

University of Warwick institutional repository

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Richard Lampard

Article Title: Couples' Places of Meeting in Late 20th Century Britain: Class, Continuity and Change

Year of publication: 2007

Link to published version:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcm004>

Publisher statement: This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in European Sociological Review following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version Lampard, R. (2007). Couples' Places of Meeting in Late 20th Century Britain: Class, Continuity and Change. European Sociological Review, 23, pp. 357-371 is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcm004>

Couples' Places of Meeting in Late 20th Century Britain: Class, Continuity and Change

[Pre copy-editing version: January 2007]

Richard Lampard

Department of Sociology

University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL

UNITED KINGDOM

e-mail: Richard.Lampard@warwick.ac.uk

Telephone: +44 (0)24 76523130

Fax (Dept.): +44 (0)24 76523497

Biographical notes:

Richard Lampard is a senior lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of Warwick. His current research interests include the formerly partnered and repartnering, various aspects of union formation and dissolution, social and educational mobility, and the impact of family structure on educational outcomes.

Couples' Places of Meeting in Late 20th Century Britain: Class, Continuity and Change

Abstract

This paper examines couples' places or contexts of meeting in the second half of the twentieth century in Great Britain, utilising a typology developed by Bozon and Héran. The continuities are as striking as the changes, with social networks maintaining a consistent level of importance, but with trends towards meetings at places of education and work, and away from meetings in public places for drinking, eating or socialising. Rather than reflecting the impact on partnership formation of the rise of individualism and self-identity, these trends arguably reflect the changing importance of settings within people's daily lives, as may the recent growth in internet dating.

Rather than declining in significance, social class appears to have become more strongly related to the likelihood of meetings in 'public' settings, apparently more common in Britain than elsewhere. Achieved characteristics, especially occupational class, have a greater impact than parental class. Variations between place of meeting categories in the extent of occupational class homogamy appear to reflect levels of class homogeneity within settings more than the impact of either individualism or a homogamy norm. Regional variations in places of meeting highlight the ongoing importance of structural factors such as patterns of sociability or cultural norms.

Couples' Places of Meeting in Late 20th Century Britain: Class, Continuity and Change

Introduction

This paper focuses on the places or contexts in which individuals meet partners with whom they subsequently have marital or cohabiting relationships. Studies of places of meeting in various national contexts have often emphasised the ways in which settings constrain individuals' choices of future partner and the extent to which they favour similarity between partners (Coleman, 1981; Bozon and Héran, 1989; Kalmijn and Flap, 2001; Houston *et al.*, 2005; Tsay and Wu, 2006). The forms of homogamy considered include similarity of class origin, class destination, age, education, religion, 'race' and geographical origin.

Other studies (like some of those listed above) have suggested links between places of meeting and marital stability or levels of commitment to partnerships, or have gained an understanding of some aspect of the couple formation process by examining places of meeting (Slater and Woodside, 1951; Michael *et al.*, 1994; de Graaf and Kalmijn, 2003). This paper shares with the above studies a general concern with the determinants and consequences of couples' places of meeting, and has a particular concern with the role of class in partner selection in a society in which a growth in individualism has been argued to have had a profound impact on intimate relationships.

In this paper, data from six surveys document trends in places of meeting in Britain in the second half of the 20th Century. An examination of class-specific trends utilises a three category typology of places or contexts of meeting developed in France by Bozon and Héran (1988). Data from the most recent survey are used to examine the relationship between place of meeting and occupational class homogamy, and multivariate analyses of these data relate Bozon and Héran's typology to explanatory factors, including class, education and parental class.

This paper's analyses of places of meeting contribute to an understanding of the balance between preferences, constraints and opportunities in partner selection, providing insights into the relevance of self-identity and of class to contemporary personal lives, and the relative importance of class compared to other characteristics. Furthermore, the analysis of class homogamy in relation to places of meeting highlights the extent to which homogamy reflects the homogeneity, with respect to class, of the people encountered within individuals' day-to-day lives, and the extent to which homogamy is determined by other factors, such as preferences for similarity rooted in self-identity or a cultural norm.

Trends in places of meeting may reflect demographic changes, or the accompanying (or underlying) cultural or ideational changes. An analysis of these trends is used to assess the impact of the suggested growth in individualism, and also provides evidence of the consequences of changes and continuities in aspects of day-to-day life that involve contact with potential partners. Comparisons with places of meeting in some other European countries and the US, and examinations of regional differences, provide evidence of variations in the impact of structural factors such as cultural norms, patterns of sociability, and the growth of individualism.

A key distinction contrasts meetings that primarily reflect shared membership of a social network with meetings that are primarily a consequence of simultaneous presence within a setting. A second key distinction contrasts meetings in settings that are governed by formal or informal 'selection procedures' with meetings elsewhere. Multivariate analyses relate these key distinctions to socio-economic characteristics and to other factors relating to cultural constraints, preferences and attitudes, and the opportunities to meet partners provided by particular lifestyles.

Research on places and circumstances of meeting

France

Girard (1974) and Bozon and Héran (1987, 1988, 1989) documented places and circumstances of meeting over a sixty year period in France. Girard identified relationships with socio-economic group and educational level (1974: 110), and variations in homogamy levels according to place of meeting (1974: 183). According to Girard, weakening constraints, such as declining parental involvement, had individualised partner selection and led to rational choice-making (1974: 30), but he acknowledged the ongoing roles of third party pressure and a cultural norm of social homogamy (1974: 198-201). He also suggested that the desire to find a partner with the same lifestyle and norms of conduct would continue to induce homogamy (1974: 31), whereas Bozon and Héran (1987: 946) suggested that *unconscious* dispositions towards others who share one's tastes and 'habitus' (Bourdieu, 1987: 88) also underpin homogamy. Bozon and Héran also argued that the multiplicity of types of meeting place can induce homogamy because of the relative homogeneity of people locating partners within a specific type of meeting place (1987:

127). However, homogamy is also induced by social homogeneity within *specific instances* of a type of meeting place, for example, dances drawing upon different sub-populations (Girard, 1974: 193).

According to Bozon and Héran, a key foundation of homogamy is variation between the forms of sociability of different groups. This also leads to a relationship between places of meeting and socio-economic groups (1988: 121-122), a foundation of their three category schema for places of meeting (1988: 125). Their distinction between ‘public’ and ‘select’ places lies in the latter (which include workplaces, places of study and the settings for leisure or organisational activities) having implicit, culturally-based selection procedures (Bozon and Héran, 1989: 102-103). Their third, ‘private’ category relates to meetings occurring via personal social networks, primarily in individuals’ own homes or those of friends or relatives. Bozon and Héran found that ‘higher class’ individuals met partners disproportionately in ‘select’ or ‘private’ places; conversely ‘working class’ individuals met partners disproportionately in ‘public’ places.¹

Bozon and Héran (1987: 951) noted declines in neighbourhood meetings and meetings at dances, but increases in other public contexts. They also observed increases in meetings via ‘select’ leisure activities and places of study, but stability in the prevalence of meetings linked to friendship or kinship networks (1987: 958). They also highlighted regional differences, private socialising being more important in urban locations and dances in rural areas (1987: 962-963). Meetings at schools and dances were more common among first marriages and workplace meetings among remarriages (1987: 960).

