

**Dating in the USA: The transformation of dating and
relationship for young Iranian American immigrants to
the US over the last four decades**

Madeline Alizadeh

PERS251

Final Paper

12/18/2017

Introduction

Iranian society has always been fairly traditional regarding societal taboos on sex and relationships. Dating, at least in a modern American sense, did not even exist for Iranians until somewhat recently, and the societal norms surrounding relationships and dating for Iranians are still very different from those in American culture. One population for whom the consequences are particularly interesting is Iranian immigrants to the US. Years of prior research showed that those who emigrate from Iran at a young age tend to have more Americanized hermeneutical lenses when discussing relationships and dating within a few years of immigration than their counterparts who stay in Iran. Much of this research was conducted on older generations of immigrants, however, and in the years since, Iranian society for youth in particular has changed a great deal. I was curious if change was reflected in immigrant populations, and if it was, how that was happening. I propose that the changes in Iranian society that affect Iranian youth and their dating and relationship norms can be reflected in the immigrant population coming from Iran to the US, and that relationship and dating norms for current youth emigrating from Iran will look very different, and will likely be more permissive towards dating more partners and sex outside of marriage than it was for previous generations.

Significance

In a historical context this research is incredibly significant. The transformation of relationship and dating norms over time is necessary to understand the cultural trends and the history of a society. Views on sex, dating and relationships, and marriage can indicate societal ways of thinking that shape many other aspects of the culture. The implications for immigrants are significant because they can indicate the degree of assimilation undergone. Additionally, an understanding of relationship and dating norms could show the current generational norms without the impact of an older generation or government tempering and dictating what is socially appropriate, and thus what is actually publicly displayed. This will be important in understanding modern Iranian history because this research could help give a more thorough understanding of the somewhat divergent impacts of the theocratic rule of the Islamic republic and ever increasing influence of the outside world.

Background

In traditional Iranian society, sex is something that is rarely a topic of familial discussion and if it is, it is often in the context of daughters being told to be chaste (Abdolsalehi-Najafi and Beckman). Iranian society places the burden of unreasonable expectations on women who are expected to be gentle and motherly, somewhat subservient, and most importantly, sexually pure, while men are free of those responsibilities. The high price tag put on women remaining virgins

until marriage has, traditionally, been a factor capable of determining whether or not a marriage could take place well into recent years (Hojat et al). This has serious implications for romantic relationship and dating norms in Iran. Typical dating wouldn't happen as it does in the US; for a girl, even being alone with an unrelated boy was considered to be a sign of moral impurity on the woman's part (Navai). Instead, most marriages were arranged and rather than being based purely on love they were typically based on local (or national) politics and class structures which were maintained (ie; people married within their class) (Floor).

The idea of dating as it's known in American society didn't traditionally exist in Iran. Instead, men and their families would look at potential brides, and if someone was found to be suitable and the families agreed to meet, Khastegari, or the meeting of families, would take place. Although the marrying parties often had some say in the upper classes, the families had to like each other and the marriage had to be beneficial in order to take place. If the Khastegari did successfully take place, the couple could be said to be something between "dating" and engaged (Floor). And while much of Iranian culture was carried over when Iranians immigrated to the US, arranged marriages and the structure of dating as it was in Iran was not as easily maintainable. Although arranged marriages did still happen among some Iranian families residing in the US, they were far less common than in Iran. But the lack of arranged marriages didn't mean young immigrants were free to marry whomever they pleased. For many immigrants, the restrictions regarding class and only "dating" someone you seriously considered marrying followed them even as they moved to the US, particularly if their parents immigrated with them.

Several studies, which tend to focus particularly on women, have been conducted on immigrants who came to the US from Iran, and in particular, on the opinions of female immigrants regarding sex and relationships. A 1991 study of Iranian girls who immigrated to Los Angeles found that age has a strong correlation with assimilation to the US and an inverse correlation with adherence to traditional Iranian sexual restrictions. The younger girls are when they come, the more likely to assimilate and in turn, the less likely they are to wait until marriage to have sex (Hanassab, Acculturation and young Iranian women...). Another report from 1996 used a different group of girls, and found that both the younger girls were when emigrating and the longer they were away from Iran, the more likely they were to hold more permissive attitudes regarding sex, dating, and relationships (Hanassab and Tidwell, Sex roles and sexual attitudes of young Iranian women...). However, even those who were considered to have more permissive attitudes still had what could be considered very traditional views by American standards.

