Annual Review of Sex Research

An Integrative and Interdisciplinary Publication of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex

h volume of the *Annual Review of Sex Research* contains 8-10 comprehensive rs authored by leading experts in the field. The articles synthesize recent theo- and research advances in specific topic areas. The *Review* provides the reader n up-to-date summary and integration of the field, highlighting important dvances and controversies.

)R
ancroft, M.D., Behaviour Research Group, Royal Edinburgh Hospital, nburgh, Scotland

CIATE EDITORS
I. Davis, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, v York
d J. Ruppel, Jr., Ed.D., Ph.D., Executive Director, The Society for the Scientific dy of Sex, Mount Vernon, Iowa

)RIAL ADVISORY BOARD
h Rice Allgeier, Ph.D., Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
. Becker, Ph.D., Arizona Health Science Center, Tucson, Arizona
rne, Ph.D., State University of New York, Albany, New York
Bullough, Ph.D., Northridge, California
Davidson, Ph.D., Stanford University, Stanford, California
Ehrhardt, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York, New York
Evernerd, M.D., University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
sher, Ph.D., New York, New York
gnon, Ph.D., State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York
Green, M.D., J.D., University of California, Los Angeles, California
e Heiman, Ph.D., University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
H. Herdt, Ph.D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
R. Leiblum, Ph.D., Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, New Jersey
LoPiccolo, Ph.D. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
leyer-Bahlburg, Dr.rer.nat., Columbia University, New York, New York
L. Mosher, Ph.D., University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut
Reinisch, Ph.D., Health Science Center at Brooklyn, SUNY, Brooklyn, New York
eiss, Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
el C. Rosen, Ph.D., Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, New Jersey
hiavi, M.D., Mt. Sinai Medical Center, New York, New York
Schmidt, Ph.D., University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
Schwartz, Ph.D., Washington University, Seattle, Washington
Udry, Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
nce, Ph.D., Sunnyside, New York
Wagner, M.D., Institute of Medical Physiology, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, nmark

e *Annual Review of Sex Research* is published annually by The Society for the ific Study of Sex, Box 208, Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 USA. The *Annual Review Research* is abstracted or indexed in Abstracts in Anthropology; Applied Social es Index & Abstracts (ASSIA); Biological Abstracts; Child Development cts & Bibliography; Criminal Justice Abstracts; Criminology, Penology and Science Abstracts; Current Literature in Family Planning; Inventory of age and Family Literature; Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts; logical Abstracts; Sage Family Studies Abstracts; Social Planning/Policy and opment Abstract; Social Sciences Citation Index; Social Work Abstracts; gical Abstracts; Studies on Women Abstracts.

scription inquiries and subscription orders should be addressed to the publisher scriptions Department, The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Box 208, Vernon, IA 52314 USA. Subscription rates: Volume 4 (1993) multiple reader ions $55 (outside the United States $60). Price for individual subscribers $35 the United States $10).

51

Annual Review of Sex Research

Volume 4, 1993

Editor
John Bancroft

Associate Editors
Clive M. Davis
Howard J. Rupple, Jr.

Editorial Assistant
Alison Harper

Copy Editor
Sandra L. Davis

Published by The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex

LYNCH, J. M., & REILLY, M. E. (1986). Role relationships: Lesbian perspectives. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12,* 53-69.

MASTERS, W. H., & JOHNSON, V. (1979). *Homosexuality in perspective.* Boston: Little, Brown.

NICHOLS, M. (1987). Lesbian sexuality: Issues in developing theory. In Boston Lesbian Psychologies Collective (Ed.), *Lesbian psychologies. Explorations and challenges* (pp. 97-125). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

NICHOLS, M. (1988). Low sexual desire in lesbian couples. In S. R. Leiblum & R. C. Rosen (Eds.), *Sexual desire disorders* (pp. 387-412). New York: Guilford.

PEPLAU, L. A., COCHRAN, S., & MAYS, V. (1986, August). *Satisfaction in the intimate relationships of black lesbians.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology Association. Washington, D.C.

PEPLAU, L. A., COCHRAN, S., ROOK, K., & PADESKY, C. (1978). Attachment and autonomy in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 34*(3), 7-27.

PEPLAU, L. A., PADESKY, C., & HAMILTON, M. (1982). Satisfaction in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality, 8,* 23-35.

SCHÄFER, S. (1977). Sociosexual behavior in male and female homosexuals: A study in sex differences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 6,* 355-364.

SCHNEIDER, M. S. (1986). The relationship of cohabiting lesbian and heterosexual couples: A comparison. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10,* 234-239.

SCHREURS, K. (1993). *Sexuality and gender in Dutch lesbian and heterosexual couples.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

TANNER, D. M. (1978). *The lesbian couple.* Lexington, MA/Toronto: D.C. Heath.

WATERMAN, C. K., DAWSON, L. J., & BOLOGNA, M. J. (1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26,* 118-124.

Historical and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Passionate Love and Sexual Desire

ELAINE HATFIELD & RICHARD L. RAPSON

In 1985, the International Academy of Sex Research sponsored a series of invited lectures and symposia on passionate love and sexual desire. The participants used the two terms almost interchangeably. This is probably not surprising. Passionate love has been defined as "a longing for union," and sexual desire has been defined as "a longing for *sexual* union" (Hatfield & Rapson, 1987b, p. 259). In this paper, we will review what social psychologists, evolutionary theorists, anthropologists, historians, and cross-cultural researchers have discovered about the nature of passionate love, in general, and sexual desire, in particular.

Passionate love has been defined as "a state of intense longing for union with another. Passionate love is a complex functional whole including appraisals or appreciations, subjective feelings, expressions, patterned physiological processes, action tendencies, and instrumental behaviors. Reciprocated love (union with the other) is associated with fulfillment and ecstasy. Unrequited love (separation) with emptiness, anxiety, or despair" (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, p. 5). The Passionate Love Scale (PLS) was designed to assess the cognitive, physiological, and behavioral indicants of such love (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986a). Approximately half of the items on the PLS measured a longing for *sexual* union. The Childhood Love Scale (CLS), which parallels the PLS, was developed to assess passionate love in children (Hatfield et al., 1989).

Most evolutionary and social psychologists have assumed that passionate love and sexual desire are cultural universals—existing at all times and in all places. Historians and cross-cultural researchers have explored how culture shapes the way that these universals are experienced and expressed at various times and in various places. In the following sections, we will review what theorists from these disciplines have learned about the nature of passionate love and sexual desire.

Evolutionary and Developmental Perspectives

Evolutionary Perspectives

Many have taken an evolutionary approach to explaining the origins of passionate love. Plutchik (1980) argued that at every phylogenetic level (from the lowest single-celled organisms up to the highest primates), animals face many of the same problems. All must survive and reproduce. Thus, all have evolved a set of emotional "programs"—inherited, adaptive patterns of emotional experience, physiological reactions, and behavior—to deal with recurrent problems. Many evolutionary theorists believe that passionate love and sexual desire are built on the ancient circuitry that evolved to insure that mothers and infants remain closely attached and that adults mate and reproduce (Ainsworth et al, 1978; Bowlby, 1969, 1980; Brown, 1991; Hatfield & Rapson, 1993; Plutchik, 1980).

Recently, Sommer (1993) asked a challenging question: Did our ancient Homo sapien ancestors live in polygynous, monogamous, polygynandrous (promiscuous), or polyandrous communities? In other primates, four variables—sexual dimorphism (relative size of males and females), testes' weight, the existence of estrous swellings, and the duration of coitus seem to predict primates' sexual arrangements. (For example, in polygynous species, males are much bigger than females, whereas in monogamous species males and females are more similar in size. In both types of societies, females do not have estrous swelling and coitus lasts fairly long). When Sommer classified Homo sapiens on these characteristics, he was led to conclude that our human forbearers probably lived in polygynous communities; possibly in monogamous ones.

Fisher (1989) provided conflicting data on the types of communities that are most common today. She pointed out that, throughout the world, the overwhelming majority of men and women are in monogamous marriages. When anthropologists examined the 853 societies tabulated in Murdock's *Ethnographic Atlas,* they found that, although 84% of societies permit polygyny, only about 10% of the men are actually involved in such arrangements. The remaining 16% of societies prescribe monogyny. Only 0.5% permit polyandry. In 99.5% of human cultures, women marry only one man at a time. (They are involved in either polygynous or monogamous marriages).

Recently, Jankowiak and Fischer (1992) argued that romantic love is a panhuman characteristic stretching across cultures. They attempted to document the universality of passionate feelings. (They

made a distinction between "romantic passion" and "simple lust"). They looked for evidence of romantic love in a sampling of tribal societies included in the *Standard Cross-Cultural Sample.* They determined whether romantic love was present or absent on the basis of five indicators: (a) accounts depicting personal anguish and longing, (b) the existence of love songs or folklore that highlight the motivations behind romantic involvement, (c) elopement due to mutual affection, (d) native accounts affirming the existence of passionate love, and (e) the ethnographer's affirmation that romantic love is present. They found clear evidence of passionate love in 147 of the 166 tribal cultures they studied. They could find no information as to whether or not passionate love existed in 18 societies. In only one society did the ethnographer state that romantic love did not exist. Jankowiak and Fischer pointed out that there was cultural variability in how *common* such passionate feelings were.