Great Britain

Slater and Woodside (1951: 286) tabulated the places or occasions of meeting spouses for men admitted to a London military hospital between 1943 and 1946, who were mainly working class and mostly met their spouses between the two World Wars. The most common place of meeting, 'the street', was then seen as 'respectable', although clubs and church-related activities provided an alternative for higher status individuals (1951: 94-95).

In 1959-1960 a Population Investigation Committee (PIC) survey examined changing marriage habits. Pierce (1963: 220) presented the places of meeting of respondents whose first marriages occurred during 1950-1960. While she stressed cross-class similarity (1963: 219), differences similar to those in France are nevertheless evident. Since 1960 there has been little overtly relevant survey research in Britain, apart from the 1974 Reading Marriage Survey of marriages in 1972-1973 in Reading and neighbouring districts (Coleman, 1979, 1984). It focused on both places and circumstances of meeting, identifying both the type of occasion and the role of third parties, and again finding a relationship with social class, similar to that in France (Coleman, 1979: 418, 432).

A 1970 survey (Chester, 1984) collected relevant national-level data from a quota sample, as did a 1989 Gallup survey for *New Woman* magazine (Tyrer, 1989). However, neither led to relevant academic publications. Furthermore, no pertinent analyses of relevant data collected from individuals aged 16-44 by the 2000-2001 National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (NATSAL) have yet been published. Sociological aspects of the place of meeting data collected

by these three surveys have not been a particular interest of the original researchers; hence, viewed collectively, they constitute a valuable, unused resource for documenting trends since 1960.²

The PIC survey established some national differences in places of meeting, but little variation within England (Coleman, 1981: 21-22). Unpublished Gallup survey tabulations show more meetings via social networks in the south of Britain, and more in ‘public’ places and less in ‘select’ places in the north.

Comparisons between Britain and other countries

Compared to the PIC and Gallup surveys, French data show fewer meetings in ‘public’ places and more in ‘private’ contexts (Bozon and Héran, 1988). Turning to the Netherlands, de Graaf and Kalmijn (2003: 1476) examined data on divorced people who had repartnered from a 1998 survey. A comparison with 1989 Gallup survey data again shows a broad similarity, although the Netherlands sample met first marriage partners more often via voluntary associations and leisure activities and less often in public places. They repartnered in public places even less frequently, relying more on workplaces and, to some extent, ‘mediated’ approaches (2003: 1476).

Kalmijn and Flap (2001) examined the impact of partners sharing various forms of setting before meeting on the extent of homogamy. They suggested that ‘organised’ settings, which ‘can be regarded as given for an individual, i.e. they are not intended as a meeting ground but provide interaction opportunities as a by-product’ (2001: 1291), induce homogamy because of

homogeneity, whereas other settings generate homogamy as a consequence either of preferences (2001: 1309), or of choices to frequent settings with particular social compositions. Kalmijn and Flap found that manual class couples less often shared an organized setting before meeting (2001: 1300-1301).³ De Graaf and Kalmijn (2003) examined the impact of various forms of social integration on the likelihood of meeting a partner in related ways, i.e. at work, via leisure activities and via social networks, demonstrating that opportunities exert a marked influence on partnership formation.

Comparisons between 1992 survey data for the US (Michael *et al.*, 1994: 72) and Gallup survey data show that US married couples had met at places of study or churches much more frequently and in public settings correspondingly less frequently.

Class and social change in the late 20th Century

In Britain, as elsewhere in Europe, the ‘Second Demographic Transition’ (Lesthaeghe, 1995) has involved various forms of change including rising ages at first marriage and rates of cohabitation since the late 1960s. Lesthaeghe viewed challenges to tradition and growing individual autonomy as important cultural developments linked to this transition. These, like demographic changes relating to marital formation, may have affected the distribution of meeting places.

Individualism is a concept central to prominent discussions of personal relationships in contemporary European societies (Giddens, 1991, 1992; Bauman, 2003). In ‘post-traditional’ societies experiencing a period of ‘reflexive modernity’, the growth of individualism and a

greater concern with self-identity have arguably led to important changes relating to couple relationships. The power of tradition has arguably diminished, leaving individuals free to develop relationships that suit them (Giddens, 1992: 58), and to select partners without being constrained by cultural norms. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995) and Giddens (1991) see individuals as reflexively shaping their own biographies and self-identities; the uncertainties of contemporary life and absence of cultural constraints have arguably forced individuals to take a more active approach to their relationship histories (Giddens, 1992).

The idea that individuals now have the freedom to choose partners who complement their personal lifestyles rather than are culturally appropriate might seem to imply a move away from utilising class-segregated places of meeting, and a weakening of the relationship between class and place of meeting. However, the assumption that social class now lacks salience relative to lifestyle preferences is arguably flawed; Jagger (2001: 42) has queried Giddens' suggestion that identities are no longer class-based, since work and occupational status are still important identity markers (2001: 55), and increasingly significant for women's identities (2001: 43). According to Jamieson (1998: 175), new forms of intimacy have not broken down class divisions, and ongoing social pressures against cross-class relationships exist (1998: 167). Irrespective of any weakening of a norm of class homogamy, a preference for a partner who shares one's tastes and lifestyle orientation (likely if partnerships are used to consolidate self-identity) could indirectly maintain the relevance of class to partner selection. Preferences geared towards consolidating personal identities are thus potentially consistent with cultural norms of homogamy.

Allan (1979: 135) and Bauman (2003: 98) suggest that (urban) middle class sociability increasingly stretches across a wider range of contexts than working class sociability, which remains locally specific (Allan, 1979: 135-138). Similarly, research on social capital (e.g. Li *et al.*, 2003: 519) indicates (growing) class differences in the opportunities to meet partners afforded by involvement in ‘voluntary associations’ and less formal social networks. Bauman also identifies a trend towards ‘communities of sameness’ within cities (2003: 34), potentially leading to an intensification of class differences in places of meeting and of class homogeneity within specific locations.

De Graaf and Kalmijn (2003: 1491) suggest that education may outrank class as a determinant of social integration and various social activities. Educational expansion may have enhanced the educational system’s role as a marriage market (Blossfeld and Timm, 2004), and Kalmijn and Flap (2001: 1301) suggest that higher education settings are the most favourable for meeting partners. Given the extended availability of upper secondary and higher education in Britain from the 1960s (Jamieson 1998: 26), increased class differences in the distribution of meeting places seem inevitable.

‘Mediated’ approaches to meeting partners

‘Mediated’ ways of meeting partners, which arguably suit the emphasis on self-identity within ‘late modern’ consumer society (Jagger, 1998: 798; Hardey, 2002: 574), feature prominently within the limited recent literature on places of meeting. Explanations of the expansion of ‘mediated’ approaches include: the rise of the mass media and communication technologies, the

shifting work-life balance, and a more rational approach to establishing relationships (Jagger, 2005; Hoyle, 2006). Jagger (1998: 796) reports a proliferation of personal advertisements in British newspapers since the 1970s, especially in the 1990s; very few individuals surveyed in 1989 had met partners via dating agencies or personal advertisements (Tyrer, 1989: 10). Dating advertisements and introduction agencies seem to have become socially acceptable markedly later in Britain and France than in the US (Lampard and Peggs, 2007; Bozon and Héran, 1988: 145; Jagger, 2005), but self-advertising is arguably now well-established in Britain (Jagger, 2005: 90).