Another more recent report from 2012 consisted of extensive interviews with older female immigrants and found that the younger immigrants who are unmarried are more likely to explore the sexual and romantic freedoms offered by American culture, including the ability to have sex in serious and non serious relationships and even to have multiple relationships throughout one's lifetime. The results of the report reinforced the results of the aforementioned studies. It was also found that even moments of connection to Iranian culture, such as the women

interviewed using Iranian words about and relating to sex in Farsi, could inspire a shame that the women typically didn't have when using the English counterparts (Rashidian et al).

Regarding marriage, the longterm goal of many relationships, both intermarriage (in this context, marriage between an Iranian and non-Iranian) and intramarriage (marriage between two Iranians) alike occur at varying rates. It was found in previous generations of young Iranian immigrants that those with higher rates of acculturation are unsurprisingly more likely to accept and pursue intermarriage. The aforementioned dating trends extend to intermarriage as well: the younger an immigrant was when they came to the US, and the more time they've spent here, the more likely they are to accept intermarriage. Additionally, although the views of young immigrants are important to consider, of equal or greater weight is the views of their parents. This is true regardless of where the family resides, but especially so if the family immigrated together. Similarly to the trends of parental views on dating, parents tend to be less assimilated and less open to the idea of intermarriage than their children are, and because of the social structure of Iranian culture, most children are forced to obey and listen to their parents' wishes (Hanassab and Tidwell, *Intramarriage and intermarriage: young Iranians in Los Angeles*).

Research similar to the aforementioned studies has been conducted several times on both previous generations and older immigrants. Although the research was corroboratory and thus quite trustworthy, it has been centered on older immigrants and/or those who came several years ago, not on the youth emigrating from Iran today. The dating and relationship trends for that population of immigrants are greatly understudied and essentially unknown. A great deal more is, however, known about their non-migratory counterparts.

Young Iranians have been ardently defying the strict traditional norm in recent years that the older generations had set for them. They have their own dating culture in Iran which is hidden from the eyes of prying parents. There are several accounts online of women finding a way to date without ostracizing themselves from the community; one strong example is that many women only participate in oral and anal sex with their partners before marriage due to the potential stigma they may earn if they don't have an intact hymen. Should they choose to have vaginal sex and later regret it, hymenoplasty is sanctioned by the Islamic Republic as a permissible means of recourse (Navai). It's well documented that for the youth of Iran today, it's just as acceptable among their peers to buck their parent's traditional values as it is to embrace them. What is unknown, however, is how likely or acceptable that is for young immigrants.

While much is known about their Iranian peers, little is known about how much of the current Iranian culture young Iranian immigrants to the US brought with them, especially in regards to dating and having relationships. Most research on the topic was done twenty or more years ago, and is very outdated due to the naturally changing social norms mentioned above. Even if research is recent, it focuses on older immigrants. Almost no research regarding recent dating norms for young immigrants has been conducted, and if it has that population was not the sole focus. Additionally, a majority of the research conducted focuses on the implications of these restrictions for women, and not the role men have in Iranian dating and sex culture. In

many ways, it has been made clear that while Iranian culture follows immigrants to the US, there is some freedom from cultural chains that is found post-immigration, especially for those who come at a younger age. Now that Iranian society is becoming more accepting of dating in a more traditionally American sense, I was interested not only in how these dating and relationship trends have transformed for Iranian American immigrants to the US over time, but also if these norms have changed differently for men and women. In order to study those trends, I decided to survey a pool of both recent and older generations of immigrants to see how the changes in Iranian society are reflected in the immigrant population.

