GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MATE PREFERENCES AMONG SINGLE HETEROSEXUAL ROMANIANS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

MONICA A. NAINIGER

Bachelor of Science in Psychology

John Carroll University

May 2001

Master of Arts in Psychology

Cleveland State University

May 2004

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirement for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN URBAN EDUCATION

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2019

We hereby approve the dissertation
of
Monica Nainiger
Candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Education Degree:
Counselor Education

This Dissertation has been approved for the
Department of Doctoral Studies,
College of Education and Human Services

And
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY,
College of Graduate Studies by

_____
Dissertation Co-Chairperson: Kathryn MacCluskie, Ed.D.

_____C.A.S.A.L. 12/03/2019_____
Department & Date

_____
Dissertation Co-Chairperson: Marius Boboc, Ed.D.

_____Curriculum and Foundations 12/03/2019_____
Department & Date

_____
Methodologist and Outside Committee Member: Michael Horvath, Ph.D.

_____Psychology 12/03/2019_____
Department & Date

December 3, 2019
Candidate's Date of Defense

To my Mom who has seen me through

every educational endeavor since I was 5. Your wisdom and guidance will never be forgotten.

To David-

Thank you for seeing beyond Evolutionary and Social Role paradigms in your choosing of me!

Love you forever and ever -

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MATE PREFERENCES AMONG SINGLE HETEROSEXUAL ROMANIANS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

MONICA A. NAINIGER

ABSTRACT

This study sought to discover whether single heterosexual mate preference differences between men and women who were born in Romania would have fluctuated as one became more acculturated to American way of life and if these sex differences may have been moderated by other variables such as SES and age. This study was based on the premises of evolutionary, social role and cultural theories, the former which stated that men tended to look for characteristics that signified reproductive value like good looks whereas women sought out men that evidenced characteristics of cultural success like having been financially independent. It was hypothesized that Romanian men tended to acculturate to American way of life faster than women and so would have been more inclined to prefer characteristics that signified cultural success over reproductive value whereas women would have tended to favor characteristics in line with the above paradigms. Along with various demographic questions that were completed, participants were asked to take 2 short surveys-one which rated gender differences in long term mate preferences and one which measured level of acculturation to American way of life. A total of 46 were included in the subsequent eight hierarchical regressions that were run.

Results indicated some support for the evolutionary and social role theories; women indicated preference for the aggregate variable of cultural success as well the survey Item of Good Financial Prospect, while men indicated preference for the survey item of Good Cook and Housekeeper. Acculturation as a main effect as well as its

interaction with gender was not significant. Participants who immigrated after the fall of communism endorsed most survey items to a higher degree. Age was found to be negatively correlated with younger persons who preferred to endorse the aggregate variable of Reproductive Value and Item Desire for Home and Children. Implications suggested shifts in social role gender norms in Romania, which nullified any effects of acculturation. Future research should explore the connections between recent immigration, acculturation and mate preferences as well as be replicated again with variables not currently examined and a bigger sample size to ensure reliability of findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mate selection for a committed long-term relationship or marriage has, for a long time, attracted the attention of many researchers including social and personality psychologists, sociologists, and evolutionary biologists (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Shackelford, Schmitt, & Buss, 2005; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Howard, Blumstein, & Schwartz, 1987) who have attempted to identify the criteria men and women used in choosing their life partners and the reasons behind their differences of opinion as to which criteria were more important. Mate selection and mate preferences were important topics to study because they would subsequently do the following: affect the current and future direction of sexual selection, give clues to human reproductive history, and "exert selective pressures on other components of the mating system" (Buss, 1989, p. 1). In response to the different challenges and concerns historically faced by men and women in pursuing a long-term marriage relationship, previous studies have cited an evolutionary perspective for these differences because "mate selection is determined by males' versus females' sexual strategies or solutions to adaptive problems" (Buss & Schmitt, 1993, p.206).