While internet dating appears increasingly common, limited evidence exists regarding its empirical importance in Britain as a source of co-resident partners.⁴ Its growth may reflect changing attitudes to self-advertising during the 1990s, or a more specific acceptance of internet dating, which may be perceived as interactive, relatively private, and providing access to numerous prospective partners.

Rates of usage of 'mediated' approaches, and partner selection using them, are often class-related (Hardey, 2002; Jagger, 1998, 2001). While self-identities presented online and in advertisements often emphasise lifestyle characteristics, they still frequently incorporate occupational information (Jagger, 1998: 809-810, 2001: 48-51; Hardey, 2002: 581), highlighting the ongoing relevance of traditional sources of self-identity. The process of development of online relationships may also indirectly filter correspondents according to class (Hardey, 2002: 578). Furthermore, the locations of self-advertisements may be as socially segregated as physical locations (Jagger, 1998: 801; Hardey, 2002: 572).

Analyses and findings

Places of meeting in six surveys

The validity of survey-based measures of places of meeting is debatable. Kalmijn and Flap (2001: 1296) observed that the concept of a ‘first’ place of meeting ignores the possibility of a gradual process involving different settings. Single questions focusing on locations may also neglect the role of social networks in generating meetings (Leonard, 1980: 88). However, this paper focuses upon settings rather than social networks, as networks may be internal features of some settings, with the setting having primary responsibility for structuring meeting opportunities.⁵ Nevertheless, meeting places are sometimes secondary to social networks, and not all meetings generated by social networks will be covered by a category corresponding to private houses.

[Table 1 about here]

While open questions are rare (Girard, 1974: 97), the appropriate categories for a closed question are not self-evident. The surveys reported here used diverse numbers and ranges of categories. Consequently, a comparison between them necessitates a loss of detail and the use of a schema that does not, as Table 1 shows, provide a fully consistent range of possibilities. Furthermore, the relatively limited ranges of categories in Chester’s survey and the Gallup survey lead to residual categories that incorporate more specific categories from other surveys and obscure conceptually important distinctions. Nevertheless, the level of comparability achieved permits a cautious

interpretation of trends, especially over the forty-year interval between the PIC and NATSAL surveys, with their random, national samples and satisfactory sets of categories.

Other comparability issues exist. Any form of co-residential sexual partnership is here treated as pertinent, but only the Gallup and NATSAL surveys allow cohabittees' meeting places to be examined, and only the latter covers same-sex cohabitations.⁶ Furthermore, the marriage cohorts represented in Slater and Woodside's data, Chester's survey and the Gallup survey are subject to marital dissolution-related attrition. Conversely, the PIC data correspond to ever-married people's first marriages. The NATSAL data relate to both current and former spouses or cohabittees, but are only available for individuals whose most recent sexual partner is, or was, their spouse or cohabitee. Apart from the PIC data, which do not correspond to remarriages, the findings may be affected by remarriage trends.

Setting aside Slater and Woodside's class-specific study, social class can be operationalised in a broadly consistent way. However, the surveys' different approaches mean that a non-manual/manual dichotomy, based on the occupation of the partner designated as, or likely to be, the chief income-earner, is the most appropriate basis for valid comparisons.⁷

Table 1 shows the distributions of places of meeting. The 'Places of study' category is reasonably consistent, although the Gallup survey may under-estimate such meetings as the category was added during coding. The 'Work' category, while fairly consistent, sometimes includes 'through work', not just 'at work'. The 'Drinking, eating or socialising' category implicitly covers 'Dances' in the NATSAL survey, and further lacks consistency because neither

Chester's survey nor the Gallup survey asked about cafés or restaurants. The 'Through friends or relatives' category contains some inconsistencies: the PIC survey focused purely on location ('private houses'), whereas Chester's survey focused on introductions by friends and relatives, omitting some locations where introductions may be subordinate to the setting. In the four other surveys, the category covers a mixture of direct introductions and social events; for the NATSAL survey, it incorporates arranged marriages. In the Reading Marriage Survey it also covers the partners' homes and other private houses.

'Organisational and leisure activities' constitute the least consistent category. Chester's survey contains no relevant categories, whereas the others included both church-related categories and categories covering sports-related meetings. The Gallup survey did not identify meetings via hobbies or societies, whereas the Reading Marriage Survey did, by collecting data on the type of meeting 'event'. The NATSAL survey's 'holiday' category also covered 'travelling', whereas the Reading Marriage Survey's separate collection of place and occasion data may have led to an under-estimation of holiday-related meetings.

The 'Public places' category includes the street in all four pertinent surveys, public transport except in Slater and Woodside's survey, and other public places in the Reading Marriage Survey and the NATSAL survey. In the two preceding surveys, the 'Local and neighbourhood category' covers meetings as neighbours or in the local neighbourhood, as well as having 'always known' one's partner, but it only covers the former in Slater and Woodside's survey and only the latter in the PIC survey. In Chester's survey, the 'Casual meetings' category apparently acted as a residual category, as does the final Gallup survey category.

Trends in places of meeting

Table 1 reveals some statistically significant trends.⁸ Meetings at places of study were less frequent in the first two surveys and more frequent in the last survey, perhaps reflecting educational expansions. Meetings at work were more frequent in the last three surveys, possibly reflecting changes in work-life balance, or declining gender segregation at work. Slater and Woodside's survey apart, the next two categories when combined show a decline, with the PIC survey having the largest proportion of meetings at dances or places of drinking, eating or socialising, and the NATSAL survey the smallest. Dances were particularly important in the PIC survey and Chester's survey.

The prevalence of meetings via friends or family is remarkably stable, apart from a higher proportion for Slater and Woodside's survey, and given that the proportion for Chester's survey may be an over-estimate. The variation in proportions meeting via organisational or leisure activities largely reflects inconsistencies; similar proportions for the PIC and NATSAL surveys suggest relative stability. Given the specifics of the Reading Marriage Survey, there is little evidence of a trend in holiday meetings.

Taken in combination, meetings in public places and local neighbourhood meetings have been at a consistent level since the PIC survey. The apparent shift towards the latter may be an artefact of coding in the PIC survey. While 'Advertisements or agencies' feature in the later surveys, their usage is too limited to establish a trend beyond this. The small (residual) 'Other' category is larger for the NATSAL survey than for other surveys with relatively full classifications.

In summary, Slater and Woodside's distinctive findings presumably reflect temporal, regional or class specificities. Otherwise, the primary trend is towards places of education and work and away from places for drinking, eating or socialising. The lower part of Table 1, in which the twelve categories are aggregated according to Bozon and Héran's three category typology, demonstrates that this constitutes a shift from 'public' towards 'select' places of meeting, although this shift is not present for all of the more specific 'public' and 'select' categories. Ratios of 'public' to 'select' meetings are presented to address the limitations of Chester's survey and the Gallup survey, although the specific categories omitted mean that the ratio for Chester's survey is probably an over-estimate and that for the Gallup survey an under-estimate.

