

EQUITY AND PREMARITAL SEX

ELAINE HATFIELD, G. W. WALSTER and JANE TRAUPMANN

University of Wisconsin

In theory, Equity principles steer all human interactions (see Berkowitz & Walster, 1976). And, Equity theory *has* been applied to predict men and women's reactions in such diverse interactions as employer-employee relations, exploiter/victim relationships, philanthropist/recipient relationships and the like. (See Walster *et al.*, 1977a, for a comprehensive review of this research.) Equity theory has proved to be surprisingly successful in predicting men and women's reactions in such casual interactions. Is Equity theory equally successful in predicting people's reactions to deeply intimate interactions? Surprisingly, we do not know. It is only within the last year that researchers have begun to determine whether or not equity principles guide the interactions of sweethearts, married couples and extramarital lovers (see Walster *et al.*, 1977 a, b, and in press). This study was designed to determine whether or not formal Equity theory can give us insight into dating couples' intimate romantic and sexual relationships.²

EQUITY AND THE DOUBLE STANDARD

According to Equity theory (see previous paper) the person who feels he's getting less from a relationship than he deserves feels entitled to "call the shots" sexually. But what does that mean?

In the past, a double standard existed. Men were allowed — if not encouraged — to get sex whenever and wherever they could. Women were supposed to save themselves for marriage. Today, remnants of the double standard still exist. (See Baker, 1974; Ehrmann, 1959; Kaats & Davis, 1970; Riess, 1967; Schofield, 1965; Sorenson, 1973.)

In the light of the double standard, we would expect men or women — who feel they should have things their way sexually — to feel entitled to demand quite different things. We would expect underbenefited *men* to feel that they are in a position to demand intimate sexual behavior from their mates. In contrast, we would expect underbenefited *women* to expect their partners to wait until they are ready for sex — and that may be a long wait.

There is some sparse anecdotal evidence for these conclusions. For example, Blau (1967) observes that men who have the "upper hand" in a relationship often use their powerful position to gain sexual favors. He reports that women who have the "upper hand" behave quite differently: they assert their right to be only so intimate as they desire.

¹ This research was supported in part by National Institute of Mental Health Grant MH 26681. We would like to thank Michael Baker and Sue Sprecher for their help in this research.

Ehrmann (1959) also cites evidence in support of Blau's contention. Ehrmann found that, when men and women had sexual relations with someone from a social class other than their own, men tended to have sex with women from a *lower* social class than their own. Women tended to have sex with men from a *higher* social class than their own.

In part, then, this study was designed to test the following hypotheses: We predicted that a *Person's Sex* and the *Equity/Inequity of his/her Relationship* (i.e. is he underbenefited? equitably treated? overbenefited?) should interact in determining how sexual a relationship is. Specifically we expect a Sex X (Underbenefit/Equitable Treatment/Overbenefit) interaction in: (1) how far the man (or woman) pressures (or allows) his (her) partner to go sexually, (2) how early in their relationship they have sexual intercourse, (3) how many dates they go on before they have sexual intercourse and (4) what percent of their dates are devoted to sex.

We also thought that, for those couples who do have sexual intercourse, Sex X (Underbenefit/Equitable Treatment/Overbenefit) might be reflected in the *reasons* men and women give for having intercourse. (Did they do it to please themselves? To please their partner? For their mutual pleasure?)

METHOD

Subjects were 537 men and women enrolled in an introductory course in human sexuality. One percent had never dated anyone; 30% considered themselves to be casual daters; 58% to be steady daters; 11% were "living with" someone or were married. Only the 227 men and 310 women who were "casual" or "steady" daters were interviewed for this study.

1. Assessing the Equity/Inequity of a Dating Relationship

During the second week of the semester, we asked men and women to complete an anonymous questionnaire. We began by explaining: "Recently, psychologists have become interested in 'dating' and 'marriage contracts'. At one time, Americans' marriage contracts were fairly standard. Couples promised to 'love', 'honor', and 'cherish' — and that was often all they thought about it. Recently, however, young people have started to become a bit more thoughtful about the kinds of relationships they want. They've started to think in very concrete ways about the kind of things they're willing to put into their relationships — and the kinds of things they expect in return."