Some evolutionary psychologists have also contended that there are cultural universals in what men and women desire in a mate (Buss, 1989; Buss et al., 1990; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Ellis & Symons, 1990; Sprecher et al., 1992). Since Darwin's (1871) classic treatise *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex,* evolutionary biologists have been interested in mate preferences. Recently, in a landmark cross-cultural study, Buss (1989; Buss et al., 1990) asked over 10,000 men and women, from 37 countries located on six continents and five islands, to indicate what characteristics they valued in potential mates. (The countries involved in this study are listed in Table 1.) The 37 cultures represented a tremendous diversity of geographic, cultural, political, ethnic, religious, racial, and economic groups.

Table 1
Countries Participating in the Mate Selection Study

African	European-Eastern	North American
Nigeria	Bulgaria	Canada (English)
S. Africa (Whites)	Estonian S. S. R.	Canada (French)
S. Africa (Zulu)	Poland	USA (Mainland)
Zambia	Yugoslavia	USA (Hawaii)
Asian	**European-Western**	**Oceanian**
China	Belgium	Australia
India	France	New Zealand
Indonesia	Finland	**South American**
Iran	Germany-West	Brazil
Israel (Jewish)	Great Britain	Columbia
Israel (Palestinian)	Greece	Venezuela
Japan	Ireland	
Taiwan	Italy	
	Netherlands	
	Norway	
	Spain	
	Sweden	

The authors asked men and women to consider 18 traits and to rate how desirable or important they thought each trait was in choosing a mate. Buss et al. (1990) found that, overall, the single trait that men and women in all the societies valued most in a mate was "mutual attraction-love." They cared next about finding a mate who possessed a dependable character, emotional stability and maturity, and a pleasing disposition.

Buss and Schmitt (1993) also argued that there should be universal gender differences in what men and women desire in a mate. According to evolutionary biology, an animal's "fitness" depends on how successful it is in transmitting its genes to subsequent generations. It is to both men's and women's evolutionary advantage to produce as many progeny as possible. But men and women differ in one critical respect—how much they must invest in their offspring if they are to survive and reproduce: Men need invest little, whereas women must invest a great deal. On the basis of this logic, Buss and Schmitt proposed a "sexual strategies theory" of human mating. They argued that, in the course of evolution, men and women have come to be genetically programmed to desire different traits in a mate. They also argued that it is to men's and women's advantage to employ different strategies in short-term relationships (i.e., "one-night stands" or brief affairs) than in a long-term marital relationship. A sampling of the 22 hypotheses they derived from their model are:

1. In *short-term relationships,* it is to men's advantage to be attuned to signs which attest to women's reproductive fitness. They should care a great deal about physical appearance, health, and youth (preferring women with clear and lustrous hair, smooth skin, full lips, white teeth, a lively gait, and good health). Men should have evolved a powerful desire for multiple sexual encounters. They should be "turned off" by women who are prudish, sexually inexperienced, conservative, or who have a low sex drive and "turned on" by women who are easily available. In the absence of a desirable partner, however, men should be willing to engage in sexual relations with a wide array of partners in a wide array of circumstances. Men should be eager to avoid commitment or heavy investment in any one relationship.

Women in short-term relationships face a different set of adaptive problems. If women choose to pursue a short-term strategy, they can maximize their evolutionary outcomes by concentrating on immediate resource extraction (preferring men who are generous, give them presents, and who have an extravagant lifestyle). If women choose to focus on long-term goals, they must try to identify men who would be appropriate marital partners. Women must look for signs that men will be willing and able to protect them and their offspring. (They should look for professional men with ambition, status, good earning capacity, and a strong career orientation. They should want mates who are kind and considerate, understanding, honest, dependable, easy-going and adaptable; they should seek out men who like children.) Women should insist on knowing men for a fairly long time before they become willing to risk a sexual encounter.

Men tend to be interested in "playing the field"; women in finding partners for a serious relationship (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss 1988a, 1988b).

2. In *long-term relationships,* men and women must confront a different set of problems. Men should still prefer women who are good looking, young, healthy, and of maximum reproductive value. But now they must also be concerned about finding a mate who is willing and able to commit herself to a long-term relationship, who will be faithful, and who possesses good parenting skills.

Women who are considering a long-term relationship tend to prefer a mate who seems able and willing to provide and protect them and their children. (Most women desire the same thing in short-term and long-term relationships.) They prefer men who will make a commitment, who are willing and able to invest resources in them and their children, who possess parenting skills, and who are willing and able to protect them from harm.

As men and women's investments become more similar (as they do in long-term relationships), both should become increasingly choosy about selecting a mate.

Buss and his colleagues collected considerable evidence in support of these hypotheses (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Ellis & Symons, 1990). For example, in his study of 37 cultures, Buss (1989) found that, as predicted, men and women did differ somewhat in how important the various traits were. Men seemed to care more about traits that signaled *reproductive capacity.* Men, worldwide, preferred marriage partners who were 2 to 3 years younger than they. They cared more about good looks than women did. In some cultures (but not all) men were more likely to insist on chastity than were women. Women worldwide seemed to care more about cues that signaled men's *resource capacity* (their ability to provide for her and her children) than did men. Women preferred men who were 3 to 4 years older than they. They, more than men, valued mates who possessed status,

were good financial prospects, and who were ambitious and industrious. (For similar results in the modern, industrialized countries of the United States, Russia, and Japan, see Hatfield & Sprecher, 1993.)

The evolutionary approach has not been without its critics. Social learning theorists argue that it is not ancient wiring but sociocultural factors that can best explain existing gender difference in passionate and sexual choices and behavior (Howard et al., 1987; Reiss & Lee, 1988; Tavris & Offir, 1984). Culture has been found to have an important impact on social definitions of how men and women think, feel, and behave in the arena of love and sex (Griffitt & Hatfield, 1985; Hatfield & Rapson, in press.) Wallen (1989), for example, conducted a reanalysis of Buss' data, in order to determine which was most important—culture or gender—in shaping people's preferences in mates. She found that for some traits—such as good looks and financial prospects—it was gender that had the biggest influence on preferences. (Gender accounted for 40%–45% of the variance; geographical origin accounted for only 8%–17% of the variance.) For other traits—such as chastity, ambition, and preferred age—on the other hand, it was culture that mattered most. (Gender accounted for only 5%–16% of the variance, whereas geographical origin accounted for 38%–59%, of the variance.) She concluded that, in general, a cultural perspective may be more powerful than an evolutionary perspective in understanding mate selection.

Researchers interested in individual differences have argued that men and women are more similar than different in their passionate sexual choices and behavior. Simpson and Gangestad (1991), for example, found that men and women who possessed a *restricted* sociosexual orientation (as assessed by the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory) insisted on closeness and commitment before they were willing to engage in sexual relations. People with an *unrestricted* sociosexual orientation felt comfortable about engaging in sex without commitment or closeness. They tended to have more one-night stands and to have sex with several partners at the same time. They concluded that both men's and women's passionate sexual behavior was more dependent on their sociosexual orientation than on their gender.

Sociologists point out that political, economic, and social changes can produce marked changes in men's and women's sexual attitudes and behavior. In America, for example, the double standard (so popular 30 years ago), if not dead, is rapidly dying (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1988; Sprecher, 1989; Sprecher & Hatfield, 1993; Sprecher et al., 1988). There is some evidence that it may be on the wane in Russia and Japan as well (Sprecher & Hatfield, 1993).

Finally, Fisher (1993) has argued that the fleeting nature of passionate love is a cultural universal. She contended that romantic and passionate love evolved for very practical genetic reasons. Presumably, adults are predisposed to remain passionately engaged with one another for about 4 years—just long enough for their first child to learn to survive on its own. (By 4 years of age, children in tribal societies have been weaned and have begun to spend most of their time in multi-age play groups.) Once it is no longer imperative for parents to remain together to insure the survival of their first child, Fisher argues, men and women generally fall out of love with their first partner and in love with someone new. Presumably, such serial monogamy (which she contends is the most common marital system) produces maximum genetic diversity, which provides an evolutionary advantage. To test her hypothesis, Fisher examined the divorce rates in collecting/hunting, agricultural, pastoral, fishing, and industrial societies, utilizing ethnographic records and the *Demographic Yearbooks* of the United Nations from 1947-1981. She found that, as predicted, throughout the world, couples are most likely to divorce in their 4th year of marriage (Fisher, 1989). She concluded: "It is parsimonious to conclude that serial pairbonding evolved in hominid paleopopulations . . . as an adaptation to rear highly dependent young through infancy and this adaptation continues to contribute to the modern cross-cultural pattern of marriage/divorce/remarriage" (Fisher, 1989, pp. 350-351).

Developmental Perspectives

Ainsworth (1989) and Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) studied the process of attachment, separation, and loss in infants and children. They found that normally, from about 9-18 months, infants become profoundly attached to their primary caregivers. (They prefer to remain in close proximity to them, become distressed when they are separated, avoid strangers, and immediately return to their caretakers when they are threatened.) Some social psychologists have argued that such early attachments are the forerunners of adults' passionate attachments—their "desire for union" (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hatfield & Rapson, 1993; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). There is some evidence that children from a variety of ethnic backgrounds are capable of experiencing passionate love very early—as early as 3½ to 4 years of age (Bell, 1902; Hatfield et al., 1988, 1989).

