this item exceeded the proportion of females, the majority of the latter also rejected it.

However, the following statement, namely that -

"The wife should be the 'boss' who says what is to be done and what is not to be done,"

was almost unanimously rejected by both males and females; whilst the statement that -

"In marriage the man should have the main say in family matters,"

was agreed to by the majority of the males, whilst the votes of the females were equally divided between agreement and non-agreement (55/54).
This casts some doubt on the findings of Bryant and Dreyer cited above, at least as far as a considerable proportion of educated Black women are concerned. Nevertheless, taken over all items, the hypothesis that submissiveness of the wife is considered important in marriage, still found support from the majority of our subjects.

5.1.8 Home-making (domesticity) as a marriage criterion

In accordance with the view that the culinary skills of a woman are not important (Vilakazi, 1962), most of the subjects are of the opinion that being a good cook carries little weight in the choice of a marriage partner. However, the woman must be able to do the cooking and to keep the house clean. As Mbatha (1960) put it, a woman is expected to cook and help keep the kraal of the man clean, but being an expert cook is not important.

In addition, most of our subjects feel that the care of the children should not be solely the wife's responsibility.

Also, although the wife should be thrifty and skillful in housekeeping, the majority are not in favour of the view that a wife should be a full-time housewife. As all the subjects interviewed are university students, the latter opinion is not really surprising.

On the whole, for the majority of subjects home-making (domesticity) is not considered an important criterion in the choice of a marriage partner.

5.2 Recommendations

This study was confined to a small section of the Black population. The attitudes of first-year university students were studied at one university, and the results are confined to this group.
It is most desirable to know which characteristics are considered important in the choice of a marriage partner by the Black community at large, educated and uneducated, rural and urban.

Also, in a future study subjects should be requested to arrange the characteristics in a hierarchical order, so as to be able to differentiate between the most important and the least important characteristics.

A more extensive study on the causes of divorce among Blacks should also be conducted, in order to answer the following questions:

- Is it possible that the absence of children in a marriage leads to divorce?

- Does the sex of the children lead to husband-wife conflict?
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONAL PARTICULARS

Make an X in the most appropriate block.

1. SEX:
   M   F

2. RELIGION:
   [ ] Roman Catholic   [ ] Anglican Church
   [ ] Lutheran Church   [ ] Full Gospel Church
   [ ] Nazareth   [ ] American Board
   [ ] Congregational Church   [ ] Seventh Day Adventist
   [ ] Dutch Reformed Church   [ ] "Zionista" Churches
   [ ] Atheist   [ ] Other

3. OCCUPATION:
   Mother:
   [ ] Professional (e.g. Doctor, teacher, nurse etc)
   [ ] Artisan (e.g. dress-maker)
   [ ] Clerk
   [ ] Labourer (e.g. Domestic Servant)
   [ ] Self-employed
4. INCOME: 

Father: 
- Full-time housewife
- Employed
- Professional (e.g. Doctor, teacher, lawyer etc)
- Artisan (e.g. motor mechanic, electrician, driver, etc)
- Clerk
- Labourer
- Self-employed
- Unemployed

Mother and Father (Combined)
- Below R80 per month
- R100 to R150 per month
- R151 to R200 per month
- R201 to R400 per month
- Over R401 per month

STATEMENTS

In order to help young people prepare for marriage and family-life, we need to know what they expect from their spouses.
Please think in terms of what you expect of your own marriage as you read each of the following statements about expectations with regard to husbands and wives.

For each statement five (5) possible answers are given; choose only ONE of those five answers. (Your answers are completely anonymous and confidential).

**KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To make family-life most successful my spouse will have to join my church.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

2. Being married will not stop me from asking my spouse to improve his or her status.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

3. Physical build is less important than other personality traits in choosing a marriage partner.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

4. It is a sin to marry a person of a different tribe.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

5. Every normal healthy couple should have as many children as possible.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

6. A woman should try to get her own way, even if she has to fight for it.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

7. If my spouse can cook well, other characteristics are not important.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

8. Every normal healthy couple should allow the children to go to any church they like.   
   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
9. I would not marry a person who comes from a family of uneducated people.

10. Spending precious time in trying to make oneself attractive is not important in marriage.

11. The children of a person who is married to someone of a different tribe should not encounter any problems in their social lives.

12. A marriage should not be contracted unless the couple plans to have children.

13. Women who want to remove the term "obey" from the marriage service do not understand what it means to be a wife.

14. A full-time housewife is better than a working wife.

15. Children should be given religious instruction by the mother irrespective of her religious affiliations.

16. I would not marry a person who comes from a lower social class.

17. To ensure most successful family-life, my mate will need to be spick and span all the time.

18. I expect to marry a person who belongs to my tribe.

19. My future spouse should be a person who desires a normal family life with children.

20. A woman's opinion should carry as much weight as a man's in the planning of a family.

21. The man should help his wife to wash and dry the dishes.
22. A woman who does not belong to her husband's church should not be allowed to give religious instruction to the children.