We mentioned that, recently, two Wisconsin sociologists had interviewed young couples about what they thought they (and their partners) *contributed* to their marriages — and what they both *got out* of their marriages.

Young couples mentioned a variety of things — good and bad — that they thought a person should contribute (or fail to contribute) to a marriage. (They cited such *Personal Contributions* as being a physically attractive person, being intelligent, being sociable, etc.; such *Emotional Contributions* as being a loving person, an understanding person, etc.; and such *Day-to-Day Contributions* as taking care of the home, contributing to the family, helping make decisions, etc. — and their converse.)

Couples also mentioned a variety of things — good and bad — that they thought a person could get out of a relationship. They listed *Personal Rewards and Frustrations*, *Emotional Rewards and Frustrations*, and *Day-to-day Rewards and Frustrations* people could derive from their marriages.

We asked students to think about the things that they (and their partners) contributed to *their* relationships — and the things they (and their partners) got out of their relationships: “What we’d like to do now is find out a little about how — considering what you’re putting into it and what you’re getting out of it — your relationship ‘stacks up’. What we’d like you to do is think of your relationship *before you got sexually involved*.”

Then we asked students to complete the Walster *et al.* (1977) *Global Measures of Participants’ Inputs, Outcomes, and Equity/Inequity*.²

We asked:

All things considered, how would you describe your contributions to your relationship? (Circle the correct response.)

My Contributions Are:

- +4. Extremely positive.
- +3. Very positive.
- +2. Moderately positive.
- +1. Slightly positive.
- 1. Slightly negative.
- 2. Moderately negative.
- 3. Very negative.
- 4. Extremely negative.

All things considered, how would you describe your partner’s contributions to your relationship? (Circle the correct response.)

My Partner’s Contributions Are:

- +4. Extremely positive.
- +3. Very positive.
- +2. Moderately positive.
- +1. Slightly positive.
- 1. Slightly negative.
- 2. Moderately negative.
- 3. Very negative.
- 4. Extremely negative.

All things considered, how would you describe your outcomes from your relationship?

My Outcomes Are:

- +4. Extremely positive.
- +3. Very positive.
- +2. Moderately positive.
- +1. Slightly positive.
- 1. Slightly negative.
- 2. Moderately negative.
- 3. Very negative.
- 4. Extremely negative.

All things considered, how would you describe your partner’s outcomes from your relationship?

My Partner’s Outcomes Are:

- +4. Extremely positive.
- +3. Very positive.
- +2. Moderately positive.
- +1. Slightly positive.
- 1. Slightly negative.
- 2. Moderately negative.
- 3. Very negative.
- 4. Extremely negative.

These estimates enabled us to calculate whether or not the students were Underbenefited, Equitably Treated [i.e. $(O_A - I_A)/|I_A|^k = (O_B - I_B)/|I_B|^k$], or Overbenefited.

Students’ relationships were classified as follows:

Greatly Underbenefited men and women were those whose Outcomes were far less than they deserved: i.e. $(O_A - \hat{O}_A)/|I_A| = -31.00$ to $-.51$. [\hat{O}_A = the Outcomes the person *should* have received, had the relationship been equitable. \hat{O}_A is obtained by solving definitional equations for O_A , given I_A , I_B , and O_B ; see Walster (1975).]

Slightly Underbenefited men and women were those whose Outcomes were slightly less than they deserved: i.e. $(O_A - \hat{O}_A)/|I_A| = -.50$ to $-.10$.

Equitably Treated men and women were those who were receiving exactly what they deserved from their relationships: i.e. $(O_A - \hat{O}_A)/|I_A| = .00$.

Slightly Overbenefited men and women were those whose Outcomes were slightly greater than they deserved: i.e. $(O_A - \hat{O}_A)/|I_A| = +.10$ to $+.50$.