Shaver and Hazan (1988) also proposed that children's early patterns of attachment should influence their adult attachments. For example, some children are *securely attached* to their mothers; they are both affectionate and reasonably independent. Such children are likely to mature into secure adults who are comfortable with intimacy and are able to trust and depend on those they care for. Some children are *anxious/ambivalent.* They may be clingy and dependent, terrified of being abandoned. They may get angry and upset at their caretakers when they leave and reject them when they return. Such children are likely to become anxious/ambivalent adults. Some may fall in love easily, seek extreme levels of closeness, and be terrified that they will be abandoned. In any case, such desperate love affairs are likely to be short-lived. *Avoidant,* rejecting children, may well become avoidant adults who are uncomfortable getting too close and have difficulty depending on others. The authors have amassed considerable support in favor of the contention that childhood patterns of attachment can be read in adult passionate attachments (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hindy et al., 1989;). Doherty and his colleagues (1993) found that attachment style had the predicted relationship to people's passionate and companionate love experiences in Americans of European, Pacific Island, or Asian ethnic backgrounds.

Recently, researchers have found that the prevalence of children and adults who develop the various attachment styles is roughly the same in all cultures. Hazan and Shaver (1987), for example, found that in the United States, approximately 56% of respondents classified themselves as securely attached, 19% as anxious/ambivalent, and 25% as avoidant. Wu and Shaver (1992) found that in the United States, Australia, Israel, and China roughly the same percentage of adults placed themselves in these three categories.

If passionate love *is* rooted in childhood attachments, certain types of people caught up in certain types of situations should be especially vulnerable to passion. Anything that makes adults feel as helpless and dependent as they were as children, anything that makes them fear separation and loss, should increase their passionate craving to merge with others. There is some evidence to support these speculations. It has been found that individuals are especially vulnerable to passion when men's and women's self-esteem is threatened (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hatfield, 1965; Jacobs et al., 1971), when they are insecure and dependent or caught up in affairs that promote such feelings (Berscheid et al., 1976; Fei & Berscheid, 1977),

when people are unusually anxious (Hatfield et al., 1989; Peele, 1975; Solomon & Corbit, 1974), or when they are sexually needy and deprived (Stephan et al., 1971).

There have therefore been social psychologists, evolutionary theorists, and developmentalists who have concluded that passionate love and sexual desire are human universals. Some social psychologists, historians, and cross-cultural researchers point out, however, that culture can have a great influence on how easily and how deeply people fall in love and how they try to deal with these tumultuous feelings.

Historical Perspectives

Literature tells us that passionate love and sexual desire have always existed—in all times and in all places. The earliest Western literature, bound up as it is between myth and reality, recounts thousands of stories of lovers caught up in a sea of passion and violence: Odysseus and Penelope, Orpheus and Eurydice, Daphnis and Chloe, Dido and Aeneas, Abelard and Eloise, Dante and Beatrice, and Romeo and Juliet. Such tales exist outside of Europe as well. For more than 4,000 years, China's history and art have been filled with stories of passionate love and sexual longing. In the Song Dynasty (960-1279 A. D.) the *Jade Goddess* recounted the story of a passionate young couple, who defied their parents' wishes, challenged convention, and eloped, only to fall into desperate straits (Ruan, 1991). (For an encyclopedic review of other Chinese love stories see Ruan, 1991 or Jankowiak, 1993.) A similar record can be found in India, Persia, and practically all other ancient societies.

But the main message of historical research is not the universality of love, but its variability. In various eras and in varying societies, the very words *love, sex,* and *intimacy* have carried a huge array of differing and contradictory meanings (Bullough, 1990; Degler, 1980; D'Emilio & Freedman, 1988; Gay, 1986; Gillis, 1985; Mintz & Kellogg, 1988; Phillips, 1988; Stone, 1977, 1990). As D'Emilio and Freedman noted "sexuality has been associated with a range of human activities and values: the procreation of children, the attainment of physical pleasure (eroticism), recreation or sport, personal intimacy, spiritual transcendence, or power over others" (p. xv).

Although passionate love and sexual desire have always existed, they were rarely encouraged. Throughout history, until about 1500, most cultures (and the political and religious authorities who held power), viewed passionate lovers' primitive and powerful feelings as a threat to the social, political, and religious order. They tried to sup-

press such dangerous feelings. In the West, during the early Christian era, for instance, suppression was especially harsh. For 1,500 years—from the earliest days of the Roman Catholic Church in the 2nd century AD to the 16th century Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation—the Church proclaimed passionate love and sex (even marital sex) for any purpose other than procreation to be a mortal sin, punishable by eternal damnation (Gay, 1984). For most of Western history until the 18th century "Age of Reason," love was not expected to end well. Romeo and Juliet, Ophelia and Hamlet, Abelard and Eloise did not make love, get married, have two children, and live happily ever after. Juliet stabbed herself. Romeo swallowed poison. Ophelia went mad and died. Hamlet was felled by a poisoned sword point. Peter Abelard (a real person) was castrated and his beloved Eloise retired to a nunnery. The same miserable endings to love occurred elsewhere. In Japan, for example, love suicides have been an institution since the end of the 17th century (Mace & Mace, 1980).

Some traditional love stories sound strange to the modern reader. And so they should. In the realms of love and sex, a profound revolution has taken place in the last 3 centuries, and it is still happening (for better or worse, depending on one's own beliefs). It started in Europe, spread to the United States, and now appears to be reaching deep into the traditions of many non-Western societies. It is part of the dominant tendency of modern history in all phases of life, a tendency given the name of "Westernization." The historical model with which most scholars interested in world history operate (McNeill, 1963; Roberts, 1976; Rapson, 1988) goes like this.

Throughout the centuries, four cultures possessed the most political and economic power and the most influential cultural traditions. The Big Four were the East Asia area (today's China, Japan, Korea, and southeast Asia); South Asia (India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka); the Middle East or West Asia (Egypt, Persia [Iran], Mesopotamia [Iraq], Palestine, Syria, and other Arab countries); and Western civilization (Europe and, recently, the United States). There have been other strong, original cultures—in Africa, North and South America, the steppes of Asia, Polynesia, Oceania, and other places—but none of them could match the power and influence of those four. Until 1500, the four major groups were by-and-large separate and independent cultural units. They tended to move on parallel tracks, intersecting at times, but generally swerving away from one another. There barely existed even the concept of one world. In the realms of

passionate love and sexual desire, different cultural groups possessed somewhat different ideas about the social rules governing them (Braudel, 1984; Stavrianos, 1981).

All that changed after about 1500. Large transformations followed in the wake of the Renaissance, the Scientific Revolution, and the Industrial Revolution. By the late 18th century, the West began to alter its view of love and almost everything else. Western culture began to "invent" a number of unique and modern ideas. In the *material sphere,* it has meant the rapid expansion of urbanization, industrialization, and technology; in the *economic* and *political spheres,* it has meant a move toward democracy, capitalism, socialism, and/or totalitarianism systems; in the *philosophical sphere,* it has meant an increasing faith first in Christianity, and then humanism, secularism, and science; and (perhaps most importantly for our purposes) in the *psychological sphere,* it has meant an increasing insistence on individualism, the desirability of the goal of personal happiness and the reduction of pain, accompanied by personal and artistic freedom and more fluid class systems. Looming large in the psychological arena has been a metamorphosis in Euro-American approaches to love and sex, many of which are now occurring in corners of the non-Western world (McNeill, 1963; Roberts, 1976; Stavrianos, 1981; Toynbee, 1962; Wallerstein, 1974).

The West initiated such ideas and practices (among many) as (a) a high value placed on romantic and passionate love; (b) marriage for love (as opposed to arranged marriage); (c) egalitarian families (as opposed to patriarchal, hierarchical arrangements); (d) sexual freedom for men and women; (e) the movement toward equality for women; and (f) childhood considered as a separate phase of the life cycle with children deserving special treatment (as opposed to treating very young children as miniature adults sent out to farm the fields as soon as they could walk) (Aries, 1962; Coontz, 1988; Ladurie, 1979; Stone, 1990). By 1800, the West had been transformed by these ideas. Have India, China, Japan, Egypt, Iran, the nations of Africa and Latin America escaped these revolutions? Not completely. Just how much such traditional societies have changed, and whether these changes are desirable, however, is debated.

There is one particularly intriguing and important phenomenon: It took the West over 500 years to embrace (or partially embrace) these "modern" ideas of love, sex, and intimacy. In some non-Western cultures, however, these same changes seem, at least superficially, to be repeating themselves in less than 50 years (Bendix, 1964; Dunn,

1989; Wittfogel, 1957). It is as though history is hurtling through these societies at an ever-accelerating pace.