23. The education of a spouse is not important in helping one to improve one's status.

24. Height is an important characteristic in the selection of a marriage partner.

25. Inter-tribal marriages should be encouraged so as to neutralise hatred between tribes.

26. A marriage should be contracted only for affection and not procreation.

27. Faithfulness is the most important characteristic in a spouse.

28. A woman who continues to work outside the home after marriage is neglecting her basic duty to husband and children.

29. If we belong to different churches, our children will not be forced to go to one of the churches only.

30. For most successful family-life, my spouse will need more than a high school education.

31. My spouse's physical attractiveness should be such that it is appreciated by my friends.

32. Marrying a person of a different tribe may improve my status.

33. A married woman should combine a career and motherhood if that proves possible.

34. Affection is the most important criterion in selecting a marriage partner.

35. The man should have a say in the running of the home.
36. If there is a difference of opinion, my children will have to attend my church.

37. I will forget about education after I am married.

38. I would not marry a person who is physically deformed.

39. If one of my friends married a member of another tribe, I would stop inviting him/her to my home.

40. Every normal healthy couple should not have more than two children.

41. The wife should be the "boss" who says what is to be done and what is not to be done.

42. The care of the children should be entirely the wife's responsibility.

43. Religion will play a more important role in my marriage than other characteristics.

44. It is very important that my future spouse has a good family background.

45. I expect my spouse to love and respect me regardless of any physical defect.

46. Marriage should depend on other more important characteristics than on the person's tribe.

47. Premarital pregnancy is nothing to be ashamed of or to hide, provided the couple plans to get married.

48. Good relations with non-family members are not important in marriage.

49. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.
50. My spouse should not leave his or her church and join mine.

51. A woman who is unable to bear children has failed in her duty.

52. I expect my spouse to love and respect me regardless of the work I do.

53. In my marriage I expect to spend time with my spouse choosing beautiful clothes for the whole family.

54. The person's tribe should be used as the only criterion for selecting a marriage partner.

55. A woman who refuses to have children has failed in her duty as a wife.

56. In marriage the man should have the main say in family matters.

57. Cooking and keeping the house clean are solely the woman's duties.

58. People belonging to different churches should not be discouraged from getting married.

59. If we marry before going to university, we shall do our best to go on studying for a degree.

60. The absence of children in a marriage is one of the most important factors leading to divorce.

61. Being well dressed all the time is not important in marriage.

62. Marrying a person of a different tribe is sure to lead to disharmony.

63. Stability in marriage does not depend on children.
64. I prefer a spouse who gets on well with people.

65. The wife should be thrifty and skillful in housekeeping.

66. It would be undesirable for my spouse to belong to a different church.

67. My future spouse should have a car.

68. The most important thing in a future marriage partner is physical attractiveness.

69. Marrying a person of a different tribe may lead to problems in the upbringing of children.

70. If the wife is going to work outside the home, there is no reason to have children.

71. The husband and wife should respect each other's religious convictions and not strive to change them.

72. Education is more important than beauty in the selection of a marriage partner.

73. The complexion of my future marriage partner is not important.

74. If my wife prefers a career to having children she will have the right to make the choice.

75. Material possessions are not important in the choice of a marriage partner.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONAL PARTICULARS

Make an X in the most appropriate block.

1. SEX: M F

2. RELIGION: 
   - Roman Catholic
   - Anglican
   - Lutheran Church
   - Full Gospel Church
   - Nazareth
   - American Board
   - Congregational Church
   - Seventh Day Adventist
   - Dutch Reformed Church
   - "Zionists" Churches
   - Atheist
   - Other

3. OCCUPATION:
   - Mother: Professional (e.g. Doctor, teacher, nurse, etc)
   - Artisan (e.g. dress-maker)
   - Clerk
   - Labourer (e.g. Domestic Servant)
4. **INCOME:** Mother and Father (Combined)

☐ Below R80 per month

☐ R100 to R150 per month

☐ R151 to R200 per month

☐ R201 to R400 per month

☐ Over R401 per month

5. **AGE:** ☐ Years
STATEMENTS

In order to help young people prepare for marriage and family life, we need to know what they expect from their spouses.

Please think in terms of what you expect of your own marriage as you read each of the following statements about expectations with regard to husbands and wives.

For each statement five (5) possible answers are given; choose only ONE of those five answers. (Your answers are completely anonymous and confidential).

KEY

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree

1. To make family-life most successful my spouse will have to join my church.

2. It is a sin to marry a person of a different tribe.

3. If my spouse can cook well, other characteristics are not important.

4. Every normal healthy couple should allow the children to go to any church they like.

5. Spending precious time in trying to make oneself attractive is not important in marriage.

6. The children of a person who is married to someone of a different tribe should not encounter any problems in their social lives.

7. Women who want to remove the term "obey" from the marriage service, do not understand what it means to be a wife.
22. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.

23. A woman who is unable to bear children has failed in her duty.

24. In my marriage I expect to spend time with my spouse choosing beautiful clothes for the whole family.

25. The person's tribe should be used as the only criterion for selecting a marriage partner.

26. A woman who refuses to have children has failed in her duty as a wife.

27. In marriage the man should have the main say in family matters.

28. Cooking and keeping the house clean are solely the woman's duties.

29. The absence of children in a marriage is one of the most important factors leading to divorce.

30. Marrying a person of a different tribe is sure to lead to disharmony.

31. The wife should be thrifty and skillful in housekeeping.

32. It would be undesirable for my spouse to belong to a different church.

33. My future spouse should have a car.

34. The most important thing in a future marriage partner is physical attractiveness.

35. Marrying a person of a different tribe may lead to problems in the upbringing of children.

36. If the wife prefers a career to having children she will have the right to make the choice.
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