Methodology

In order to gather data, an anonymous survey was sent to be filled out by heterosexual Iranian American immigrants to the US, all of whom came when they were between the ages of 13-30. The age range chosen was due to the intent of this study to look at the transformation of dating trends for Iranian immigrants; current trends tend to be reflected in younger generations as opposed to older generations who often came while or after having been married, with children, etc, and it is easy to account for variability by limiting the age range to one in which the highest percentage of respondents will be dating or have recently been dating. Individuals who identify as homosexual were excluded from this study due the differences in dating and relationship trends within the gay community (Iranian or otherwise). Being gay is already considered taboo within the Iranian community, so the responses from gay participants about engaging in what are often considered taboo behaviors in Iranian culture could skew results and inaccurately predict dating trends for heterosexual Iranians.

Participants were asked to fill out the survey with the mindset they had within a few years of having come to the US, since having spent a long time away from Iran could yield more permissive attitudes and skew results. The questions asked (full list in Supplemental 1) aimed to understand the participant's religious background along with their opinions on dating (such as who they might be most likely to date and why), sex both within and outside of a serious relationship, and how important their own beliefs are and how they may be applied when looking for a partner (for instance, to see if they may not be comfortable with sex before marriage, but are comfortable with their partner or future partner having had sex prior to their relationship). Participants were also asked to choose: the decade in which they'd emigrated from Iran, with the 4 options being 1977-1986, 1987-1996, 1997-2006, and 2007-2017; whether or not they identified with a religion, and what that religion was; and whether they identified as men or women.

The questions asked were framed in such a way that answers collected were both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Most categorical questions asked for the respondent's likelihood of participating in or doing something, with 1 being extremely unlikely and 10 being overwhelmingly likely, and only discrete integers available as answer choices. The questions

asking for short comments were typically asking for elaboration in regards to certain answers, such as if the respondent had a limit on number of lifetime partners, what that limit was and why. Additionally one question requested the respondent's opinion on what makes someone "dateable" or "marriageable".

Results

The results of this study, attached in Appendix A, come from the responses of 34 Iranian American immigrants to the US. 20 men (58.8%) and 14 women (41.2%) comprised the experimental group, with 32 (94.1%) of the respondents born Muslim, 1 born Zoroastrian, and 1 born into a non-religious family. Today, however, only 17 (50.0%) respondents consider themselves Muslim, 1 considers themselves to be Christian, and the other 16 (47.0%) consider themselves to be non-affiliated with any religion (in which case they were instructed to put none under religion). Those who affiliated with a religion were considered to be religious when analyzing the data. 25 (71.4%) respondents came to the US in the last ten years while the other 9 came prior to that.

A three way ANOVA (analysis of variance) was utilized for each question with a null hypothesis of no change occurring among any of the discrete categorical answers (ie; the questions that asked for a number on a scale of one to ten). This was done to analyze a variety of things at once: the differences between the responses from the current decade of immigrants (2007-2017) and the responses from the previous three decades (1977-2006), both split up by gender and not split, and the differences between the male and female responses of only the current decade and all decades; it was also meant to analyze the differences of those who called themselves religiously affiliated in any sense and those who did not. The first three decades of this study were combined for two reasons: the first was that the lack of responses and resultant small sample size from each individual decade prior to 2007 made doing individual statistical analyses unreliable; the second was inherent in my hypothesis -- I proposed that the change in current Iranian youth could be reflected in the immigrant population coming from Iran to the US, and this means that the differences would be between this generation and every other generation of immigrants, making it unnecessary to distinguish between those previous generations. The results of this ANOVA, displayed in figures 1-11, attempted to calculate which categorical factors had the biggest impact, ie; to see whether gender, religion, or time of arrival to the US had a significant impact on responses.

Unfortunately due to the small sample sizes, some of our adjusted R^2 values are smaller than expected but nonetheless the results are overall quite telling. Based on the results, it appears time of immigration has the largest impact on whether participants were both more likely to participate in any sexual activity and/or have sex, and expect their partners to do so, within the context of a serious relationship. Their likelihood to do anything sexual with a person whom they were not close to like someone they may be casually dating, however, was much more dependent

on religion and gender, and had little to do with decade of immigration. And while religious participants were less likely to date someone they wouldn't marry, wanting to date and marry non-Iranians was completely random and had nothing to do with any of the three factors.