Recently, of course, there has begun to be a backlash against Western ideas and hegemony. Non-Western ethnic groups have begun to celebrate their own cultures; some resist wholesale Western cultural imperialism. Throughout the world, people have begun to speculate about the possibilities of taking only the best that the West has to offer and integrating it with the cultural traditions that are uniquely their own (Axtell, 1981; Kağitçibaşi, 1990; Skocpol, 1979). Some feel it is best to try to turn back the clock and reject Westernization (which many associate with drugs, crime, licentiousness, and greed) entirely. The dialectic between Westernization and resistance to it defines much of international life today. Even in the United States and Western Europe, many citizens are repelled by sexual permissiveness, the ease of divorce, and the women's movement. Among historians, there is as yet no substantial disagreement with the contention that since 1800, the West has greatly expanded its influence upon the rest of the world (Braudel, 1984; McNeill, 1963; Roberts, 1976; Stavrianos, 1981). There is serious debate, however, about how deep these influences go. Are they fundamental or cosmetic (Axtell, 1981; Moore, 1966; Skocpol, 1979; Wittfogel, 1957)? And there is heated controversy about whether Western cultural expansion has been largely constructive or malignant (Bendix, 1964; Dunn, 1989; Rapson, 1988; Toynbee, 1962; Wallerstein, 1974).

The current historical perspective suggests several questions for sex researchers: What aspects of love, sex, and intimacy are universal? Which are social constructions? Is the world in fact becoming one and homogeneous? Or are traditional cultural practices more tenacious and impervious to this sort of deep transformation than some have supposed (Axtell, 1981; Kağitçibaşi, 1990; Moore, 1966)?

Cross-Cultural Perspectives

Culture can, of course, have a profound impact on how people view love, how susceptible they are to falling in love, with whom they tend to fall in love, and how their passionate affairs work out. It can also effect the object of sexual desire as well as when, where, and why people feel sexual passion. Culture has been defined as "the shared way of life of a group of people" (Berry et al., 1992, p. 1). Cross-cultural psychologists have been interested in the similarities and differences between cultures, in cross-national comparisons, and in ethnic differences. They contribute to our understanding of passionate love and sexual desire in two different ways. First, they can give us some sense of what social structures and processes are found throughout the human family. Second, they give us some sense of how variable social arrangements can be. Let us review some of the major cross-cultural theorists' perspectives.

In 1830, DeTocqueville (1830/1981) observed that the United States was an individualist/materialist culture, compared to the Europe of his day. In *Democracy in America,* he detailed the consequences, positive and negative, of this type of individualist philosophy. Cross-cultural psychologists, too, have observed that the world's cultures differ profoundly in the extent to which they emphasize individualism or collectivism (although some would focus on related concepts: independence or interdependence; modernism or traditionalism; urbanism or ruralism; affluence or poverty). Individualistic cultures (such as the United States, Britain, Australia, Canada, and the countries of northern and western Europe) tend to focus on personal goals. Collectivist cultures (such as China, many African and Latin American nations, Greece, southern Italy, and the Pacific Islands), on the other hand, press their members to subordinate their personal interests to those of the group.

Triandis and his colleagues (1990) identified several traits which seem to distinguish individualistic from collectivist cultures. In individualistic cultures, people are allowed to "do their own thing," to put their own needs first. In collectivist cultures, they are pressed to subordinate their needs to those of the group. Individualist cultures stress rights over duties; collectivists stress duties over rights. Individualists' behavior is shaped primarily by their own attitudes and preferences, by private cost-benefit analyses of what will work for them and what won't. Collectivists are expected to conform to social norms; deviant behavior is punished (p. 1007).

Triandis et al. (1990) went on to note, "in collectivist cultures there is much emphasis on hierarchy. Usually, the father is the boss and men superordinate women. This is not nearly as much the case in individualistic cultures" (p. 1007).

Triandis et al. (1990) also developed a scale to classify cultures as individualist or collectivist. Within a given culture, of course, people can vary in their philosophies. Their scale also indicates how idiocentric (individualistic) or allocentric (collectivist) individuals are.

Markus and Kitayama (1991) argued that culture has a critically important impact on people's self-construals (on the way they see themselves and others). Culture, they contended, affects cognitions,

emotions, and motivations. In many Western, *independent* cultures there is a faith in the inherent separateness of distinct persons. These cultures value individuality, uniqueness, and independence. Many non-Western, *interdependent* cultures, on the other hand, insist on the fundamental connectedness of human beings. The self is defined in relation to ancestors, family, and those around them. These cultures emphasize attending to and fitting in with others and the importance of conformity and harmonious interdependence.

Asian scholars have also theorized about cultural differences in people's views of passionate love and sexual desire (or at least about their sexual attitudes, feelings, and behavior). Chu (1985) contrasted the traditional American and Chinese views of self.

> The American self seems to be characterized by individualism. It tends to assert one's self rather than accommodate others and to strive for a high degree of self-reliance and independence. . . . The traditional Chinese self exists primarily in relation to significant others. Thus, a male Chinese would consider himself a son, a brother, a husband, a father, but hardly *himself*. It seems as if . . . there was very little independent self left for the Chinese. This point can be further illustrated by the position of women in traditional China. Before marriage, a woman followed her father. After marriage, she followed her husband. After the death of her husband, she followed her son. The self had little meaning outside these rigidly defined social contexts. The idea that a woman could stand on her own, and be herself, simply did not seem possible. A person, in this case a woman, measured the worth of herself not by what she had personally achieved, but by the extent to which she had lived up to the behavioral expectations of the significant others as defined by the predominant cultural ideas. (pp. 257-258)

As a consequence, Chu observed, American and traditional Chinese men and women desired very different qualities in a mate. "In traditional China the selection of a marital partner was made by parents, who relied on go-betweens. The main criteria were known as *men tang hu tui,* that is, the doors of the two families should be of similar texture and the houses must face each other. In other words, comparability of family social status was of paramount importance. Whether the young couple were compatible and could get along with each other was of little consequence" (p. 264).

For Americans, love and compatibility are the first priority. Chu expressed considerable alarm that in the wake of the Cultural revolution, modern Chinese men and women have become increasingly self-centered and materialistic; they have, he fears, lost their traditional anchorage. Today the young seem to care nothing about scholarly achievements and knowledge. Family and relatives are totally

rejected. Young women seem to be totally self-centered and materialistic. He asked, "How can one explain this change from the past?" Chu postulated that the Cultural Revolution probably caused this "decline." The new Chinese self was no longer so strongly anchored in traditional values. Families lost power and influence. Parents were so busy striving for material goods that no one stayed home to care for the "latchkey" children. Young people learned that moral principles did not pay. They saw opportunists gain power. Violence was encouraged. The result was that young people became less submissive to authority figures, more assertive, and less accommodating. Chu held on to the hope, however, that this trend would be reversed. (We would, of course, see such changes more neutrally, as evidence of embryonic Westernization of China and its adoption of more individualistic values.)

Hsu (1985) also contrasted Western and Chinese values concerning passionate love and intimacy. American culture, he argued, is interested in personality; it is individual-centered. It attaches great importance to emotional expression. Chinese culture is situation-centered. Individuals are caught up in "a web of interpersonal relationships" (Hsu, 1985, p. 33). Group members are required to conform to "the interpersonal standards of the society" (Hsu, 1971, p. 29). Chinese men and women tend to "underplay all matters of the heart" (Hsu, 1971, p. 12). Hsu (1981) argued that such differences have a critical impact on how romantic love is viewed in each society. The concept of romantic love fits in well with a North American cultural perspective but *not* with a Chinese cultural orientation, where one is expected to consider not just one's own personal feelings, but obligations to others, especially one's parents. Hsu wrote, "an American asks, 'How does my heart feel?' A Chinese asks, 'What will other people say?' " (p. 50). He claims that the Western idea of romantic love has not had much of an impact on young adults in China. Hsu pointed out that the Chinese generally used the term love to describe not a respectable, socially sanctioned relationship, but an *illicit* liaison between a man and a woman.

Hsu (1971, 1985) also noted that culture has a profound impact on where people seek intimacy and how likely they are to find it. In the West, people focus on romantic love; it is in passionate affairs that they expect to find intimacy. It is considered immature to remain dependent on one's parents. In Chinese society, men and women expect less from marriage. Parents and kin are the source of intimacy. Men and women assume they will be tied to their families throughout life. Love may fail, but families do not. Hsu (1985)

remarked "most parents are like dogs; one can kick them in the teeth and they will still come back for more. No one can take his peers for granted to that extent. He and they are likely to compete for the same things. His desire for mastery over them is matched by theirs over him. He has to satisfy his peers as much as they have to satisfy him" (p. 38).

Ho (1982) also distinguished Western from Eastern ideas about love, sex, and marriage. In Ho's analysis, Western psychologists tend to think in individualistic terms; they talk about the self and personality. Asian psychologists' concepts are relational. Ho argued that behavioral scientists should expand their focus:

> My intention is not to derogate individualistic concepts; much has been achieved through their use, and their respectability is well-deserved. Nevertheless, so long as they remain the primary constructs to be relied upon, behavioral science will continue to be individual-centered, wedded to the ideology of individualism. And dissatisfaction with this ideological bias has been voiced. . . . The point I wish to emphasize is that social behavior is inherently relational in nature: Individual behavior assumes social meaning only in the context of human relations. . . . The basic unit of analysis is therefore not individual behavior, but behavior-in-a-relational-context. (p. 233)

Doi (1973) contended that a key to understanding the Japanese cultural perspective is to understand the concept of *amae*. The verb *amaeru* can be translated as "to depend and presume upon another's love" or "to indulge in another's kindness." (Doi, 1963, p. 266). This word describes what infants and small children feel for their mothers: a desire for infantile dependency—a wish to cling to her, to have someone attend to one's every need, to resist being cast into the cold world of objective reality. In adulthood, Doi (1973) argued "*amae*, generally speaking, is an inseparable concomitant of love (*koi*)" (p. 118).