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 shows trends in places of meeting, again aggregated according to Bozon and Héran's typology, but distinguishing between non-manual and manual couples to establish any class differences. The ratios of 'public' to 'select' meetings for Chester's survey should be closer to the PIC survey ratios, and the ratios for the Gallup survey are under-estimates, as are those for the Reading Marriage Survey, because of its greater likelihood of identifying meetings as occurring via organisational and leisure activities. For non-manual couples, Table 2 suggests a shift towards 'select' places during the 1950s or 1960s, possibly continuing through the 1970s and 1980s. For manual couples, a similar shift appears less marked. In consequence, by the 1990s the class differential in the balance of 'public' and 'select' places was greater than in the 1950s.⁹

Places of meeting, social class and education

[Table 3 about here]

Table 3 documents the social class and educational characteristics of NATSAL respondents across the full range of place of meeting categories. A class of destination dichotomy, based on respondent's occupation, was constructed by matching socio-economic groups to the 'service class', as defined by Goldthorpe *et al.* (1987: 40-43). A class of origin dichotomy was constructed similarly, using a more limited classification of father's occupation when the respondent was 16, or mother's occupation if they did not live with their father. The educational dichotomy is based on highest educational or vocational qualifications.

Table 3 shows that, typically, 'select' places of meeting have the highest proportions of service class individuals, and 'public' places the lowest, with 'private' places falling in between. The patterns for education and parental class are broadly similar, although less clear-cut. However, the proportions for categories within each of the three broader ones vary considerably. For example, well-qualified and higher class individuals are disproportionately likely to have met partners at social events organised by friends, as opposed to via friends or relatives in other ways.

Places of meeting and service class homogamy

The NATSAL survey collected data on resident partners' occupations where the partner was the chief income earner or an income earner equal to the respondent. A sub-sample of respondents can thus be used to examine class destination homogamy.¹⁰ Contrasting the service class with other classes allows homogamy to be quantified as a single odds ratio, links the analysis to a key distinction within the class structure, and is consistent with the (more detailed) categorisation used by Kalmijn and Flap (2001: 1297).

The overall odds ratio for class destination homogamy is 4.26. Controlling for the relationships between partners' classes and places of meeting only reduces it to 3.90. Thus the odds ratio mainly reflects homogamy occurring *within* places of meeting. Nevertheless, places of meeting play an important role in relation to homogamy; the overall variation between the odds ratios in Table 3 is statistically significant.¹¹ Aggregating categories, the odds ratios of 3.00 for 'public' places and 5.32 for 'select' places also differ significantly ($P < 0.01$).

The odds ratios are moderate to high for most categories that Kalmijn and Flap (2001: 1291-1293) characterised as 'organised settings'. They suggested that homogamy can be induced by homogeneity within specific settings, with the homogeneity and any preference for similarity reinforcing each other. Table 3 indicates that the levels of homogamy are significantly higher for schools and work than for social events organised by friends and for public locations for drinking, eating or socialising. The high odds ratios for schools and work are consistent with

high levels of internal homogeneity, with preferences not needing to be exercised actively for homogamy to be a likely outcome.

Perhaps surprisingly, the odds ratio for universities and colleges is significantly lower than those for schools and work. However, the homogeneity in class terms of those meeting partners in universities or colleges means that homogamy is nearly as frequent as for work-related meetings. Furthermore, educational homogamy is highly likely, so instances of class destination heterogamy are arguably misleading.

The high odds ratio for the 'have always known each other' category may reflect homogeneity within specific settings, acting in combination with a further filtering effect reflecting a preference for similarity for *achieved* characteristics. The lower odds ratios for the friends and family categories may partly reflect a moderate level of homogeneity within social networks, bolstered by cultural norms of homogamy operating via third party pressure.

The lowest odds ratios for substantial categories, significantly lower than those for schools and for work-related meetings, are for holidays and travelling and for societies, sports clubs and interest groups. Levels of class homogeneity are likely to have been low in many of the specific meeting places within these categories. Furthermore, partner selection may have been governed by identity-related preferences for alternative forms of similarity such as shared interests, and adherence to cultural norms of class homogamy may have been minimal, either because of the characteristics of individuals meeting partners in such contexts or because of the characteristics of the contexts themselves. The slightly higher odds ratios corresponding to meetings in various

public locations, including places for drinking, eating or socialising, may reflect some degree of homogeneity within such settings, plus a greater adherence to a cultural norm of class homogamy, together with a relative absence of self-identity-based preferences.

Given the agency involved in ‘mediated’ meetings, the odds ratio corresponding to advertisements and agencies may indicate an active preference for homogamy, although it does not differ significantly from those for other ‘select’ locations like schools and workplaces.¹²

Multivariate explanatory analyses of meetings in ‘private’, ‘select’ and ‘public’ locations

The remaining analyses (using NATSAL data) focus on two dichotomies: ‘private’ contexts versus other meeting places, and, among the latter, ‘select’ versus ‘public’ locations. The analyses allow the absolute and relative importance of class origin, education, and class destination to be assessed, and also identify other important explanatory factors. NATSAL collected quite extensive data on attitudes to sexual or couple relationships and their desirable features.¹³ Other factors available include ethnicity, religion, country of origin and migration to current locality. Age, cohort and marital history-related differences can be examined, and the impact of parenthood assessed.

[Tables 4 and 5 about here]

Tables 4 and 5 present results from logistic regression analyses of the two dichotomies. The ‘private’ dichotomy compares categories involving friends or relatives and arranged marriages

with the remaining categories in Table 3, excluding ‘No answer given’. The matching of categories to the ‘select’ versus ‘public’ dichotomy is shown in Table 3.

The omission of occupational class and educational level from Table 4 reflects their insignificant impact on the first dichotomy. The impact of parental class is also very limited, with individuals from professional backgrounds possibly being disproportionately likely to have met their partners in ‘private’ contexts. Another cluster of factors is much more influential than these socio-economic characteristics. Members of (some) minority ethnic groups are disproportionately likely to have met their partners in ‘private’ contexts, as are individuals born outside Britain. People who have moved to their current locality, and individuals with non-Christian religious denominations also appear more likely to have met their partners in such contexts, although these two effects fall short of statistical significance. It thus appears that both migrants and members of (some) minority ethnic or religious groups tend to meet their partners in ‘private’ contexts, perhaps for cultural reasons such as an endogamy norm, but possibly also because their day-to-day lives (or social lives) may be more strongly tied to family or friendship networks. However, constraints on access to some locations may also be relevant. Most of the impact of each factor within the cluster, apart from religious denomination, remains if arranged marriages are discarded.

Table 4 also highlights significant regional differences, with meetings in ‘private’ contexts being most frequent among London residents, and least frequent among residents of Northern England and Wales. These regional differences do not reflect socio-economic differences, or differences

in the balance of urban, suburban and rural areas, so they may instead reflect cultural variations or differing patterns of sociability.

Neither age at meeting nor year of meeting affected the odds of having met one's partner in a 'private' context significantly. Similarly, parental status at the time of meeting had an insignificant effect. However, remarriages and cohabitations after earlier marriages were found to be disproportionately unlikely to involve meetings in 'private' contexts, possibly reflecting constraints on social networks during or after time spent as a married person.¹⁴

Turning to attitudes towards relationships, feeling that one night stands are always or mostly wrong was associated with having met partners in 'private' contexts. The less importance an individual attached to having tastes and interests in common (in relation to the 'success' of a long-term relationship), the more likely they were to have met their partner in a 'private' context, perhaps because they saw no need to search elsewhere.