Participants tended to rank intelligence and appearance highly when looking for potential partners, and ratios were as consistent as possible with our sample size between decades: 35% of men and 29% of women listed appearance, and 25% of men and 29% of women listed intelligence as an important factor when considering someone as a potential date or spouse. Women, however, considered similar personalities or personal moral values as an important factor at a rate much higher than men, with 71% of women listing that as a necessity for someone they may marry or date as opposed to 45% of men. Those proportions were also roughly the same between those who came prior to 2007 and those who came after. As for how many people the participants would date, 29% of women had a self imposed limit on the number of people they would date and sleep with which is quite close to the 30% of men, which was again consistent across decades; those who mentioned a limit for one had a limit for the other in every case except one. When it came to expectations of their partner, however, 57% of women had a limit on how many lifetime partners (both dating wise and sexually) they expected their partners to have whereas only 30% of men had a tentative limit on their partner's number of lifetime partners. Men's percentages were consistent across decades, while women's were not; for women who came prior to 2007, the number was 25%.

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the significant results, it appears as though certain norms and trends have changed while others have not. Sex within a close relationship is much more acceptable for current youth immigrating regardless of gender, both for themselves and their partners. How acceptable sex is within a more casual relationship both individually and for partners, however, is much more dependent on religion or religiousness and gender. Additionally, the most significant factors when considering dating or marrying someone are consistent throughout the generations, and with the exception of one factor, "sharing religious values", tend to be consistent among religious and non-religious alike; the two most important factors intelligence and/or education, and appearance, were listed in equal numbers by men and women as well. And while religious participants are more likely to date someone they wouldn't marry, who wanted to date and/or marry non-Iranians was completely random and independent of any of the three factors (religion, gender, decade of immigration) studied. When it comes to partner limits, self-imposed limits have remained consistent between the two designated generations; expectations of partners, however, have changed. Women are more likely to have a limit on the number of people they expect their partner to date in this current decade of immigrants than in prior decades.

The contrast of which norms have changed and which haven't is quite interesting to say the least. While the expectations of what happens within a relationship have changed over time, the types of relationships (such as casual vs more serious) have not. Additionally, what is expected of partners within a relationship in terms of important qualities has not changed, but in terms of number of prior partners has for women. Sex is still not as acceptable in Iranian culture as it is within American culture, but in the current generation of youth immigrating to the US, women and men are being held to a more similar standard; both expect the other to engage in sex within serious relationships, and both expect the other not to engage in non-serious relationships.

This is consistent with what is known of current Iranian youth, but also has significant consequences. The fact that current Iranian youth immigrants have relationship and dating norms fairly consistent with what is known of Iranian youth is somewhat in contrast to the differences and inconsistency between older generations of Iranians (when they were youth) and their immigrant counterparts. As described in the background, and shown in numerous studies, older generations of immigrants who immigrated when they were young tended to be more liberal regarding dating norms than their Iranian counterparts. They often found a cognitive dissonance between their two cultures, and tended to go towards American culture if they came before a certain age (Rashidian et al). Not only do current youth immigrating not have that issue, but they maintain the norms they bring with them from Iran instead. The implications of this are that Iranian culture regarding dating norms has changed but it has changed in such a way that Iranian youth who choose to emigrate from Iran are identifying more closely with it than they have in previous generations.

While not enough research was done here to be able to claim why, this could be for a few reasons: current Iranian society has become more permissive of sex outside of marriage within the context of a close relationship allowing immigrants to feel more closely aligned with societal values; Iranians immigrating now feel more closely aligned to their heritage than in previous generations; or the immigrants emigrating now are a different subpopulation of Iran than in previous generations. Truthfully, it is likely some combination of the three. Iranian society does appear to have become more permissive of sex; although older generations who immigrated here as youth tended to be more liberal regarding dating, sex, and relationships, they are probably not as liberal as current youth in Iran based on qualitative evidence from interviews. Iranian youth today grew up in a country where their culture was a very important part of their upbringing, perhaps even more so than during the Pahlavi dynasty. It stands to reason that a closer connection to Iranian culture and society is possible for the youth of Iran today. Finally, it is also likely that much of the population of immigrants being sampled for this study, especially among youth, came as students without their families for the purpose of studying as opposed to moving here for life. This is somewhat in contrast to the fact that most immigrants who came in the decade or two directly after the revolution came with their families and to get away from the strict regime that led at the time.