Doi (1973) elaborated on the vocabulary of *amae:*

> The word *amae* itself is far from being an isolated expression of the *amae* psychology in the Japanese language. A large number of other words give expression to the same psychology. The adjective *amai*, for example, is . . . a description of a man's character: thus if A is said to be *amai* to B, it means that he allows B to *amaeru*, i.e. to behave self-indulgently, presuming on some special relationship that exists between the two. . . . Next, there is a group of words such as *suneru, higamu, hinekureau,* and *uramu* that relate to various states of mind brought about by the inability to *amareru. Suneru* (to be sulky) occurs when one is not allowed to be straightforwardly self-indulgent yet the attitude comprises in itself a certain degree of that same self-indulgence. *Futekusareru* and *jakekuso ni naru* (indicating, respectively, the attitudes of defiance and irresponsibility in speech or behavior associated with a "fit of the sulks"), are two phenomena that arise as a result of *suneru. Higamu* (to be suspicious or jaundiced in one's attitude), which involves laboring under the delusion that one is being treated unjustly, has its origins in the failure of one's desire for indulgence to find the expected response. *Hinekureru* (to behave in a distorted, perverse way) involves feigning indifference to the other instead of showing *amae.* Under the surface one is, in fact, concerned with the other's reaction; although there appears to be no *amae,* it is there, basically all the time. *Uramu* (to show resentment toward or hatred of) means that rejection of one's *amae* has aroused feelings of hostility; this hostility has a complexity not present in simple hatred, that shows how closely it is linked with the *amae* psychology. (pp. 29-30)

According to Doi (1973), the Japanese assume that amae will continue to cement their most intimate of relationships throughout their lives.

The Japanese have a second term, *enryo,* which may be roughly translated as "restraint" or "holding back." In one sense, people do not hold back with their intimates as they do with outsiders. In another sense, they are more likely to show restraint and consideration for those they care for. Doi (1973) continued: "In Japan, little value is attributed to the individual's private realm as distinct from the group" (p. 42).

> The presence or absence of *enryo* is used by the Japanese as a gauge in distinguishing between the types of human relationships that they refer to as "outer" and "inner." One's relatives, with whom no *enryo* is necessary, are in one's "inner" circle—literally, since the term *miuchi,* "relatives," means something like "one's inner circle"—but *giri*-type relationships where *enryo* is present are the "outer" circle...in contrast to the world of tanin, with whom one is quite unconnected, and where there is no need, even, to bring *enryo* into play. (p. 40)

Doi (1973), too, seems to share Western theorists' observation that the Japanese are much more concerned with in-group and out-group differences than are Westerners. Theorists, then, make it clear that we might expect to find both cultural similarities and differences in the way that men and women view love, and that culture plays a significant part when it comes to love and sex.

Let us now turn to recent research into the impact of culture on passionate love and sexual desire.

The Cross-Cultural Data

Culture and the Definition of Passionate Love

Are there cultural differences in how men and women view passionate love? Wu and Shaver (1992; Shaver et al., 1991) interviewed young people in America, Italy, and the People's Republic of China about their emotional experiences. In all cultures, men and women identified the same emotions as basic, prototypic, emotions. These were joy/happiness, love/attraction, fear, anger/hate, and sadness/depression. They also agreed completely as to whether the various emotions should be labeled as positive experiences (such as joy) or negative ones (such as fear, anger, or sadness). They agreed completely except, that is, about one emotion—love. American and Italian subjects tended to equate love with happiness; both passionate and companionate love were assumed to be intensely positive experiences. Chinese students, however, had a darker view of love. In Chinese there are few "happy-love" ideographs. Love tends to be associated with sadness, pain, and heartache. Chinese men and women generally associated passionate love with such ideographs as infatuation, unrequited love, nostalgia, and sorrow-love.

Students from the East and West never did come to an agreement as to the nature of love. Each cultural group continued to regard one another's visions of love as "unrealistic."

Culture and Susceptibility to Love

It has been claimed that Americans are preoccupied with love (Murstein, 1986). When Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) asked University of Miami students "Are you in love now?" 46% of them said they were. Eighty-nine percent of them said they had been in love at least once in their lives. Only 11% had never been in love. Men and women seem to differ in their vulnerability to passionate love. In the Hendrick and Hendrick study, 46% of men and 66% of women admitted they were in love at the present time.

How about men and women in the rest of the industrialized world? Some early researchers (Goode, 1959; Rosenblatt, 1967) assumed that romantic love would be most prevalent in modern, industrialized, countries. The emerging evidence, however, suggests that men and women in a variety of cultures (industrializing as well as industrial) are every bit as romantic as Americans. Sprecher et al. (1992), for example, interviewed 1,667 men and women, all college students, in the United States, Russia, and Japan. Similar percentages of men

and women in the various cultures said they were currently in love (see Table 2). Passion was more common worldwide than the researchers expected. They had expected American men and women to be most vulnerable to love; the Japanese the least. In fact, they found that it was the Russians who reported being currently in love the most often. American men and women were intermediate and the Japanese were least likely to be in love. (The percentage of those currently in love was "surprisingly" high in all three societies, however.) In all three cultures, men were slightly less likely than were women to be in love at the present time.

Table 2
Percentage of Men and Women in Various Countries Who Are Currently in Love

Cultural Group	Percentage in Love	
	Men	Women
American	53	63
Russian	61	73
Japanese	41	63

Note. Source: Sprecher et al. (1992).

Surveys of Mexican-American, Chinese-American, and Euro-American students have also found that in a variety of cross-national groups, young men and women show high rates of reporting being in love at the present time (Aron & Rodriquez, 1992).

Culture and Intensity of Passionate Love

What impact does culture have on how passionately men and women fall in love? In one study, Hatfield and Rapson (1987a) asked American men and women of European, Filipino, and Japanese ancestry to complete the Passionate Love Scale (PLS). Men and women from the various ethnic groups seemed to love with equal passion (see Table 3).

Table 3
Intensity of Passionate Love in Various Ethnic Groups

Ethnic Group	Average PLS[a] Score	
	Men	Women
Euro-Americans (Mainland USA)	97.50	110.25
Euro-Americans (Hawaii)	100.50	105.00
Filipino–Americans (Hawaii)	106.50	102.90
Japanese–Americans (Hawaii)	99.00	103.95

Note. Source: Hatfield & Rapson (1987a).
[a]PLS = Passionate Love Scale.

Culture and the Willingness to Marry Someone You Do Not Love

In the West, people generally assume that couples should be romantically in love with who ever they choose to marry. In the mid-1960s, Kephart (1967) asked more than 1,000 American college students: "If a boy (girl) had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him (her)?" He found that in the 1960s, men and women had different ideas as to how important romantic love was in a marriage. Men thought passion was essential. Women said that the absence of love would not necessarily deter them from considering marriage. Kephart suggested that whereas men might have the luxury of marrying for love, women did not. Women's status was dependent on their husbands'; thus, they had to be practical and take a potential husband's family background, professional status, and income into account. Since the 1960s, sociologists have continued to ask young American men and women this question. They have found that, year by year, young American men and women have come to demand more and more of love. Simpson and his colleagues (1986), for example, found that in the 1980s, 85% of American men and women would not even consider marrying someone they did not love. In the most recent research, 86% of men and 91% women answered the same question "No!" (Allgeier & Allgeier, 1991).

Today, American men and women assume that romantic love is so important that they insist that if they fell out of love, they would not even consider *staying* married! (Simpson et al., 1986). Of course, with more experience they might find that they are willing to "settle" for less than they think they would.

How do young men and women in other countries feel about this issue? Sprecher et al. (1992) asked American, Russian, and Japanese students, "If a person had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry him/her if you were not in love?" (Students could only answer *yes* or *no*.) The authors, of course, had expected that only the individualistic Americans would demand love *and* marriage; they predicted that both the Russians and the Japanese would be more practical. They found that they were wrong. Both the Americans and the Japanese were romantics (see Table 4). Few of them would consider marrying someone they did not love. (Only 11% of Americans and 18% of the Japanese said yes.) The Russians, especially the women, were more practical; 30% of the Russian men and 41% of the Russian women said they would accept such a proposal.

Table 4
Percentage of American, Russian, and Japanese Men and Women Willing to Marry Someone They Did Not Love

Cultural Group	Percentage Willing To Marry Someone Not Loved	
	Men	Women
American	13	9
Russian	30	41
Japanese	20	19

Note. Source: Sprecher et al. (1992).