Greatly Overbenefited men and women were those whose Outcomes were greater than they deserved: i.e. $(O_A - \hat{O}_A)/|I_A| = +.51$ to $+31.00$.

² Reported in Traupmann (1977) and Utne (1977).

2. Assessing Men and Women's Contentment/Distress

Students were asked to complete the Austin (1974) *Measure of Contentment/Distress*: "When you think about your relationship – what you put into it and what you get out of it – and what your partner puts into it, and what s/he gets out of it – how does that make you feel?"

They then indicated how "Contented", how "Happy", and how "Angry" and "Guilty" they felt. (Possible answers ranged from (1) – "Not at all to (4) – "Very much".)

Austin's *Total Mood Index* is calculated by summing the respondents' "Content" and "Happy" scores minus their "Angry" and "Guilty" scores. The higher the score, the more Content (and the less Distressed) they are. (F A main effect (S's Sex): *Time 1* = 43.14, 1 and 335 d.f. *Time 2* = 13.33, 1 and 158 d.f. $p < .0001$.)

3. Assessing Whether or Not a Double Standard Still Exists

During the first week of the semester, students were asked to indicate whether or not they thought a double standard exists at Wisconsin. Sixty-one percent of the men and 64% of the women indicated that it does.

[Our data provide some additional evidence that remnants of the double standard still exist. We asked men and women *why* they became sexually involved with their partners: "Because they wanted to?" "Because their partner wanted to?" Men, either through chivalry or honesty, were far more likely to report that it was *they*, not their partners, who wanted to have intercourse.]

4. Assessing How Sexual a Relationship Is

How much sexual intimacy men and women demanded from (or permitted) their partners was assessed via the following scale:

How Intimate Is Your Relationship?

(1) How far have you gone with your partner? (Check all that you have engaged in.)

- _____ 1. Necking: kissing and hugging.
- _____ 2. French or deep kissing.
- _____ 3. Petting: IF A MAN: "I touched her covered breasts."
IF A WOMAN: "He touched my covered breasts."
- _____ 4. Petting: IF A MAN: "I touched her naked breasts."
IF A WOMAN: "He touched my naked breasts."
- _____ 5. Genital Play: Female
IF A MAN: "I touched her clitoris or vagina."
IF A WOMAN: "He touched my clitoris or vagina."
- _____ 6. Genital Play: Male
IF A MAN: "She touched my penis."
IF A WOMAN: "I touched his penis."
- _____ 7. Genital Apposition: The man lies prone on female, petting without penetration of her vagina.
- _____ 8. Sexual Intercourse.
- _____ 9. Cunnilingus: oral contact with woman's clitoris or vagina.
- _____ 10. Fellatio: oral contact with man's penis.

In addition, we asked students three other questions designed to tap how quickly their relationships had become intimate and to tap whether or not their relationships were predominantly sexual in nature.

(1) How long did you *know* each other before you had sexual intercourse?

- 8. Less than 1 week.
- 7. More than a week, but less than a month.
- 6. 1-2 months.
- 5. 3-5 months.
- 4. 6-10 months.
- 3. 11-15 months.
- 2. 16-24 months.
- 1. More than 2 years.
- 0. Never had sexual intercourse.

(2) How many times did you go out with your partner before you had sexual intercourse?

- 8. We had sexual intercourse on our first date.
- 7. We had sexual intercourse on our second date.
- 6. We had 2-5 dates before we had sexual intercourse.
- 5. 6-12 dates.
- 4. 13-20 dates.
- 3. 21-30 dates.
- 2. 31-40 dates.
- 1. More than 40 dates.
- 0. Never had sexual intercourse.

(3) On what percent of your dates do you have intercourse?

- 6. We have sexual intercourse on all of our dates.
- 5. We have sexual intercourse on almost all of our dates.
- 4. We have sexual intercourse on over half of our dates.
- 3. We have sexual intercourse on less than half of our dates.
- 2. We have sexual intercourse on very few of our dates.
- 1. We have had sexual intercourse only once.
- 0. We have never had sexual intercourse.