In future studies which of these is the reasons is responsible, or at least which reasons are most impactful, could be tested by having a control sample population of 13-30 year olds currently in Iran, and by adding questions to the survey about how strongly participants' identities are based on being Iranian. Additionally, questions regarding reasons for coming to the US and who immigrated with participants could further clarify why these changes have happened. Regardless, the fact that relationship and dating norms have transformed for youth emigrating from Iran to the US is clear, as is the fact that they will likely continue to change with society as time goes on. What is unclear is what that change will look like and should it continue to be studied, the topic could give vast insight into how Iranian society continues to transform over time.

Figures

Key: C1 denotes the category each participant falls into, where the first letter is either F or M, for female or male, the second letter is either R or N, for religious or nonreligious, and the third letter is either N or O, for newly immigrated or older immigrant. N denotes the number of participants in each population, and the mean is simply the mean of the scores of the given population. VAR002 is gender, VAR003 is religious (this is either yes or no), and VAR004 is time of immigration (during this decade or prior).

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	131.338 ^a	6	21.890	3.014	.022
Intercept	1074.543	1	1074.543	147.946	.000
VAR00002	10.745	1	10.745	1.479	.234
VAR00003	6.697	1	6.697	.922	.345
VAR00004	93.729	1	93.729	12.905	.001
VAR00002 * VAR00003	13.058	1	13.058	1.798	.191
VAR00002 * VAR00004	1.307	1	1.307	.180	.675
VAR00003 * VAR00004	.663	1	.663	.091	.765
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0			
Error	196.103	27	7.263		
Total	2151.000	34			
Corrected Total	327.441	33			

a. R Squared = .401 (Adjusted R Squared = .268)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	9.6667	0.5774	(6.4822, 12.8511)
FNO	2	4.500	4.950	(0.600, 8.400)
FRN	7	6.571	2.820	(4.487, 8.656)
FRO	2	2.5000	0.7071	(-1.4001, 6.4001)
MNN	9	8.8889	1.9650	(7.0504, 10.7274)
MRN	5	9.0000	1.2247	(6.5334, 11.4666)
MRO	6	5.833	4.119	(3.582, 8.085)

Pooled StDev = 2.68813

Figure 1. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [You to have any sexual activity with a close, serious partner before marriage?]”

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	113.580 ^a	6	18.930	1.603	.185
Intercept	871.736	1	871.736	73.809	.000
VAR00002	29.193	1	29.193	2.472	.128
VAR00003	4.461	1	4.461	.378	.544
VAR00004	39.249	1	39.249	3.323	.079
VAR00002 * VAR00003	7.374	1	7.374	.624	.436
VAR00002 * VAR00004	.005	1	.005	.000	.983
VAR00003 * VAR00004	.011	1	.011	.001	.976
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0			
Error	318.890	27	11.811		
Total	1882.000	34			
Corrected Total	432.471	33			

a. R Squared = .263 (Adjusted R Squared = .099)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	7.000	5.196	(2.935, 11.065)
FNO	2	4.500	4.950	(-0.478, 9.478)
FRN	7	4.857	3.805	(2.196, 7.518)
FRO	2	2.5000	0.7071	(-2.4783, 7.4783)
MNN	9	8.3333	2.5000	(5.9865, 10.6801)
MRN	5	8.6000	2.0736	(5.4514, 11.7486)
MRO	6	5.833	4.119	(2.959, 8.708)

Pooled StDev = 3.43129

Figure 2. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [You to have sex with a close, serious partner before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00007					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	107.695 ^a	6	17.949	1.843	.128
Intercept	415.972	1	415.972	42.717	.000
VAR00002	9.325	1	9.325	.958	.336
VAR00003	21.876	1	21.876	2.246	.146
VAR00004	4.367	1	4.367	.448	.509
VAR00002 * VAR00003	11.095	1	11.095	1.139	.295
VAR00002 * VAR00004	7.809	1	7.809	.802	.378
VAR00003 * VAR00004	6.140	1	6.140	.631	.434
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	262.922	27	9.738		
Total	989.000	34			
Corrected Total	370.618	33			

a. R Squared = .291 (Adjusted R Squared = .133)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	7.000	3.000	(3.304, 10.696)
FNO	2	3.000	2.828	(-1.526, 7.526)
FRN	7	2.0000	2.2361	(-0.4193, 4.4193)
FRO	2	1.5000	0.7071	(-3.0261, 6.0261)
MNN	9	5.444	3.539	(3.311, 7.578)
MRN	5	3.400	2.302	(0.537, 6.263)
MRO	6	5.833	4.119	(3.220, 8.446)