The preceding studies, then, suggest that the large differences that once existed between Westernized, urban, modern, industrial societies and Eastern, modern, urban industrial societies are fast disappearing. Those interested in cross-cultural differences may only find them if they begin to explore some of the most underdeveloped, developing, and collectivist of societies—such as in Africa or Latin America, in China or the Arab countries (Egypt, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudia-Arabia, Iraq, or the U.A.E.). Not surprisingly, data on passionate love and sexual desire are collected primarily in the West, where such feelings are valued. Collectivist societies, which denigrate such feelings, forbid such data collection. Thus, the very societies in which we would be most interested are also the most inaccessible. There are some data, however, which suggest that, even there, the winds of Westernization and change are blowing.

Culture and Sexual Desire

China is often cited as the prototype of a sexually repressive culture (Ruan, 1991). Yet, Deng Xiaoping's far reaching reforms have begun to change (for better or worse, depending on your point of view) even Chinese attitudes toward passionate love and sexual desire. Recently, *Time* magazine, in a report entitled "The sexual revolution hits China," observed "millions of Chinese, newly exposed to Western ideas, have fallen prey to notions of romantic love and sexual fulfillment" (Burton, 1988, p. 65). Their conclusion was based on interviews with China's new sexologists. One was Liu, a Chinese sexologist, who added, "the Chinese are like people who have been in the dark a long time. . . . Suddenly, when the windows are opened, they feel dizzy." (Burton, 1988, p. 65).

Change is sweeping China. . . . and the rest of the world. Liu lectures on sex and has written 30 best-selling books on love, sex, and marriage. He is not alone. In 1993, China founded the Chinese Society for the Scientific Study of Sex and held their first meetings. In 1993, the first Sino-North American Symposium on Sexuality,

sponsored by the Chinese Medical Association, will be held in Beijing, in the People's Republic of China.

As yet, cross-cultural researchers have collected little data on sexual desire. They have devoted their first efforts to studying sexual attitudes and values and sexual behavior. We can get some sense, however, of how quickly things are changing in these ways. For the first time, such data are being collected in the most remote corners of the world. In a culture that does not value or is attempting to suppress sexual passion, such data would not be collected. Second, an overview of the following data on sexual attitudes and behavior suggest that although cultural differences still exist in sexual attitudes and behaviors, some profound changes do seem to be occurring: The double standard, for example, seems to be steadily eroding, even in some of the most traditional societies of the world. Also, in most societies, young people are beginning to have more favorable views of passionate love and sexuality. They are beginning to marry for love in increasing numbers. People are beginning to engage in more sexual activity and experimentation.

Liu (1991) and 500 volunteer social workers, for example, interviewed 23,000 men and women in 15 Chinese provinces using a 240-question survey. Liu found that 86% of the respondents approved of premarital sex. A surprising 69% of them said they saw nothing wrong with extramarital affairs. Liu (cited in Burton, 1988) estimated that up to 30% of Chinese youth have engaged in premarital sexual activity.

Men, especially those living in rural areas, reported they got more satisfaction from sex than did women. Liu found that only 17% of couples living in the city, but a full 34% of the couples living in the countryside, said they engaged in either no foreplay at all or in less than a minute of foreplay. Partly as a result of this, 37% of the rural wives reported having pain during intercourse. Pan (cited in Burton, 1990) found that whereas men reached orgasm about 70% of the time, women did so only 40% of the time.

We therefore must not exaggerate the changes in China. Women who are "promiscuous" are still sentenced to prison for prostitution or adultery. Homosexuals are still condemned as hooligans. (Some gay clubs have begun to open in the largest cities, however.)

Surveys conducted in America (with a variety of ethnic groups) and in a number of other cultures also testify to the changes sweeping the world. Obviously, there is neither time nor space to review all these articles. We can, however, alert readers to a sampling of the

articles that have been published since 1980. In the following studies, men and women from various cultures and ethnic groups were interviewed about their sexual *attitudes* and *values*. In America, researchers have interviewed African-American (Dunn & Wyatt, 1991), Chinese-American (Sue, 1982), Japanese-American (Abramson & Imai-Marquez, 1982), and Mexican-American (Padilla & O' Grady, 1987) respondents. Throughout the world, they have interviewed men and women in Australia (Hong, 1991), China (Chan 1990; Gill, 1991; Ng & Lau, 1990; Pan, 1993), Columbia (Alzate, 1989), France (Werebe & Reinert, 1983), Holland (Schuijer, 1990), Hungary (Vincze, 1985), India (Bhatia, 1986), Iran (Hanassab & Tidwell, 1989; Hojat & Shapurian,1985; Shapurian & Hojat, 1985), Israel (Linn, 1991), Japan (Sprecher & Hatfield, 1993), Mexico (LaBeff & Dodder, 1982), Sweden (Foa et al., 1987), and Zimbabwe (Marindo & Wilson, 1989).

In some studies the emphasis has been on *sexual behavior*. In America, researchers have interviewed African-American (Belcastro, 1985; Bell et al, 1981; Fisher, 1980; Klassen et al, 1981; Wyatt, 1989; Zelnik & Kantner, 1980), Chinese-American (Huang & Uba, 1992; Sue, 1982), ethnic groups in Hawaii (Mokuau, 1986), and Mexican-American (Padilla & O' Grady, 1987) respondents. Throughout the world, they have studied cultural groups in China (Chan, 1990; Liu, 1992; Pan, 1990; Zessen & Sanfort, 1991), Colombia (Alzate, 1989), Hong Kong (Chan, 1990; Family Planning Association of Hong Kong, 1987), India (Bhatia, 1986), Japan (Dewaraja & Sasaki, 1991; Hatano, 1991), Northern Ireland (Sneddon & Kremer, 1992), Norway (Sundet et al., 1992), Peru (Holmes, 1993), Samoa, (Mokuau, 1986), Sri Lanka (Dewaraja & Sasaki, 1991), United Kingdom (Breakwell & Fife-Schaw, 1992; Turner et al., 1988), and West Germany (Clement, et al., 1984).

Conclusions

From our own work as psychotherapists in Hawaii (with clients from a variety of cultures), from our work as professors at the University of Hawaii (with students from a variety of cultures), and in an attempt to summarize the existing historical and cross-cultural research, we would like to offer some observations that temper the cross-cultural theoretical statements with which we began this paper. We would argue:

1. The major cultural groups are more similar in their views of love, sex, and intimacy than the stereotypes would suggest. In making theoretical distinctions, it sometimes helps to sketch extreme distinc-

tions between "ideal" types. In today's reality, however, none of the major industrial and industrializing cultures—China, Japan, India, Africa, North America, Europe, or South America—can accurately be portrayed as purely individualistic or purely collectivist. In *all* cultures, people must often put themselves first. In *all* cultures, people must sometimes sacrifice themselves for others if the marriage, family, or community is to survive. Real people in all cultures are always engaged in a balancing act. They must balance their own self-oriented concerns against the desires of the group. In fact, it is almost certainly true that people from modern industrialized countries, East and West, have a good deal more in common than not. Differences exist, but we must be careful not to exaggerate them.

2. *Cultural and gender differences may often be less powerful than individual personality differences in shaping attitudes and behavior.* Culture has a powerful impact on romantic and sexual attitudes and behavior. Nonetheless, the sparse research that exists—comparing cultural, gender, and individual differences—seems to suggest that within a given culture or gender, sizable individual differences exist in romantic and sexual attitudes and behavior.

3. *"Westernization" may very likely prevail in the arenas of love, sex, and intimacy.* Among historians, there is as yet no substantial disagreement with the contention that since 1800, the West has greatly expanded its influence upon the rest of the world. There *is* serious debate, however, about how deep these influences go. Some argue that these transformations are deep and long lasting; others that they represent merely temporary accommodations. And there is heated controversy about whether Western cultural expansion has been constructive or destructive. The dialectic between Westernization and resistance to it defines much of international life today.

From our survey of the existing literature on passionate love and sexual desire (especially, when we focus on social changes in sexual attitudes and behavior from, say, 1930 to the present) we would risk some conclusions. Throughout the developed world, two changes have occurred that seem likely to continue: (a) There has been a movement in the direction of equality for men and women (although actual equality remains far off); (b) Societies have increasingly come to accept the notion that the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain are desirable goals. The growing acceptance in these arenas of what were once considered "Western" values, and now, slowly beginning to be thought of as part of a universal bill of human rights, has produced a variety of changes in people's views of love and sex. It has

produced an increasing acceptance of passionate love and sexual desire as legitimate, expressible feelings. It has produced an increasing trend toward marriage for love. It has led to more sexual permissiveness. In these areas, we might expect that personal freedom, once experienced, would be difficult to surrender. But no one can foretell the future, and the tempestuous story of passionate love and sexual desire remains to be written.

Acknowledgements

Our thanks to Dr. Susan Sprecher and Rachita Shri Chandak (Illinois State University) and Kari Thompson (University of Hawaii) for their help in tracking down recent articles concerning sexual attitudes and behavior in a variety of societies.

References

ABRAMSON, P. R., & IMAI-MARQUEZ, J. (1982). The Japanese-American: A cross-cultural, cross-sectional study of sex guilt. *Journal of Research in Personality, 16,* 227-237.

AINSWORTH, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44,* 709-716.