In determining and understanding gender differences in mate preferences, previous studies have often employed two different theoretical orientations—the sociocultural and evolutionary theories. For example, in their study of preferences in mate selection, Buss and Barnes (1986) referred to Darwin's theory of Sexual Selection as a causal factor of evolutionary change. This theory subsumed another related process known as intersexual selection, or epigamic selection, which was a "tendency of members of one sex to preferentially choose as mates certain members of the opposite sex" (Buss & Barnes, 1986, p.559). Likewise, in monogamous societies, "assortative mating is the most pronounced deviation from panmixia (random mating)" (Buss & Barnes, 1986, p. 560). What's more, assortative mating, which was a nonrandom coupling based on genotypic or phenotypic resemblance, seemed to be the dominant mode of Western cultures.

1.1 Theoretical Framework

Identification of mate preferences involved two major perspectives: Evolutionary Theory and Socio-cultural Theory. The Evolutionary Theory maintained an emphasis on reproductive investment and how such investment has caused different evolutionary pressures to evolve on human males and females. These, in turn, have led to different male/female reproductive strategies. The Socio-cultural Theory emphasized how male and female social roles and culture determined gender differences in mate preferences.

Mate selection theories. A number of authors have posited various explanations for mate selection. Following was a brief overview of some commonly researched models.

Evolutionary theory-reproductive investment. To give credence to the evolutionary theory of mate preferences, Buss and Barnes (1986) found that the characteristics most preferred in potential mates (both male and female) were those that served as a proximate cue to *reproductive investment*. According to Buss & Barnes (1986), reproductive investment could be defined as those characteristics or values each respective gender brings to the dyadic coupling that would translate into the most successful genome for offspring. In fact, "individuals who in the past have enacted preferences for characteristics that are positively correlated with a mate's reproductive investment may have been selected and thus represented genetically more than individuals who have been indiscriminate or who have enacted preferences that do not correlate to the reproductive investment abilities of a potential mate" (Buss & Barnes, 1986, p. 568). Therefore, men preferred the external attributes such as attractiveness in women because their reproductive value was closely tied to age and health, and good looks are proximate cues to age and health. Women, on the other hand, put greater importance on strong earning power because a man's reproductive value was closely tied to this extrinsic attribute. This value was seen in material advantages and enhanced social/economic advantages given to the offspring as well as genetically-based qualities which generated this earning power. Due to the socialization process, boys and girls were encouraged to prefer in future mates those qualities and characteristics that exemplified reproductive investment.

Buss and Schmitt (1993) corroborated many of the findings of previous studies along with those of Buss and Barnes (1986). In their research, mate preferences and ways in which men and women confronted adaptive problems in short and long-term

contexts were studied. Consistent with the theoretical paradigm of this author, they also proposed a contextual-evolutionary theory with regard to mating strategies since "men and women are hypothesized to have evolved distinct psychological mechanisms that underlie short-term and long-term strategies" (Buss & Schmitt, 1993, p. 204).

Social conditioning models. The social perspective of mate preferences was advanced by Howard, Blumstein, and Schwartz (1987) who examined mate preferences in samples of both heterosexual and homosexual couples. Results of their study showed women preferred ambitious (powerful) men and men preferred attractive mates. This replicated the findings of Buss and Barnes (1986) and mirrored the preoccupation with the reproductive value of men and women. However, this study also showed that preferred mate characteristics were those that led to marital happiness and survival and were indicative of the social powerlessness experienced by women in general. In addition, the findings of the study revealed characteristics that correlated highly with reproductive investment. Because of this, Howard et al. (1987) stated that the results of their study, which incorporated homosexual couples, suggested that human mate preferences were better understood by using a social perspective "[because] some of the mate preferences reported here . . .do not serve clear reproductive purposes and a few even contradicted such purposes" (p. 200). In fact, Howard et al. (1987) believed their findings gave more credence and direct evidence to the adequacy of the social theory perspective rather than the evolutionary theory perspective. According to the social theory, women are excluded from power and are viewed primarily as "goods" which showed restricted advancement. Because of this situation, women sought men with characteristics associated with power and material resources. Consequently, it can be

said that "the social and evolutionary theories are not intrinsically incompatible" (Buss & Barnes, 1986, p. 568).