To summarise, the findings are consistent with the likelihood of meeting in 'private' contexts being determined by a mixture of opportunities, cultural norms and preferences, but with no marked socio-economic differentials.¹⁵ However, Table 5 shows that socio-economic characteristics have a significant impact on the second dichotomy. Both an individual's qualifications and their occupational class (based on current or past occupation) have marked impacts, with the highest level nearly trebling the odds (relative to the lowest level) of an individual having met their partner in a 'select' as opposed to a 'public' location. The impact of parental class is weaker, but not negligible. The educational effect relates primarily to degree-

level qualifications, although other qualifications obtained after the minimum school-leaving age also increase the odds of meeting one's partner in a 'select' location. The occupational class effect is more graduated, with professionals and large-scale managers having higher odds than other non-manual workers, and skilled or semi-skilled manual workers higher odds than unskilled manual workers. Employers and own-account workers deviate from this pattern; their chances of having met their partners in 'select' locations are similar to those of unskilled manual workers.

The findings from Table 5 discussed above show that achieved attributes are more influential than parental class, and class of destination more influential than education. Achieved socio-economic attributes such as higher-level occupations and degrees may be linked to lifestyles in which 'select' locations feature prominently, with such locations typically providing contact with potential partners who complement an individual's personal and social identities, allowing both cultural norms of homogamy and personal preferences to be satisfied.

Neither religious denomination nor country of birth has a significant effect on the second dichotomy, although viewing shared religious beliefs as unimportant decreases the odds of having met a partner in a 'select' location significantly, whereas having foreign qualifications appears to increase them. Only the Indian or Bangladeshi ethnic group appears distinctive, having higher odds of having met partners in 'select' locations. The distinction between 'select' and 'public' locations may thus not be as strongly linked to the day-to-day lives of minority ethnic and religious groups as that between 'private' contexts and other settings. However, people who have moved to their current locality are more likely to have met their partners in

‘select’ locations, perhaps reflecting unfamiliarity with, or a relative lack of ease in, local, ‘public’ locations.

The odds of having met a partner in a ‘select’ location vary significantly regionally. The differences have similarities to those in the preceding analysis, with Northern England having the lowest odds. However, the South of England, rather than London, has the highest odds. Together, the two analyses indicate a marked downwards gradient in the empirical importance of ‘public’ locations as one moves from Northern England through the Midlands to London and the South, suggesting regional variation in the extent or cultural acceptability of ‘public’ sociability. This pattern echoes regional variation in cohabitation rates (Haskey and Kiernan, 1989: 29); Duncan and Smith have suggested that culturally-rooted regional trajectories in relation to family formation can develop (2002: 490).

Age at meeting, specifically meeting a partner when aged under 16, has a significant effect; the increased odds of meeting in a ‘select’ location for this age group reflect meetings at school. Meetings in the period 1998-2001 are less likely to have occurred in ‘select’ locations, but this probably reflects a longer average duration between meeting and living together for meetings in ‘select’ locations. Work-related meetings are particularly important for the formerly married, who consequently have higher odds of having met a partner in a ‘select’ location.

Attitudes are again relevant. Those viewing one night stands as always or mostly wrong are less likely to have met their partner in a ‘public’ location, and the more importance an individual attached to shared tastes and interests, the more likely they are to have met their partner in a

‘select’ location. Not viewing an adequate income as important is also associated with having met one’s partner in a ‘select’ location. Thus ‘select’ locations appear to appeal to individuals prioritising partners who complement their identities rather than simply satisfy their immediate sexual desires or provide economic security.

Checks for interaction effects only identified one significant trend: the impact of a professional, managerial or administrative parental class was greater before 1980.

Concluding discussion

Trends in places of meeting

The continuities in places of meeting in Britain in the late 20th Century are as striking as the changes. Inasmuch as changes occurred, it was not demographic trends relating to marital formation but other forms of structural change that had an impact. Educational expansion increased opportunities to meet partners, primarily for middle class individuals via higher education, but also for working class individuals at secondary school. Furthermore, there was an increase in work-related meetings (primarily within the manual classes), which may reflect decreasing gender segregation in the workplace¹⁶, or the growing salience of paid work to women’s self-identities.

A decline in meetings in places for drinking, eating or socialising may also reflect a shift in the work-life balance. Despite this decline, meetings in ‘public’ places have been more common in

Britain in recent decades than in France, the Netherlands, and especially the US. Consequently, the proportion meeting partners in ‘public’ places may diminish further, as a reflection of an ongoing shift towards meetings in ‘select’ locations such as educational settings. However, the rise of individualism and increased significance of self-identity in contemporary Britain have not yet led to a corresponding growth in the importance of another ‘select’ meeting place category, namely the settings for organisational or leisure activities. These have actually declined in importance for the manual classes, echoing research findings regarding involvement in such activities (Li *et al.*, 2003).

Since, like other ‘mediated’ approaches, internet dating highlights self-identities, a proliferation of online meetings arguably reflects a rising level of individualism. However, other ‘mediated’ approaches have, at least until recently, only generated a fraction of meetings in Britain. Furthermore, internet dating does not necessarily involve a rejection of traditional sources of identity like class, or of norms regarding appropriate partners. Now that the internet is a feature of many people’s day-to-day lives, making internet dating more commonplace than earlier ‘mediated’ approaches, internet sites simply constitute an additional category of ‘select’ meeting places.

The determinants of places of meeting and of homogamy

If anything, social class (based on an individual’s own occupation) appears to be growing in importance in Britain as a determinant of place of meeting. More generally, the likelihood of meeting a partner in a ‘select’ location depends upon achieved characteristics (primarily class but

also degree-level qualifications) to a greater extent than it does upon parental class. However, in contemporary Britain, 'private' meetings do not vary in overall importance according to class.

Substantial numbers of service class and well-qualified individuals meet partners in all the categories of meeting place. It is thus homogeneity within *specific* settings that is crucial to the generation of occupational class homogamy. Low levels of homogamy for some categories of meeting place highlight the absence of a universally effective cultural norm of class homogamy, and variations in homogamy between categories of meeting place are consistent with homogamy primarily reflecting class homogeneity within settings, with some of the remaining variation reflecting preferences for class similarity.

Class differences in the proportion of meetings in 'select' locations may reflect the differing day-to-day lives of classes leading to varying levels of involvement in such locations. Similarly, regional differences in proportions meeting partners in 'public', 'select' or 'private' settings may reflect the impact of differing patterns of sociability on opportunities; levels of membership of local organisations and of informal community involvement show a broadly similar regional pattern (Williams, 2003: 536; Casey, 2004: 107). Alternatively, regional differences may reflect cultural variations in the locations deemed appropriate for meeting partners, with meetings via public sociability being viewed more favourably in Northern England. Either way, partner selection continues to take place in a social and/or cultural context rather than being an individualised process free from constraints.