AINSWORTH, M. D. S., BLEHAR, M. C., WATERS, E., & WALL, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

ALLGEIER, E. R., & ALLGEIER, A. R. (1991). *Sexual interactions* (3rd ed.). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

ALZATE, H. (1989). Sexual behavior of unmarried Colombian university students: A follow up. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 18,* 239-250.

ARIES, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood.* New York: Random House.

ARON, A., & RODRIGUEZ, G. (1992, July 25). *Scenarios of falling in love among Mexican-, Chinese-, and Anglo-Americans.* Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Personal Relationships. Orono, ME.

AXTELL, J. L. (1981). *The European and the Indian: Essays in ethnohistory of colonial North America.* New York: Oxford University Press.

BARTHOLOMEW, K., & HOROWITZ, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 226-245.

BELCASTRO, P. A. (1985). Sexual behavior differences between black and white students. *The Journal of Sex Research, 21,* 56-67.

BELL, S. (1902). A preliminary study of the emotion of love between the sexes. *The American Journal of Psychology, 13,* 325-354.

BELL, A. P., WEINBERG, M. S., & HAMMERSMITH, S. (1981). *Sexual preference: Statistical appendix.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

BENDIX, R. (1964). *Nation-building and citizenship; studies of our changing social order.* New York: Wiley.

BERRY, J. W., POORTINGA, Y. H., SEGALL, M. H., & DASEN, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

BERSCHEID, E., GRAZIANO, W., MONSON, T., & DERMER, M. (1976). Outcome dependency: Attention, attribution, and attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 978-989.

BHATIA, J. (1986). Lifting India's fig-leaf prudery. *Far Eastern Economic Review, 131,* 37-38.
BOWLBY, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.
BOWLBY, J. (1973). Affectional bonds: Their nature and origin. In R. Weiss (Ed.), *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation* (pp. 38-52). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
BOWLBY, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Sadness and depression.* New York: Basic Books.
BRAUDEL, F. (1984). *The perspective of the world.* (S. Reynolds, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
BREAKWELL, G. M., & FIFE-SCHAW, C. (1992). Sexual activities and preferences in a United Kingdom sample of 16-20 year olds. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21,* 271-293.
BROWN, D. E. (1991). *Human universals.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
BULLOUGH, V. L. (1990). History and the understanding of human sexuality. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 1,* 75-92.
BURTON, S. (1988, September 12). The sexual revolution hits China. *Time,* p. 65.
BURTON, S. (1990, May 14). Straight talk on sex in China. *Time,* p. 82.
BUSS, D. M. (1988a). Love acts: The evolutionary biology of love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 100-118). New Haven: Yale University Press.
BUSS, D. M. (1988b). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 616-628.
BUSS, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12,* 1-49.
BUSS, D. M. and 49 others. (1990). International preferences in selecting mates: A study of 37 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21,* 5-47.
BUSS, D. M., & BARNES, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 559-570.
BUSS, D. M., & SCHMITT, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100,* 204-232.
CHAN, D. W. (1990). Sex knowledge, attitudes, and experience of Chinese medical students in Hong Kong. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 19,* 73-93.
CHU, G. C. (1985). The changing concept of self in contemporary China. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F. L. K. Hus (Eds.). *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 252-277). London, England: Tavistock.
CLEMENT, U., SCHMIDT, G., & KRUSE, M. (1984). Changes in sex differences in sexual behavior: A replication of a study on West German students (1966-1981). *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 13,* 99-120.
COONTZ, S. (1988). *The social origins of private life: A history of American families, 1600-1900.* London, England: Verso.
DARWIN, C. (1871). *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex.* London: Murray.
DEGLER, C. N. (1980). *At odds: Women and the family in America from the revolution to the present.* New York: Oxford University Press.
DELAMETER, J., & MACCORQUODALE, P. (1979). *Premarital sexuality: Attitudes, relationships, behavior.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
D'EMILIO, J., & FREEDMAN, E. (1988). *Intimate matters: A history of sexuality in America.* New York: Harper & Row.
DETOQUEVILLE, A. (1830/1981). *Democracy in America.* New York: Vintage Press.
DEWARAJA, R., & SASAKI, Y. (1991). Semen-loss syndrome: A comparison between Sri Lanka and Japan. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 45,* 14-20.
DOHERTY, R. W., HATFIELD, E., THOMPSON, K., & CHOO, P. (1993). *Cultural and ethnic influences on love and attachment.* Unpublished manuscript.

DOI, L. T. (1963). Some thoughts on helplessness and the desire to be loved. *Psychiatry, 26,* 266-272.
DOI, L. T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence* (J. Bester, Trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.
DUNN, J. (1989). *Modern revolutions: An introduction to the analysis of a political phenomenon.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
DUNN, K. M., & WYATT, G. E. (1991). Examining predictors of sex guilt in multiethnic samples of women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 20,* 471-485.
ELLIS, B. J., & SYMONS, D. (1990). Sex differences in sexual fantasy: An evolutionary psychological approach. *The Journal of Sex Research, 27,* 527-555.
FAMILY PLANNING ASSOCIATION OF HONG KONG. (1987). *The adolescent sexuality study 1986. Household survey: Summary of findings.* Family Planning Association, Hong Kong.
FEENEY, J. A., & NOLLER, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 281-291.
FEI, J., & BERSCHEID, E. (1977). *Perceived dependency, insecurity, and love in heterosexual relationships: The eternal triangle.* Unpublished manuscript, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
FISHER, H. E. (1989). Evolution of human serial pairbonding. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 78,* 331-354.
FISHER, H. E. (1993). *Anatomy of love: The natural history of monogamy, adultery, and divorce.* New York: W. W. Norton.
FISHER, S. (1980). Personality correlates of sexual behavior in black women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 9,* 27-35.
FOA, U. G., ANDERSON, B., CONVERSE, J. JR., URBANSKY, W. A., & CAWLEY, M. J. III. (1987). Gender-related sexual attitudes: Some crosscultural similarities and differences. *Sex Roles, 16,* 511-519.
GAY, P. (1984). *The Bourgeois experience: Victoria to Freud. Education of the senses* (Vol. 1). New York: Oxford University Press.
GAY, P. (1986). *The Bourgeois experience: Victoria to Freud. The tender passion* (Vol. 2). New York: Oxford University Press.
GILL, V. E. (1991). An ethnography of HIV/AIDS and sexuality in The People's Republic of China. *The Journal of Sex Research, 28,* 521-537.
GILLIS, J. R. (1985). *For better, for worse: British marriages, 1600 to the present.* New York: Oxford University Press.
GOODE, W. J. (1959). The theoretical importance of love. *American Sociological Review, 24,* 38-47.
GRIFFITT, W., & HATFIELD, E. (1985). *Human sexual behavior.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
HANASSAB, S., & TIDWELL, R. (1989). Cross-cultural perspective on dating relationships of young Iranian women: A pilot study. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 2,* 113-121.
HATANO, Y. (1991). Changes in the sexual activities of Japanese youth. *Journal of Sex Education & Therapy, 17,* 1-14.
HATFIELD, E. (1965). The effect of self-esteem on romantic liking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1,* 184-197.
HATFIELD, E., BRINTON, C., & CORNELIUS, J. (1989). Passionate love and anxiety in young adolescents. *Motivation and Emotion, 13,* 271-289.
HATFIELD, E., & RAPSON, R. L. (1987a). Passionate love: New directions in research. *Advances in Personal Relationships, 1,* 109-139.
HATFIELD, E., & RAPSON, R. L. (1987b). Passionate love/sexual desire: Can the same paradigm explain both? *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 16,* 259-278.
HATFIELD, E., & RAPSON, R. L. (1993). *Love, sex, and intimacy: Their psychology, biology, and history.* New York: Harper Collins.

HATFIELD, E., & RAPSON, R. L. (in press). *Passion and its enemies: A cross-cultural look at love and sex.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

HATFIELD, E., SCHMITZ, E., CORNELIUS, J., & RAPSON, R. (1988). Passionate love: How early does it begin? *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 1,* 35-52.

HATFIELD, E., & SPRECHER, S. (1986a). Measuring passionate love in intimate relations. *Journal of Adolescence, 9,* 383-410.

HATFIELD, E., & SPRECHER, S. (1993). *Men's and women's mate preferences in the United States, Russia, and Japan.* Unpublished manuscript.

HAZAN, C., & SHAVER, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511-524.

HENDRICK, C., & HENDRICK, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 392-402.

HINDY, C. G., SCHWARZ, J. C., & BRODSKY, A. (1989). *If this is love, why do I feel so insecure?* New York: The Atlantic Monthly Press.

HO, D. Y. F. (1982). Asian concepts in behavioral science. *Psychologia, 25,* 228-235.

HOJAT, M., & SHAPURIAN, R. (1985). Sexual and premarital attitudes of Iranian college students. *Psychological Reports, 57,* 67-74.

HOLMES, K. K. (1993, July 1). *Sexually transmitted disease seroprevalence related to general knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and practices among the general population in Lima, Peru.* Paper presented at the International Academy of Sex Research, 19th Annual Meeting. Pacific Grove, CA.