In addition, we asked those men and women *who had had sexual intercourse*:

Reasons For Entering a Sexual Relationship

People enter sexual relations for different reasons. Following are fourteen possible reasons for becoming sexually involved with someone. Check all of the reasons why you became sexually involved with your partner.

- 1. I was curious, wanted experience.
- 2. Partner wanted/needed it.
- 3. Mutual curiosity.
- 4. I wanted/needed it.
- 5. Partner wanted me to prove love.
- 6. We were/are in love.
- 7. To prove I am a man/woman.
- 8. I wanted to prove love.
- 9. We like/liked each other.
- 10. My friends think it is appropriate.
- 11. Partner convinced me it was appropriate.
- 12. Mutual physical desire, enjoyment.
- 13. I enjoyed it, it felt good.
- 14. Partner enjoyed it.

In a survey of Wisconsin students, John DeLamater found that students generally cited one of the preceding reasons when explaining why they engaged in intercourse.

I wanted to. Sometimes students gave essentially self-centered reasons for having had intercourse (i.e. "I was curious, wanted experience").

My partner wanted to. Sometimes students gave partner-centered reasons for having had intercourse (i.e. "Partner wanted/needed it").

We both wanted it. Sometimes students indicated they *both* wanted it (i.e. "Mutual curiosity"; "We are/were in love"; "We like/liked each other"; "Mutual physical desire, enjoyment").

We scored students' responses in two ways: (a) *I wanted to* — *Partner wanted to*: we counted the number of self-centered reasons a man or woman gave for having intercourse *minus* the partner-centered reasons he/she gave. (b) *Mutual reasons*: we recorded the number of mutual reasons a man or woman gave for having intercourse.

5. Assessing How Stable a Relationship Is

Finally, we tried to assess how stable the men and women perceived their relationships to be. We asked:

- (1) Are you still going with your partner? (1 = no; 2 = yes.)
- (2) How certain are you that the two of you will be together one year from now? and
- (3) How certain are you that the two of you will be together 5 years from now? [Possible answers ranged from (5) = "Completely certain" to (1) = "Certain we won't be together".]

Three and one-half months later, we contacted students once again and asked them to fill out an abbreviated version of the original questionnaire.³ As before, we asked students to estimate how intimate their relationships were. As before, we asked students if they were still going together. Finally, we asked:

"If you and your partner are still together, how long have you been going together? (If you've already broken up, how long did you go together before you broke up?)" [Possible answers ranged from (1) = "Less than 1 month" to (9) = "Over 3 years".]

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Relationship Between Equity/Inequity and Contentment/Distress

According to Equity theory:

Proposition III: When individuals find themselves participating in inequitable relations, they become distressed. The more inequitable the relationship, the more distress individuals feel.

Our first prediction, then, is that men and women who feel either Greatly Underbenefited or Greatly Overbenefited should be somewhat uneasy about the balance of their relationship.

³Unfortunately our scheduled visit fell on one of the coldest days of 1976, and only 101 men and 161 women came to class because of the -20°F temperature. Thus, our sample at Time 2 is far smaller than expected.

Table 1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EQUITY/INEQUITY OF A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND MOOD

How equitable is the S's romantic relationship?	(N)	How content do you feel? ^a	How happy do you feel? ^a	How angry do you feel? ^a	How guilty do you feel? ^a	Total mood index
Greatly Underbenefited	(64)	2.70	2.98	1.98	1.39	2.31
Slightly Underbenefited	(84)	3.26	3.42	1.75	1.44	3.49
Equitably Treated	(220)	3.51	3.61	1.36	1.31	4.46
Slightly Overbenefited	(89)	3.51	3.69	1.36	1.51	4.33
Greatly Overbenefited	(80)	2.91	3.06	1.54	1.83	2.61
Pooled Within-cell S.D.	(537)	(.71)	(.68)	(.65)	(.71)	(1.89)
	d.f.					
F Main Effect A (S's Sex)	1	2.19	6.56	1.13	.23	.88
F Linear Trend B (Equity)	1	4.34	2.37	24.65	14.99	2.56
F Quadratic Trend B (Equity)	1	87.08	66.51	33.46	15.72	99.56
F Sex X Equity Interaction (Linear Trend)	1	.08	1.63	2.21	.47	.67
F All Other Trends ^b	5	1.04	2.21	3.65	1.39	2.40
Within Cells	527					

^aThe higher the number, the more Content, Happy, Angry, and Guilty S's feel.
^bi.e. Cubic B, Quartic B, A X Quadratic B, A Cubic B, A X Quartic B.