Other findings in this paper similarly illustrate the importance of structural or cultural factors in determining places of meeting. However, individuals vary in their adherence to norms and (in contrast) in the importance that they attach to finding someone who complements their self-identity. Such heterogeneity has an impact on places of meeting: for example, individuals who conform to norms regarding sexual propriety are relatively unlikely to meet partners in ‘public’ settings and more likely to meet them in ‘private’ contexts, and individuals who prioritise shared tastes and interests are relatively unlikely to meet partners in ‘private’ contexts, and more likely to meet them in ‘select’ locations. Irrespective of any general trend towards individualism, the balance between cultural or structural factors and self-identity as determinants of places of meeting evidently varies between individuals, and possibly between classes and regions as well.

Endnotes

¹ Table 3 shows that this pattern is replicated in contemporary Britain across a detailed range of ‘select’ and ‘public’ places, demonstrating the external validity of this aspect of Bozon and Héran’s schema in a British context.

² The paucity of quantitative sociologists in Britain with a demographic or spatial orientation may also help explain the neglect of this topic.

³ Class was defined using the male partner’s occupation when the couple started living together.

⁴ A dating service survey indicated extensive online dating in Britain (Hoyle, 2006).

⁵ Bozon and Héran (1987: 967) and Kalmijn and Flap (2001: 1299) similarly focus on settings.

⁶ Just under 1 per cent of the NATSAL sample corresponds to same-sex cohabitations.

⁷ The published PIC data were categorised as non-manual, skilled manual or other manual using husband’s occupation at marriage. The Reading Marriage Survey used Registrar General’s Social Class (RGSC); this paper uses the first of the following that belongs to Classes I-V: husband’s occupation at meeting, husband’s occupation at interview, wife’s occupation at meeting. However, wife’s occupation is used where it falls within Classes I-II. For the other surveys, class is operationalised using current (or last) occupations. Chester’s data include a standard market research class-related measure (see Heath *et al.*, 1985: 13). The Gallup survey’s schema, available for chief wage-earner’s occupation, incorporates a non-manual/manual distinction. The NATSAL data include chief income-earner’s occupation, coded according to RGSC and a more detailed socio-economic group schema. The use of a non-manual/manual dichotomy for the between-survey comparison limits the impact of changes in class position between the time of meeting and later points in time.

⁸ A log-linear model incorporating the trends and inconsistencies discussed in this section fits Table 1 well. (Model deviance = 23.2 with 25 d.f.; $P > 0.05$). Note that the primary trends identified relate to (combinations of) categories where the level of between-survey comparability is good; the PIC and NATSAL surveys (the most satisfactory reference points) do not indicate the presence of further substantial trends.

⁹ This trend in the class differential may reflect (in part) trends in other class differentials, e.g. in relation to age at marriage.

¹⁰ Weighting corrected for the over-representation of equal-income couples.

¹¹ The likelihood ratio chi-square value for the relevant log-linear model interaction term is 38.1 with 16 d.f. ($P = 0.0014$).

¹² The differences discussed within this section are statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) within logistic regressions.

¹³ The analyses rely on respondents' *current* characteristics and attitudes being adequate proxies for their characteristics and attitudes when they met their partners. While there is no way of knowing how these may have changed since the time of meeting, it seems unlikely (albeit not impossible) that the place of meeting has, in itself, changed them.

¹⁴ Neither distinguishing between first and subsequent cohabitations among the never-married, nor between remarriages and cohabitations after marriage, enhanced the fit of the multivariate models.

¹⁵ The sex effect suggests that women more often *report* meetings as reflecting third party involvement.

¹⁶ The percentage of the British workforce in ‘integrated’ (rather than male- or female-dominated) occupations rose markedly during the 1980s (Hakim, 1992: 139).

References

- Allan, G. (1979). *A Sociology of Friendship and Kinship*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995). *The Normal Chaos of Love*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Blossfeld, H.P. and Timm, A. (Eds) (2004). *Who Marries Whom? Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Choses dites*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Bozon, M. and Héran, F. (1987). La Découverte du Conjoint I: Evolution et morphologie des scènes de rencontre. *Population*, **42.6**, 943-966.
- Bozon, M. and Héran, F. (1988). La Découverte du Conjoint II: Les scènes de rencontre dans l'espace social. *Population*, **43.1**, 121-150.
- Bozon, M. and Héran, F. (1989). Finding a spouse: A survey of how French couples meet. *Population*, **44.1** (English Selection) 1, 91-121.
- Casey, T. (2004). Social Capital and Regional Economies in Britain. *Political Studies*, **52**, 96-117.
- Chester, R. (1984). *Survey on Marriage, 1970* [computer file: SN434]. Colchester: UK Data Archive.
- Coleman, D.A. (1979). A study of the spatial aspects of partner choice from a human biological viewpoint. *Man*, **14**, 414-435.
- Coleman, D.A. (1981). The effect of socio-economic class, regional origin and other variables on marital mobility in Britain 1920-1960. *Annals of Human Biology*, **8.1**, 1-24.

- Coleman, D.A. (1984). *Reading Marriage Survey, 1974* [computer file: SN1578]. Colchester: UK Data Archive.
- De Graaf, P.M. and Kalmijn, M. (2003). Alternative routes in the remarriage market: Competing-risk analyses of union formation after divorce. *Social Forces*, **81.4**, 1459-1498.
- Duncan, S. and Smith, D. (2002). Geographies of family formations: spatial differences and gender cultures in Britain. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **27.4**, 471-493.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Girard, A. (1974). *Le Choix du Conjoint: Une enquête psycho-sociologique en France* (2nd edition). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Goldthorpe, J.H., Llewellyn, C. and Payne, C. (1987). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain* (2nd edition). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hakim, C. (1992). Explaining Trends in Occupational Segregation: The Measurement, Causes and Consequences of the Sexual Division of Labour. *European Sociological Review*, **8.2**, 127-152.
- Hardey, M. (2002). Life beyond the screen: embodiment and identity through the internet. *Sociological Review*, **50.4**, 570-585.
- Haskey, J. and Kiernan, K. (1989). Cohabitation in Great Britain - characteristics and estimated numbers of cohabiting partners. *Population Trends*, **58**, 23-32.
- Heath, A., Jowell, R. and Curtice, J. (1985). *How Britain Votes*. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Houston, S., Wright, R., Ellis, M., Holloway, S. and Hudson, M. (2005). Places of possibility: Where mixed-race partners meet. *Progress in Human Geography*, **29.6**, 700-717.
- Hoyle, B. (2006). Why today's singles are logging on in the search for love at first byte. *The Times* (January 5).
- Jagger, E. (1998). Marketing the self, buying an other: Dating in a post modern, consumer society. *Sociology*, **32.4**, 795-814.
- Jagger, E. (2001). Marketing Molly and Melville: Dating in a postmodern, consumer society. *Sociology*, **35.1**, 39-57.
- Jagger, E. (2005). Is thirty the new sixty? Dating, age and gender in a postmodern, consumer society. *Sociology*, **39.1**, 89-106.
- Jamieson, L. (1998). *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kalmijn, M. and Flap, H. (2001). Assortative meeting and mating: Unintended consequences of organized settings for partner choices. *Social Forces*, **79.4**, 1289-1312.
- Lampard, R. and Peggs, K. (2007). *Identity and Repartnering after Separation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Leonard, D. (1980). *Sex and Generation: A Study of Courtship and Weddings*. London: Tavistock.
- Lesthaeghe, R. (1995). The second demographic transition in Western countries: An interpretation. In Mason, K.O. and Jensen, A-M (Eds) *Gender and family change in industrialized countries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 17-62.
- Li, Y., Savage, M. and Pickles, A. (2003). Social capital and social exclusion in England and Wales (1972-1999). *British Journal of Sociology*, **54.4**, 497-526.