HONG, S-M. (1991). Gender differences in Australian attitudes toward premarital sex: A reexamination. *Psychological Reports, 68,* 418.

HOWARD, J. A., BLUMSTEIN, P., & SCHWARTZ, P. (1987). Social or evolutionary theories? Some observations on preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 194-200.

HSU, F. L. K. (1971). Psychosocial homeostasis and jen: Conceptual tools for advancing psychological anthropology. *American Anthropologist, 73,* 23-44.

HSU, F. L. K. (1981). *Americans and Chinese: Passage to difference* (3rd ed.). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

HSU, F. L. K. (1985). The self in cross-cultural perspective. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 24-55). London, England: Tavistock.

HUANG, K., & UBA, L. (1992). Premarital sexual behavior among Chinese college students in the United States. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21,* 227-240.

JACOBS, L., BERSCHEID, E., & HATFIELD, E. (1971). Self-esteem and attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17,* 84-91.

JANKOWIAK, W. R. (1993). Sex, death, and hierarchy in a Chinese city: An anthropological account. New York: Columbia University Press.

JANKOWIAK, W. R., & FISCHER, E. F. (1992). A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love. *Ethnology, 31,* 149-155.

KAĞITÇIBAŞI, C. (1990). Family and socialization in cross-cultural perspective: A model of change. In R. A. Diensbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: 1989: Cross-Cultural Perspectives, 37,* 136-200.

KEPHART, W. M. (1967). Some correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29,* 470-479.

KLASSEN, A. D., WILLIAMS, C. J., & LEVITT, E. (1981). *American sexual standards.* Unpublished manuscript. Alfred C. Kinsey Institute for the Study of Sex, Gender and Reproduction, Bloomington, IN.

LABEFF, E. E., & DODDER, R. A. (1982). Attitudes toward sexual permissiveness in Mexico and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 116,* 285-286.

LADURIE, E. L. R. (1979). *Montaillou: The promised land of error* (B. Bray, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

LINN, R. (1991). Sexual and moral development of Israeli female adolescents from city and Kibbutz: Perspectives of Kohlberg and Gilligan. *Adolescence, 26,* 59-71.

LIU, D. (1991). *National sex civilization survey.* Shanghai, China: Sex Sociological Research Center.

LIU, D. (1992). *Sexual behavior in modern china. A report of the nation-wide sex civilization survey on 20,000 subjects in China.* Shanghai: SJPC Publishing Co. (In Mandarin).

MACE, D., & MACE, V. (1980). *Marriage: East and West.* New York: Dolphin Books.

MARINDO, R., & WILSON, D. (1989). Erotophobia and contraception among Zimbabwean students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129,* 721-723.

MARKUS, H. R., & KITAYAMA, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

MCNEILL, W. H. (1963). *The rise of the West: A history of the human community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MINTZ, S., & KELLOGG, S. (1988). *Domestic revolutions: A social history of American life.* New York: Free Press.

MOKUAU, N. (1986). Human sexuality of native Hawaiians and Samoans. Special issue: Human sexuality, ethnoculture, and social work. *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 4,* 67-80.

MOORE, B., Jr. (1966). *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy: Lord and peasant in the making of the modern world.* Boston: Beacon Press.

MUEHLENHARD, C. L., & QUACKENBUSH, D. M. (1988, November). *Can the sexual double standard put women at risk for sexually transmitted diseases? The role of the double standard in condom use among women.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, San Francisco, CA.

MURSTEIN, B. I. (1986). *Paths to marriage.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

NG, M. L., & LAU, M. P. (1990). Sexual attitudes in the Chinese. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 19,* 373-388.

PADILLA, E. R., & O'GRADY, K. E. (1987). Sexuality among Mexican Americans: A case of sexual stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 5-10.

PAN, S. (1990, November 7-8). *Manual, oral, anal, and homosexual behavior today in Chinese civil peoples.* Paper presented at the First Sino-American Management of HIV Disease Symposium. Beijing, China.

PAN, S. M. (1993). China: Acceptability and effect of three kinds of sexual publication. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 22,* 59-71.

PEELE, S. (1975). *Love and addiction.* New York: Taplinger Publishing.

PHILLIPS, R. (1988). *Putting asunder: A history of divorce in Western society.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

PLUTCHIK, R. (1980). *Emotion: A psychoevolutionary synthesis.* New York: Harper and Row.

RAPSON, R. L. (1988). *American yearnings: Love, money, and endless possibility.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

REISS, I. L., & LEE, G. R. (1988). *Family systems in America* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

ROBERTS, J. M. (1976). *History of the world.* New York: Knopf.

ROSENBLATT, P. C. (1967). Marital residence and the function of romantic love. *Ethnology, 6,* 471-480.

RUAN, F. F. (1991). *Sex in China.* New York: Plenum.

SCHUIJER, J. (1990). Tolerance at arm's length: The Dutch experience. *Journal of Homosexuality, 20,* 199-229.

SHAPURIAN, R., & HOJAT, M. (1985). Sexual and premarital attitudes of Iranian college students. *Psychological Reports, 57,* 67-74.

SHAVER, P., & HAZAN, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5,* 474-501.

SHAVER, P. R., WU, S., & SCHWARTZ, J. C. (1991). Cross-cultural similarities and differences in emotion and its representation: A prototype approach. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology,* (Vol. 13, pp. 175-212). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

SIMPSON, J. A., CAMPBELL, B., & BERSCHEID, E. (1986). The association between romantic love and marriage: Kephart (1967) twice revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12,* 363-372.

SIMPSON, J. A., & GANGESTAD, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 870-883.

SKOCPOL, T. (1979). *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

SNEDDON, I., & KREMER, J. (1992). Sexual behavior and attitudes of university students in Northern Ireland. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21,* 295-312.

SOLOMON, R. L., & CORBIT, J. D. (1974). An opponent process theory of motivation. I. The temporal dynamics of affect. *Psychological Review, 81,* 119-145.

SOMMER, V. (1993, November 13). *Primate origins: The hardware of human sexuality.* Paper presented at the meeting of The Society for the Scientfic Study of Sex. San Diego, CA.

SPRECHER, S. (1989). Premarital sexual standards for different categories of individuals. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26,* 232-248.

SPRECHER, S., ARON, A, HATFIELD, E., CORTESE, A., POTAPOVA, E., & LEVITSKAYA. (1992). *Love: American style, Russian style, and Japanese style.* Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Personal Relationships, Orono, ME.

SPRECHER, S., & HATFIELD, E. (1993). *Premarital sexual permissiveness and the double standard: Cultural and gender comparisons.* Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois. Normal, IL.

SPRECHER S. MCKINNEY, K., WALSH, R., & ANDERSON, C. (1988). A revision of the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50,* 821-828.

STEPHAN, W., BERSCHEID, E., & HATFIELD, E. (1971). Sexual arousal and heterosexual perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20,* 93-101.

STAVRIANOS, L. S. (1981). *Global rift: The Third World comes of age.* New York: Morrow.

STONE, L. (1977). *The family, sex, and marriage: In England 1500-1800.* New York: Harper & Row.

STONE, L. (1990). *Road to divorce: England 1530-1987.* New York: Oxford University Press.

SUE, D. (1982). Sexual experience and attitudes of Asian-American students. *Psychological Reports, 51,* 401-402.

SUNDET, J. M., MAGNUS, P., KVALEM, I. L., SAMULSEN, S. O., & BAKKETEIG, L. S. (1992). Secular trends and sociodemographic regularities of coital debut age in Norway. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21,* 241-252.

TAVRIS, C., & OFFIR, C. (1984). *The longest war: Sex differences in perspective* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

TOYNBEE, A. J. (1962). *A study of history.* New York: Oxford University Press.

TRIANDIS, H. C., MCCUSKER, C., & HUI, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 1006-1020.

TURNER, C., ANDERSON, P., FITZPATRICK, R., FOWLER, G., & MAYON-WHITE, R. (1988). Sexual behavior, contraceptive practice and knowledge of AIDS of Oxford University students. *Journal of Biosocial Science, 20,* 445-451.

VINCZE, L. (1985). Hungarian peasant obscenity: Sociolinguistic implications. *Ethnology, 24,* 33-42.

WALLEN, K. (1989). Mate selection: Economics and affection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12,* 37-38.

WALLERSTEIN, I. M. (1974). *The modern world-system.* New York: Academic Press.

WEREBE, M. J. G., & REINERT, M. (1983). Attitudes of French adolescents toward sexuality. *Journal of Adolescence, 6,* 145-159.

WITTFOGEL, K. A. (1957). *Oriental despotism: A comparative study of total power.* New York: Yale University Press.

WU, S., & SHAVER, P. R. (1992, July 23-28). *Conceptions of love in the United States and the People's Republic of China.* Paper presented at the Sixth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships. Orono, ME.

WYATT, G. E. (1989). Reexamining factors predicting Afro-American and white American women's age at first coitus. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 18,* 271-298.

ZELNIK, M., & KANTNER, J. (1980). Sexual activity, contraceptive use and pregnancy among metropolitan-area teenagers: 1971-1979. *Family Planning Perspectives, 12,* 230-237.

ZESSEN, G. VAN, & SANFORT, T. (1991). *Seksualiteit in Nederland.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.