In like manner, a study which involved the relationship of socioeconomic status (SES), gender, financial resources, and mate preferences, Luszyk (2001) found that those with lower SES placed more value on partner resources than did those with higher SES which lead to a more socioeconomic approach in the explanation of gender differences in the evolution of mate preferences. These preferences for financial resources, it was believed, led to more marital satisfaction and success.

An important corollary to the social theory was the social role theory. Eagly (1999) spoke of the importance of the social role theory when he stipulated that the different roles into which individuals were cast in society throughout life eventually were internalized and self-reinforcing which influenced their behavior and mindset. Eastwick et al. (2006) stated that the social role theory emphasized that the "placement of men and women in different roles underlies many of the sex differences in preferences for long-term partners" (p. 604), and this finding was found in cross-cultural studies as well. This gave credence to the belief that gender roles definitely guided mate preferences and affected behavior as well. Gangestad, Haselton, and Buss (2006) found that as gender equality increased and roles changed, gender preferences in mate selection changed as well (women cared more for domestic skills rather than economic security). In corroboration with Gangestad et al., Moore and Cassidy (2007) stated that, as societal equality increased for women, their preferences shifted toward those of men (attractiveness). In less egalitarian societies, women preferred economic resources in their mates.

Culture-specific mate selection preferences. Culture could also be viewed as an intricate part of the gender differences in mate preferences. Toro-Morn and Sprecher (2003) defined culture as "a set of likely reactions of people who share a common mental programming and reflect a statistical tendency within a society" (p. 154). Gangestad, Haselton, and Buss (2006), in their study, established the fact that culture could be intertwined with the evolutionary and social theories, both of which formed the background for this current study on mate preferences. Findings from their study mirrored the results of previously mentioned studies regarding differences in mate preferences. In fact, Gangestad et al. (2006) concluded that "most endorse the idea that cultural and evolutionary views of behavior are complementary . . .not necessarily opposing, explanations" (p. 138).

In addition, other studies attested to the importance of culture in establishment of differences in mate preferences. Buss et al. (1989) found that Eastern European cultures valued domestic skills such as desire for home and children and keeping the house neat, and being refined and neat in all things. The study testified to the fact that "culture [appeared] to exert substantial effects on mate preferences . . .[and] culture accounted for an average of 14% of the variance" (Buss et al., 1989, p. 42). Culture could significantly affect long-term mate preferences in that individualistic societies (United States) expected their prospective long term partner to display more of those reproductive cues than do Eastern, collectivistic cultures like Romania (Buss et al., 1990). Likewise, Buss et al. also found that the religious affiliations and cultural values often directed the choices of marriage partners. Hofstede (1980) found in his research that the United States was individualistic and Romania was collectivistic in terms of the values they upheld.

This, in turn, corresponded with the differences Hofstede found in mate preferences among males and females about which he hypothesized. Stone, Shackelford, and Buss (2008) stipulated that people in lower SES countries (like Romania) were more traditionalistic and endorsed mate preferences such as good health, neatness, refinement, chastity, industriousness, ambition, desiring home and family, and religious similarity with less emphasis on mutual love and attraction. Likewise, Hatfield and Sprecher (1995) stated that cross-cultural researchers classified Western culture as individualistic and egalitarian (a tendency to value personal goals over collective goals and value love, sex, and intimacy), whereas Eastern cultures (of which Romania is one) tended to be more collectivistic (a tendency to subordinate personal goals to group goals and find love, sex, and intimacy to have threatened the social order). In addition, the collectivistic cultures tended to value hierarchy and authority and see men as dominant in society. Pongracz (2005) revealed that Romanians favored the traditional values which included gender roles. She found that values important to women were children and housework. Romanians proved to be traditionalists in that they believed in the traditional viewpoint that women took care of the house and children and men were the breadwinners and dominant in the marriage dyad. Negura (2009), in his study of the Romanian people, stipulated that, after the fall of communism in 1989, Romania became more individualistic in nature, but Ellis (2009) suggested that Romania still maintained its traditional prejudices against women, which could affect gender roles and, concomitantly, mate preferences. The history of Romania, with its social change and revolutions, could have indeed contributed the narrowed sex differences in certain areas of mate preferences. Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife, Elena, ruled Romania from 1967