As we can see from Table 1, the data provide firm support for this hypothesis: men and women involved in relatively equitable relationships, i.e. men and women who see themselves as *Slightly Underbenefited*, *Equitably treated*, or *Slightly Overbenefited*, are far more "content" and "happy" than are their *Greatly Underbenefited* or *Greatly Overbenefited* peers. [Fs for the relevant Quadratic trends are $F = 87.08$ and $F = 66.51$, $1/527$ d.f., respectively.] As you might expect, the *Greatly Underbenefited* feel most "angry" about their position. [Linear $F = 24.65$.] The *Greatly Overbenefited* feel most "guilty" about theirs. [Linear $F = 14.99$.]

When we examine Austin's (1974) *Total Mood Index*, we see that persons in fairly equitable relationships are more content than are persons caught up in greatly inequitable ones (F for the Quadratic Trend = 99.56 , d.f. $1/527$, $p < .001$). Equity theorists also predict that "persons who are overbenefited will be less distressed than persons who are underbenefited". When we examine the *Total Mood Index*, we find no support for this hypothesis. Greatly Underbenefited respondents are more distressed than Greatly Overbenefited ones, but this difference is not significant ($F < 1$, $1/527$ d.f.). These results are consistent with considerable data (see Austin & Walster, 1974 a, b) which support the contention that relatively equitable relationships are comfortable relationships, while markedly inequitable ones are distressing — to both the underbenefited and the overbenefited.

2. Do Sex of Respondent X Degree of Inequity (Underbenefited, Equitably Treated, Overbenefited) Interact in Determining How Sexual a Relationship Is?

Do men, who feel they should be able to "do better", at least demand that their partner "put out" sexually? Do their partners accede? Do women, who feel they should "do better", feel entitled to call the sexual shots — to delay sexual relations for as long as they wish — perhaps forever? In brief, do Sex X Equity interact as predicted? The answer appears to be

stop before "going all the way". (Fs for the Quadratic Trend: *Time 1* = 7.83, 1/527 d.f., $p < .01$; *Time 2* = 14.50, 1/252 d.f., $p < .001$.)

We also asked our respondents who had had intercourse, why they had engaged in intercourse. The participants in relatively Equitable relations are most likely to say they had intercourse because they *both* wanted to (i.e. to say that "Mutual curiosity"; the fact that "We are/were in love"; "We like/liked each other"; or "Mutual physical desire, enjoyment" were their reasons for having intercourse). Those who feel extremely Overbenefited or extremely Underbenefited are less likely to say they had sex because they *both* wanted it. (The Fs for the Quadratic Trend = *Time 1*: $F = 5.53$, 1/335 d.f., $p < .02$; *Time 2*: $F = 1.61$, 1/158 d.f., n.s. (see Table 3)).

Table 3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EQUITY/INEQUITY AND REASONS S's CITE FOR HAVING INTERCOURSE

