MATE SELECTION
COURTSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT

FLIRTING

Moving closer
Gazing into the perspective partner’s eyes.
Interpersonal touch
Smiling

THE DATING PROCESS

ADOLESCENT DATING
Percentage of High School Students
Who have Engaged in Intercourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females 9th-12th grades</th>
<th>Males 9th-12th Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991 51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2011–2013, 79% of female teenagers and 84% of male teenagers used a contraceptive method at first sexual intercourse

Source: Center for Disease Control

THE DATING PROCESS

SOCIAL MEDIA/ONLINE DATING

[In our study of photographs posted on online dating sites] we found that woman advertised their reproductive fitness regardless of relationship type, and that men display different characters to women [features that reveal social standing and strength]. . . .Women also more often wore minimal clothing and exposed more of their bodies."

Gallant, et al. 2011

THE FIRST DATE

30% of men sampled by Clark, Shaver, Abraham (1999) compared to 8% of women identified sexual intimacy (or just “following hormones” as the reason why they sought to initiate or accept a date.
THE CASUAL DATING STAGE

COLLEGE DATING

Important Question
What is expected and acceptable dating behavior?

Percentage of College Student Respondents Who Had Ever Engaged In Various Sexual Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necking</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Kissing</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast fondling</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male fondling of female genitals</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female fondling of male genitals</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitals touching</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercourse</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male mouth contact with female genital</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mount contact with male genitals</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is from 1979 DeLamater and MacCorquodale; Subjects: Undergraduates at the University of Wisconsin

Communication and Casual Dating
Certain topics are avoided to prevent scaring off the other person

The Future of the relationship (i.e., Commitment)
Rules for the relationship
Negative personal behavior
Negative Life experiences
Prior sexual experiences

Texting and Sexting
"Sexting seems to be a way in which couples may enhance their relationship and sexual satisfaction. . . Hedonism arose as an important motivator of sexting behavior." Parker, et al., 2013

Dating and Alcohol

*When I’m drinking, I can say and do things with women that I’d never ever think of when I’m sober.*

Disinhabitant
People may give consent when intoxicated (a consent they would not give when not intoxicated) and when heavily under the influence are at increased risk of sexual victimization.
Men’s Split Sexual Attitudes

Women’s Split Sexual Attitudes

Christopher & Cate, (1985): the average length of a casual dating relationships varied between:
- 7.72 weeks Rapid sexual involvement
- 9.56 weeks Gradual sexual involvement

The Commitment Dance

SERIOUS DATING
(The deepening stage of relationship development)

“. . .with the increase in cohabitation and high commitment non-cohabiting relationships in today’s society, it is no longer appropriate to assume that relationship growth is always directed from less toward greater estimated chance of marriage”

Brown & Amatea, 2000)

Intimacy
Social Penetration Theory

1. Orienting
2. Exploratory affective exchange
3. Affective exchange
4. Stable exchange

Disillusionment.

Loss of Independence and Balance

Possessiveness and Jealously

Sexual Differences

Differences in sexual frequency, duration, arousal style, and goals are normally suppressed during early encounters and in the heights of being in love.

In an effort to retain the title of his partner’s ‘best lover’ a man may attempt to lead his partner into better orgasms or multiple organs. Paradoxically, his intentions can easily become a pressure on her to ‘perform spontaneously.’ For she may assume he’s rating his quality as her lover and their compatibility as sex partners on how well she loses control and has orgasms. On her
part, a woman may feel too guilty to ask for any changes in sexual behavior. Or she may expect all men to reach sexual release quickly and pretend to reach a peak when he does, in order to protect herself from performance expectations on his part. No amount of authoritative pronouncements about normalcy, freedom, and honesty in sex can change the fact that sex carries multiple meanings about the relationships and both partner’s sexual self-esteem. With so much symbolism involved, sexual communication could not be simple for long.

Brown and Amatea, 2000

**Pre-Engagement Cohabitation**

Trial run for marriage?

**Cohabitation Effect**

Before-engagement cohabiters had “more negative interactions, lower interpersonal commitment, lower relationship quality, and lower relationship confidence than those who did not cohabit until after engagement or marriage.” Kline, et al. 2004

Pre-engagement cohabitation increases risk for poor marital outcome.