Pooled StDev = 3.11957

Figure 3. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [You to have any sexual activity with someone whom you are not close to before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00008					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	104.265 ^a	6	17.378	1.764	.145
Intercept	282.435	1	282.435	28.671	.000
VAR00002	15.482	1	15.482	1.572	.221
VAR00003	10.124	1	10.124	1.028	.320
VAR00004	.392	1	.392	.040	.843
VAR00002 * VAR00003	1.987	1	1.987	.202	.657
VAR00002 * VAR00004	9.590	1	9.590	.974	.333
VAR00003 * VAR00004	5.294	1	5.294	.537	.470
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	265.970	27	9.851		
Total	808.000	34			
Corrected Total	370.235	33			

a. R Squared = .282 (Adjusted R Squared = .122)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	5.000	4.583	(1.283, 8.717)
FNO	2	1.5000	0.7071	(-3.0522, 6.0522)
FRN	7	1.5714	1.5119	(-0.8618, 4.0047)
FRO	2	1	0	(-3.55224, 5.55224)
MNN	9	4.778	3.667	(2.632, 6.924)
MRN	5	2.6000	2.0736	(-0.2791, 5.4791)
MRO	6	5.833	4.119	(3.205, 8.462)

Pooled StDev = 3.13760

Figure 4. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [You to have sex with someone whom you are not close to before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00009					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	115.250 ^a	6	19.208	2.141	.081
Intercept	991.735	1	991.735	110.521	.000
VAR00002	5.282	1	5.282	.589	.450
VAR00003	17.532	1	17.532	1.954	.174
VAR00004	65.974	1	65.974	7.352	.012
VAR00002 * VAR00003	11.335	1	11.335	1.263	.271
VAR00002 * VAR00004	2.988	1	2.988	.333	.569
VAR00003 * VAR00004	1.810	1	1.810	.202	.657
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0			
Error	242.279	27	8.973		
Total	1968.000	34			
Corrected Total	357.529	33			

a. R Squared = .322 (Adjusted R Squared = .172)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	10	0	(6.43800, 13.56200)
FNO	2	4.500	3.536	(0.137, 8.863)
FRN	7	5.857	3.132	(3.525, 8.189)
FRO	2	3.000	1.414	(-1.363, 7.363)
MNN	9	8.5556	2.5550	(6.4990, 10.6121)
MRN	5	7.400	3.209	(4.641, 10.159)
MRO	6	5.667	3.933	(3.148, 8.185)

Pooled StDev = 3.00686

Figure 5. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [Your partner to have any sexual activity with a close, serious partner before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00010					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	83.890 ^a	6	13.982	1.214	.330
Intercept	780.031	1	780.031	67.702	.000
VAR00002	18.387	1	18.387	1.596	.217
VAR00003	14.285	1	14.285	1.240	.275
VAR00004	18.809	1	18.809	1.633	.212
VAR00002 * VAR00003	1.743	1	1.743	.151	.700
VAR00002 * VAR00004	1.169	1	1.169	.101	.753
VAR00003 * VAR00004	.031	1	.031	.003	.959
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0			
Error	311.081	27	11.522		
Total	1631.000	34			
Corrected Total	394.971	33			

a. R Squared = .212 (Adjusted R Squared = .037)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	7.000	5.196	(2.967, 11.033)
FNO	2	4.500	3.536	(-0.439, 9.439)
FRN	7	4.429	3.599	(1.788, 7.069)
FRO	2	3.000	1.414	(-1.939, 7.939)
MNN	9	8.0000	2.8284	(5.6716, 10.3284)
MRN	5	6.600	2.793	(3.476, 9.724)
MRO	6	5.500	3.782	(2.648, 8.352)