- Michael, R.T., Gagnon, J.H., Laumann, E.O. and Kolata, G. (1994). *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- National Centre for Social Research. (2005). *National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles II, 2000-2001* [computer file: SN5223]. Colchester: UK Data Archive.
- Pierce, R.M. (1963) Marriage in the fifties. *Sociological Review*, **11.2**, 215-240.
- Slater, E. and Woodside, M. (1951). *Patterns of Marriage: A Study of Marriage Relationships in the Urban Working Classes*. London: Cassell.
- Tsay, R-M. and Wu, L-H. (2006). Marrying Someone from an Outside Group: An Analysis of Boundary-Crossing Marriages in Taiwan. *Current Sociology*, **54.2**, 165-186.
- Tyrer, N. (1989). Where (exactly) do you meet your match? *New Woman* (April), 8-11.
- Williams, C.C. (2003). Developing Community Involvement: Contrasting Local and Regional Participatory Cultures in Britain and their Implications for Policy. *Regional Studies*, **37.5**, 531-541.

Table 1: Places of meeting: Results from six surveys*

	Slater & Woodside	PIC	Chester	Reading Marriage	Gallup	NATSAL
Sample size	n = 200	n = 739	n = 955	n = 946	n = 863	n = 6,343
Sample type & response rate	Quota	Random (82%)	Quota	Random (63%)	Quota	Random (64%)
Median year of meeting	1934	1951	1953	1970	1969	1991
Places of study	7 (3.5)	(4.6)	62 (6.5)	65 (6.9)	52 (6.0)	781 (12.3)
Work	30 (15.0)	(14.6)	139 (14.6)	199 (21.0)	147 (17.0)	1262 (19.9)
Drinking, eating or socialising	20 (10.0)	(15.7)	141 (14.8)	190 (20.1)	148 (17.1)	1856 (29.3)
Dances	23 (11.5)	(27.3)	198 (20.7)	137 (14.5)	147 (17.0)	
Through friends or relatives	53 (26.5)	(17.6)	206 (21.6)	169 (17.9)	141 (16.3)	1126 (17.7)
Organisational/leisure activities	7 (3.5)	(5.9)		83 (8.8)	24 (2.8)	326 (5.1)
Holidays	4 (2.0)	(3.5)		8 (0.8)	21 (2.4)	188 (3.0)
Public places	47 (23.5)	(9.7)		44 (4.7)		287 (4.5)
Local or neighbourhood	8 (4.0)	(0.8)		42 (4.4)		383 (6.0)
Advertisements or agencies	1 (0.5)			4 (0.4)	6 (0.7)	58 (0.9)
Casual meetings			208 (21.8)			
Other or unspecified		(0.3)	1 (0.1)	5 (0.5)	177 (20.5)	78 (1.2)
‘Public’	98 (49.0)	(53.5)	339 (35.5)	413 (43.7)	295 (34.2)	2525 (39.8)
‘Private’	53 (26.5)	(17.6)	206 (21.6)	169 (17.9)	141 (16.3)	1126 (17.7)
‘Select’	49 (24.5)	(28.6)	201 (21.0)	359 (37.9)	250 (29.0)	2613 (41.2)
Other		(0.3)	209 (21.9)	5 (0.5)	177 (20.5)	78 (1.2)
‘Public’ to ‘Select’ ratio	2.00	1.87	1.69	1.15	1.18	0.97

Continued overleaf

Notes: The figures in parentheses are percentages. Slater and Woodside's sample consists of 'neurotic' and 'control' sub-samples, with similar meeting place distributions. The figures for the PIC survey are based on published percentages, derived from weighted data. The median year of meeting value is an estimate, but should be a good approximation to the actual value.

The aggregated categories in the lower part of the table correspond to the twelve categories in the upper part of the table as follows:

- *'Public' is an aggregation of the 3rd, 4th, 8th and 9th categories.*
- *'Private' is equivalent to the 5th category.*
- *'Select' is an aggregation of the 1st, 2nd, 6th, 7th and 10th categories.*
- *'Other' is an aggregation of the 11th and 12th categories.*

** I am grateful to the UK Data Archive, and to the collectors and sponsors of the survey data analysed within this paper, none of whom bear any responsibility for my analyses and interpretations. For further details of NATSAL, Chester's survey and the Reading Marriage Survey, see <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/>.*

Table 2: Places of meeting: Non-manual/Manual differences

	Slater & Woodside	PIC	Chester	Reading Marriage	Gallup	NATSAL
<i>Non-manual</i>						
'Public'			114	126	110	1150
		(42.9)	(33.1)	(29.9)	(28.1)	(31.6)
'Private'			83	77	62	673
		(20.6)	(24.1)	(18.3)	(15.9)	(18.5)
'Select'			80	216	139	1782
		(36.0)	(23.3)	(51.3)	(35.5)	(48.9)
Other			67	2	80	37
		(0.4)	(19.5)	(0.5)	(20.5)	(1.0)
'Public' to 'Select' ratio		1.19	1.43	0.58	0.79	0.65
<i>Manual</i>						
'Public'	98		225	284	171	1293
	(49.0)	(58.4)	(36.8)	(55.1)	(36.3)	(51.4)
'Private'	53		123	91	79	416
	(26.5)	(15.8)	(20.1)	(17.7)	(16.8)	(16.5)
'Select'	49		121	137	123	770
	(24.5)	(25.5)	(19.8)	(26.6)	(26.2)	(30.6)
Other			142	3	97	37
		(0.2)	(23.2)	(0.6)	(20.6)	(1.5)
'Public' to 'Select' ratio	2.00	2.29	1.86	2.07	1.39	1.68

Table 3: Place of meeting categories from the NATSAL survey (2000-2001):
Respondents' class and educational characteristics

Place of meeting category	Service class (%)	'A' level plus (%)	Parent service class (%)	Sample size	Homogamy odds ratio	Sample size
University or college ¹	67.3	93.0	58.2	413	2.70	160
Church ¹	57.9	84.2	64.9	38	12.00	13
Neighbour/Lived locally/Shared house ²	52.8	56.8	47.2	36	2.00	7
Dating agency/Personal ad./Chat line ¹	49.1	43.9	25.9	57	22.75	24
Society/Sports club/Interest group ¹	47.9	62.8	40.3	288	1.51	127
At or through work ¹	44.4	54.3	39.1	1,261	7.30	576
School ¹	41.7	54.6	31.1	367	9.28	173
Other (uncategorised)	39.0	50.0	30.0	41	2.67	15
Social event organised by friend(s)	38.3	54.7	38.7	948	3.49	419
Holiday/Travelling ¹	38.3	53.7	37.8	188	2.17	72
Arranged marriage	32.1	37.9	20.7	28	4.00	9
Pub/Café/Restaurant/Bar/Club ²	29.6	39.6	24.5	1,857	2.67	796
Through friends or relatives	27.3	39.6	29.3	150	3.95	65
No answer given	26.3	32.4	18.9	38	8.00	15
At a public place (Buildings, etc.) ²	22.5	47.5	31.7	40	∞	13
Have always known each other ²	21.7	35.0	22.0	346	6.00	155
In a public place (Street/Park/Bus/etc.) ²	20.7	35.8	26.3	246	2.44	97
TOTAL	37.7	50.7	33.7	6,343	4.26	2,737

Notes: The second sample size corresponds to the sub-sample of respondents for whom the necessary data to examine homogamy were available. ¹ indicates that a category belongs to the 'select' component of the 'select' versus 'public' dichotomy; ² indicates that a category belongs to the 'public' component.