How equitable is the S's romantic relationship?	Why did you have intercourse?			Why did you have intercourse?		
	(N)	Time 1		(N)	Time 2	
		I wanted to — Partner wanted to ^a	We both wanted to ^b		I wanted to — Partner wanted to ^a	We both wanted to ^b
Greatly Underbenefited	(38)	.42	2.00	(17)	.42	2.06
Slightly Underbenefited	(49)	.16	2.08	(24)	.08	2.38
Equitably Treated	(148)	.40	2.32	(77)	.38	2.40
Slightly Overbenefited	(64)	.23	2.25	(33)	.30	2.61
Greatly Overbenefited	(46)	.65	2.02	(17)	.78	2.35
Pooled Within-cell S.D.	(345)	(1.05)	(.95)	(168)	(.98)	(.91)
	d.f.					
F Main Effect A (S's Sex)	1	43.14	.00	1	13.33	3.05
F Linear Trend B (Equity)	1	.01	.15	1	.61	1.24
F Quadratic Trend B (Equity)	1	.14	5.53	1	.53	1.61
F Sex X Equity Interaction	1	1.81	.14	1	1.55	.30
F All Other Trends	5	2.86	.96	5	.85	2.01
Within Cells	335			158		

^aThe higher the number, the more S's selfish reasons for having intercourse exceeded his partner-centered reasons.

^bThe higher the number, the more mutual reasons S's gave for having intercourse.

The reader will recall that we asked respondents three questions designed to tap how quickly their relationship had become intimate and to tap whether or not their relationship was predominantly sexual in nature. These measures tell us little that is new. Couples in equitable and inequitable relationships knew each other a fairly long time before they had sexual intercourse; they *all* had a considerable number of dates before they had intercourse, and even today, they only have sex "now and then". *All* of the Quadratic Trends on these measures are nonsignificant.

We did not expect the results we secured — we did *not* predict that Equitable couples would be the most sexual couples — but in retrospect, the data do not seem so unreasonable. (Of course, in retrospect, nothing seems unreasonable.) Equity theorists have observed — and we found — that it is in equitable love relationships that men and women feel most content and happy. Inequitable love relationships are volatile relationships — the underbenefited feel resentful; the overbenefited feel guilty. Clinicians and family therapists (see Berne, 1970;

Masters & Johnson, 1975) have observed that deep-seated resentment or guilt will corrode the best of sexual relations.

Table 4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EQUITY/INEQUITY OF A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND ITS PERMANENCE

How equitable is the S's romantic relationship?	(N)	Relationship's permanence Time 1 ^a			Total index
		Are you still together?	In 1 year	In 5 years?	
Greatly Underbenefited	(64)	1.41	1.33	1.03	3.77
Slightly Underbenefited	(84)	1.57	1.90	1.39	4.86
Equitably Treated	(220)	1.73	2.53	2.05	6.31
Slightly Overbenefited	(89)	1.71	2.21	1.63	5.55
Greatly Overbenefited	(80)	1.41	1.38	1.16	3.95
Pooled Within-cell S.D.	(537)	(.47)	(1.59)	(1.48)	(3.30)
	d.f.				
F Main Effect A (S's Sex)	1	6.71	13.50	6.80	10.93
F Linear Trend B (Equity)	1	.71	.60	.82	.81
F Quadratic Trend B (Equity)	1	38.49	48.48	29.12	40.49
F Sex X Equity Interaction (Linear Trend)	1	.23	.43	1.88	.99
F All Other Trends	5	.64	.69	1.02	.80
Within Cells	527				
How equitable is the S's romantic relationship?	(N)	Relationship's permanence Time 2 ^a			
		Are you still together?	How long have you been together?		
Greatly Underbenefited	(29)	1.31	3.93		
Slightly Underbenefited	(43)	1.44	5.40		
Equitably Treated	(115)	1.70	5.62		
Slightly Overbenefited	(44)	1.61	5.23		
Greatly Overbenefited	(31)	1.42	4.19		
Pooled Within-cell S.D.	(262)	(.48)	(2.21)		
	d.f.				
F Main Effect A (Sex)	1	.83	.87		
F Linear Trend B (Equity)	1	2.62	.04		
F Quadratic Trend B (Equity)	1	18.04	19.48		
F Sex X Equity Interaction (Linear Trend)	1	.11	1.46		
F All Other Trends	5	.93	.29		
Within Cells	252				

^aThe higher the number, the more permanent S's relationship is.

3. Equity and the Stability of Relationships

According to Equity theorists, equitable relations are viable relationships, while inequitable relations are not (see Table 4).