Pooled StDev = 3.40432

Figure 6. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [Your partner to have sex with a close, serious partner before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00011					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	130.294 ^a	6	21.716	2.400	.055
Intercept	392.548	1	392.548	43.380	.000
VAR00002	6.017	1	6.017	.665	.422
VAR00003	32.426	1	32.426	3.583	.069
VAR00004	12.774	1	12.774	1.412	.245
VAR00002 * VAR00003	2.456	1	2.456	.271	.607
VAR00002 * VAR00004	2.501	1	2.501	.276	.603
VAR00003 * VAR00004	5.625	1	5.625	.622	.437
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	244.324	27	9.049		
Total	993.000	34			
Corrected Total	374.618	33			

a. R Squared = .348 (Adjusted R Squared = .203)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	7.000	5.196	(3.423, 10.577)
FNO	2	2	0	(-2.38077, 6.38077)
FRN	7	2.1429	1.3452	(-0.1988, 4.4845)
FRO	2	2.500	2.121	(-1.881, 6.881)
MNN	9	6.667	3.674	(4.602, 8.732)
MRN	5	3.2000	2.0494	(0.4294, 5.9706)
MRO	6	4.000	3.225	(1.471, 6.529)

Pooled StDev = 3.01943

Figure 7. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [Your partner to have any sexual activity with someone whom they are not close to before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00012					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	92.735 ^a	6	15.456	1.537	.204
Intercept	301.451	1	301.451	29.979	.000
VAR00002	.409	1	.409	.041	.842
VAR00003	29.125	1	29.125	2.896	.100
VAR00004	6.823	1	6.823	.679	.417
VAR00002 * VAR00003	5.081	1	5.081	.505	.483
VAR00002 * VAR00004	5.318	1	5.318	.529	.473
VAR00003 * VAR00004	6.140	1	6.140	.611	.441
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	271.500	27	10.056		
Total	802.000	34			
Corrected Total	364.235	33			

a. R Squared = .255 (Adjusted R Squared = .089)

Means

C1	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	7.000	5.196	(3.231, 10.769)
FNO	2	2	0	(-2.61627, 6.61627)
FRN	7	2.0000	1.5275	(-0.4675, 4.4675)
FRO	2	2.500	2.121	(-2.116, 7.116)
MNN	9	5.000	4.123	(2.824, 7.176)
MRN	5	2.0000	1.4142	(-0.9196, 4.9196)
MRO	6	3.833	3.371	(1.168, 6.499)

Pooled StDev = 3.18174

Figure 8. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely would it be or would it have been for: [Your partner to have sex with someone whom they are not close to before marriage?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00013					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	62.388 ^a	6	10.398	.851	.542
Intercept	722.260	1	722.260	59.121	.000
VAR00002	12.730	1	12.730	1.042	.316
VAR00003	.791	1	.791	.065	.801
VAR00004	.352	1	.352	.029	.867
VAR00002 * VAR00003	11.724	1	11.724	.960	.336
VAR00002 * VAR00004	.001	1	.001	.000	.993
VAR00003 * VAR00004	.102	1	.102	.008	.928
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	329.848	27	12.217		
Total	1454.000	34			
Corrected Total	392.235	33			

a. R Squared = .159 (Adjusted R Squared = -.028)

Means

C4	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	4.000	5.196	(-0.144, 8.144)
FNO	2	4.000	2.828	(-1.075, 9.075)
FRN	7	4.571	3.207	(1.859, 7.284)
FRO	2	4.5000	0.7071	(-0.5749, 9.5749)
MNN	9	7.6667	2.7839	(5.2743, 10.0590)
MRN	5	5.200	3.347	(1.990, 8.410)
MRO	6	5.667	4.457	(2.737, 8.597)

Pooled StDev = 3.49787

Figure 9. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely are you or would you have been to [Date someone you are sure you would never marry?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00015					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	39.845 ^a	6	6.641	.707	.647
Intercept	852.048	1	852.048	90.674	.000
VAR00002	.121	1	.121	.013	.911
VAR00003	5.859	1	5.859	.623	.437
VAR00004	2.417	1	2.417	.257	.616
VAR00002 * VAR00003	7.491	1	7.491	.797	.380
VAR00002 * VAR00004	.542	1	.542	.058	.812
VAR00003 * VAR00004	7.821	1	7.821	.832	.370
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	253.714	27	9.397		
Total	1435.000	34			
Corrected Total	293.559	33			

a. R Squared = .136 (Adjusted R Squared = -.056)