Table 4: Logistic regression analysis of the ‘private’ contexts versus other locations dichotomy for places of meeting partners in the NATSAL survey

Variable	Category	B	S.E. (B)	Odds ratio	p-value
Parental class (0.239)	Professional	0.179	0.093	1.20	0.055
	Managerial/administrative	0.016	0.091	1.02	0.862
	Never had a job	-0.097	0.205	0.91	0.635
	OTHER			1.00	
Ethnic group (0.000)	Black	0.614	0.199	1.85	0.002
	Indian or Bangladeshi	1.027	0.255	2.79	0.000
	Pakistani	0.863	0.371	2.37	0.020
	OTHER			1.00	
Country of birth (0.025)	Outside Great Britain	0.255	0.114	1.29	0.025
	GREAT BRITAIN ^a			1.00	
Always lived in this city, town or village (0.053)	No	0.147	0.076	1.16	0.053
	YES			1.00	
Religious denomination (0.062)	Non-Christian	0.385	0.206	1.47	0.062
	CHRISTIAN OR NONE			1.00	
Region (0.000)	NORTH OF ENGLAND			1.00	
	Midlands	0.263	0.113	1.30	0.020
	South of England ^b	0.346	0.096	1.41	0.000
	Greater London	0.511	0.119	1.67	0.000
	Wales	0.042	0.190	1.04	0.824
	Scotland	0.232	0.137	1.26	0.091
Sex (0.005)	Female	0.193	0.069	1.21	0.005
	MALE			1.00	
Type of relationship (0.059)	FIRST MARRIAGE			1.00	
	Never-married cohabitation	0.009	0.080	1.01	0.910
	Repartnered after marriage	-0.250	0.109	0.78	0.022
View of ‘one night stands’ (0.003)	ALWAYS OR MOSTLY WRONG			1.00	
	Less frequently wrong	-0.180	0.071	0.84	0.011
	Depends/Don’t know	-0.516	0.186	0.60	0.005
Importance of shared tastes and interests for a successful relationship (0.034)	Very important	-0.144	0.080	0.87	0.071
	Not at all important	0.381	0.222	1.46	0.086
	OTHER ANSWER			1.00	
Importance of an adequate income for a successful relationship (0.052)	VERY IMPORTANT			1.00	
	Quite important ^c	-0.258	0.110	0.77	0.019
	Not very or not at all important	-0.034	0.076	0.97	0.652

Notes: $n=6,238$ of which 1,121 (18%) were meetings in ‘private’ contexts. The deviance (-2 Log Likelihood value) is 5,677.04, and the change in deviance corresponding to the model is 198.55 (23 degrees of freedom; $p=0.000$). Cox and Snell’s pseudo-R square value is 0.031.

The figure in parentheses by each variable name is the overall p-value for that variable

(a) Includes one individual who gave no answer.

(b) Includes East Anglia.

(c) Includes eight individuals who answered “Don’t know”.

Table 5: Logistic regression analysis of the ‘select’ locations versus ‘public’ locations dichotomy for places of meeting partners in the NATSAL survey

Variable	Category	B	S.E. (B)	Odds ratio	p-value
Occupational class (based on current or last occupation) (0.000)	Professional/Large-scale manager	0.996	0.203	2.71	0.000
	Other non-manual/Personal services	0.622	0.185	1.86	0.001
	Skilled or semi-skilled manual	0.390	0.191	1.48	0.041
	UNSKILLED MANUAL			1.00	
	Employer/Own-account worker	0.142	0.212	1.15	0.501
	Unknown	0.856	0.475	2.35	0.072
	No job within last 10 years ^d	0.249	0.229	1.28	0.277
Highest level of qualifications (0.000)	Degree-level	1.074	0.098	2.93	0.000
	‘A’-level or equivalent	0.286	0.073	1.33	0.000
	Foreign or unspecified quals.	0.777	0.393	2.18	0.048
	OTHER			1.00	
Parental class (0.000)	Professional	0.338	0.095	1.40	0.000
	Managerial/administrative	0.274	0.084	1.32	0.001
	Never had a job	-0.366	0.179	0.69	0.041
	OTHER			1.00	
Importance of shared religious beliefs ^e (0.041)	Not at all important	-0.135	0.066	0.87	0.041
	OTHER ANSWER			1.00	
Ethnic group (0.009)	Black	0.093	0.234	1.10	0.693
	Indian or Bangladeshi	1.075	0.327	2.93	0.001
	Pakistani	-0.351	0.451	0.70	0.436
	OTHER			1.00	
Always lived in this city, town or village (0.000)	No	0.315	0.067	1.37	0.000
	YES			1.00	
Region (0.000)	NORTH OF ENGLAND			1.00	
	Midlands	0.247	0.097	1.28	0.011
	South of England ^b	0.478	0.083	1.61	0.000
	Greater London	0.298	0.113	1.35	0.008
	Wales	0.254	0.153	1.29	0.096
	Scotland	0.185	0.117	1.20	0.116
Sex (0.602)	Female	0.036	0.069	1.04	0.602
	MALE			1.00	
Age at meeting (0.000)	Under 16	0.470	0.128	1.60	0.000
	16 OR OVER, OR UNKNOWN			1.00	
Year of meeting (0.000)	1998 or later	-0.306	0.086	0.74	0.000
	BEFORE 1998, OR UNKNOWN			1.00	
Type of relationship (0.019)	FIRST MARRIAGE			1.00	
	Never-married cohabitation	0.048	0.077	1.05	0.528
	Repartnered after marriage	0.255	0.091	1.29	0.005

Continued overleaf

View of 'one night stands' (0.053)	ALWAYS OR MOSTLY WRONG					1.00
	Less frequently wrong	-0.156	0.065	0.86		0.017
	Depends/Don't know	-0.144	0.144	0.87		0.317
Importance of shared tastes and interests for a successful relationship (0.035)	Very important	0.094	0.071	1.10		0.186
	Not at all important	-0.512	0.241	0.60		0.034
	OTHER ANSWER					1.00
Importance of an adequate income for a successful relationship (0.003)	VERY IMPORTANT					1.00
	Quite important ^c	0.007	0.088	1.01		0.934
	Not very or not at all important	0.238	0.097	1.27		0.014

Notes: n=4,973 of which 2,443 (49%) were meetings in 'select' locations. The deviance (-2 Log Likelihood value) is 6,189.33, and the change in deviance corresponding to the model is 702.74 (33 degrees of freedom; p=0.000). Cox and Snell's pseudo-R square value is 0.132.

The figure in parentheses by each variable name is the overall p-value for that variable

(a) - (c) See Table 4.

(d) Excluding jobs of less than 10 hours per week.

(e) For a successful relationship.

[Blank page]