Our data provide considerable support for this contention. At Time 1, those men and women involved in Fairly Equitable relationships are generally in intact relationships — and they expect them to remain that way. Both the Underbenefited — who have every reason to hope that something better will come along — and the Overbenefited — who have every reason to wish that their relationship could last — are well aware that their relationships are tenuous ones. If their relationships are not already in disarray, they expect that they soon will be. (The F Quadratic trend for the Time 1 *Total Stability Index* = 40.49; 1/527 d.f., $p < .001$.)⁴

By Time 2, the report is the same. The Fairly Equitable relations are likely to still be intact. The Inequitable relations are not. ($F = 18.04$, 1/252 d.f., $p < .001$.) Finally, Fairly Equitable couples report they have been together longer than do inequitable couples. (F at Time 2 = 19.48, 1/252 d.f., $p < .001$.)

In conclusion, this study suggests that in the casual and steady dating period, equitable relationships are contented relationships. It is couples in equitable relationships who are most willing to chance intense premarital sexual relationships — perhaps because they expect their casual or steady dating relationships to evolve into permanent ones.

Possible Alternative Explanations for the Data

Once again, our data are correlational, so it is possible that some unknown variable X might be causing college men and women to (1) rate themselves as Overbenefited, Equitably Treated or Underbenefited, and (2) make them more or less enthusiastic about premarital sex. (The creative researcher can surely come up with a plethora of variables that might be accounting for our results.)

In addition, the causal sequence might be opposite to that we suggest. Men and women's sexual experiences might determine their perception of Equity/Inequity, rather than the other way around.

The only way to be absolutely sure about what is causing what is to run an experiment. In the area of human sexual behavior, however, that is still somewhat difficult.

REFERENCES

- Austin, W. & Walster, E. Participants' reactions to "equity with the world". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 528-548 (1974) (a).
- Austin, W. & Walster, E. Reactions to confirmations and disconfirmations of expectancies of equity and inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 208-216 (1977) (b).
- Baker, M. J. The effects of inequity on heterosexual behavior: A test for compensation in inequitable dating relationships. University of Wisconsin (Master's Thesis). Unpublished manuscript, 1974.
- Berne, E. *Sex in Human Loving*. Simon Schuster, N.Y. (1970).
- Berkowitz, L. & Walster, E. (Eds.) Equity theory: Toward a general theory of social interaction. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 9. Academic Press, N.Y. (1976).
- Blau, P. M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley, N.Y. (1967).
- Ehrmann, W. *Premarital Dating Behavior*. Holt, N.Y. (1959).
- Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K. & Traupmann, J. Equity theory and intimate relations. In R. L. Burgess & T. L. Huston (Eds.), *Social Exchange in Developing Relationships*. N.Y. Academic Press, 1978.
- Kaats, G. R. & Davis, K. E. The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 32, 390-399 (1970).

⁴The *Total Stability Index* is calculated by summing up the subject's scores on the three items which comprise the index.

- Masters, W. H. & Johnson, V. E. *The Pleasure Bond*, Bantam, N.Y. (1975).
- Reiss, I. L. *The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, N.Y. (1967).
- Schofield, M. *The Sexual Behavior of Young People*. Little Brown, Boston (1965).
- Sorenson, R. C. *Adolescent Sexuality in Contemporary America*. World Publishers, N.Y. (1973).
- Traupmann, J. Equity and intimate relations: A test of the theory in marital interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1977.
- Utne, M. K. Equity and intimate relations: A test of the theory in marital interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1977.
- Walster, E., Utne, M. K. & Traupmann, J. Equity-theorie und intime Sozialbeziehungen. In Gerold Mikula and Wolfgang Stroebe (Eds.), *Freundschaft und Liebe*. Huber, Berne (1977) (a).
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W. & Berscheid, E. *Equity: Theory and Research*. Allyn & Bacon, Boston (1977) (b).
- Walster, G. W. The Walster *et al.* (1973) Equity formula: a correction. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 6, 65-67 (1975).