Means

C4	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	8.333	2.887	(4.690, 11.977)
FNO	2	6.500	2.121	(2.037, 10.963)
FRN	7	5.286	3.039	(2.900, 7.671)
FRO	2	6.500	3.536	(2.037, 10.963)
MNN	9	7.5556	2.6034	(5.4518, 9.6593)
MRN	5	6.800	2.280	(3.978, 9.622)
MRO	6	6.333	4.274	(3.757, 8.910)

Pooled StDev = 3.07590

Figure 10. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely are you or would you have been to [Date someone who is not Iranian?]”

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: VAR00014					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	37.941 ^a	6	6.324	.691	.659
Intercept	1178.264	1	1178.264	128.737	.000
VAR00002	4.256	1	4.256	.465	.501
VAR00003	.630	1	.630	.069	.795
VAR00004	1.235	1	1.235	.135	.716
VAR00002 * VAR00003	6.673	1	6.673	.729	.401
VAR00002 * VAR00004	11.580	1	11.580	1.265	.271
VAR00003 * VAR00004	22.501	1	22.501	2.458	.129
VAR00002 * VAR00003 * VAR00004	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	247.117	27	9.152		
Total	1814.000	34			
Corrected Total	285.059	33			

a. R Squared = .133 (Adjusted R Squared = -.060)

Means

C4	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
FNN	3	8.333	2.887	(4.709, 11.958)
FNO	2	5.5000	0.7071	(1.0613, 9.9387)
FRN	7	4.571	3.409	(2.199, 6.944)
FRO	2	4.5000	0.7071	(0.0613, 8.9387)
MNN	9	6.3333	2.2913	(4.2409, 8.4258)
MRN	5	5.000	2.828	(2.193, 7.807)
MRO	6	6.333	4.274	(3.771, 8.896)

Pooled StDev = 3.05938

Figure 11. Results of three way ANOVA on means of the response to the question “How likely are you or would you have been to [Marry someone who is not Iranian?]”

References

1. Abdolsalehi-Najafi, Emon, and Linda J. Beckman. "Sex guilt and life satisfaction in Iranian-American women." *Archives of sexual behavior* 42.6 (2013): 1063-1071.
2. Elahi, Babak. "Translating the Self: Language and Identity in Iranian-American Women's Memoirs." *Iranian Studies* 39, no. 4 (2006): 461-480
3. Floor, Willem M. *A social history of sexual relations in Iran*. Washington, DC: Mage Publishers, 2008.
4. Hanassab, Shideh. "Acculturation and young Iranian women: Attitudes toward sex roles and intimate relationships." *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 19.1 (1991): 11-21.
5. Hanassab, Shideh, and Romeria Tidwell. "Intramariage and intermarriage: young Iranians in Los Angeles." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22, no. 4 (1998): 395-408.
6. Hanassab, Shideh, and Romeria Tidwell. "Sex roles and sexual attitudes of young Iranian women: Implications for cross-cultural counseling." *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal* 24.2 (1996): 185-194.
7. Hojat, Mohammadreza, Reza Shapurian, Habib Nayerahmadi, Mitra Farzaneh, Danesh Foroughi, Mohin Parsi, and Maryam Azizi. "Premarital sexual, child rearing, and family attitudes of Iranian men and women in the United States and in Iran." *The Journal of psychology* 133, no. 1 (1999): 19-31.
8. Navai, Ramita. "High Heels and Hijabs: Iran's Sexual Revolution." *New Statesman*. August 1, 2014.
<https://www.newstatesman.com/lifestyle/2014/07/high-heels-and-hijabs-iran-s-sexual-revolution>
9. Rashidian, Mitra, Rafat Hussain, and Victor Minichiello. "'My culture haunts me no matter where I go': Iranian-American women discussing sexual and acculturation experiences." *Culture, health & sexuality* 15.7 (2013): 866-877.