to 1989. During their reign, the Romanians suffered "years of scarcity and oppression overseen by the megalomaniacal couple" (Bishop, 2014, p. 1 of 4). Bishop also stated that, after Ceausescu and his wife were executed following a Christmas Day revolution, Romania elected a new president, Klaus Iohannis, who fought corruption and strengthened the rule of law. Consequently, there was a more egalitarian society, and, because of this, Helmuth (2012) believed that sociocultural changes occurred and "the more egalitarian the country, the less likely men and women were to value [the] traditional qualities that Buss et al. believed to be innate . . .[and] the more egalitarian the country, the less constrained the people are by stereotyped sex roles" (p. 4 of 9). Thus, perhaps, the great revolution in Romania, along with its concomitant social changes, has tempered the genetically-predisposed legacies in mate preferences for long-term relationships. This could account for any deviations from the findings of the original studies of mate preferences within an evolutionary framework.

Similarly, Oprica (2008) contended that, in Romania, gender inequality still persisted even more so after the fall of communism due to people's ability to think for themselves, and the fact that people went back to traditionalist notions fueled by the Romanian Orthodox Church (women stayed home and were more submissive and men were dominant in society and the breadwinners). Likewise, Oprica saw Romanians as being in a transition which was occurring very slowly.

1.2 Acculturation

In addition to encompassing the evolutionary, social, and cultural perspectives as a theoretical background, this study also encompassed the concept of acculturation in comparison of the values of different generations of Romanians. Acculturation was

defined by Hall and Barongan (2002) as "the changes that groups and individuals undergo when they come into contact with another culture" (p. 21). Rudmin (2009) also defined acculturation as the "adoption and assimilation of an alien culture" (p. 2 of 4) and described it as a phenomenon that occurred at two levels: an individual level and a societal level. On an individual level, it was like a second culture acquisition, and, on a societal level, it was a process whereby whole cultures change when different cultural groups came into contact with changes in the culture of either or both groups. One of the models of acculturation as depicted by Hall and Barongan (2002) was assimilation, "which involves absorption into the dominant or more desirable culture" (p. 23). Because assimilation involved immigrants who voluntarily came to the United States and were willing to adopt a second culture rather than those who have been forced to immigrate and may or may not have chosen to adopt the second culture, this model of acculturation was more conducive to the understanding of the effect of culture on mate preferences. Participants of this study were those most of whom likely came to the United States voluntarily and were willing to participate in a second culture acquisition. Ataca and Berry (2002) and Stone and Buss (2008) in their studies both found that in the collectivistic Eastern European societies such as the Turkish society, low SES immigrants held on to their traditional values and gender roles when migrating to another country. Therefore, they were not as acculturated to their new environment as were those with higher SES who were inclined to endorse the less traditional mate preferences or those in stark contrast to those historically valued by men and women. Moreover, married people in Turkish society influenced their partner's attitudes when acculturating to society. These findings were pertinent to Romania which was deemed a relatively poorer country

since 27% were at absolute poverty, 11% in extreme poverty and one region (the Northeast) which had 40% poverty (Romanian Ministry of Public Health, 20-02-2007). Since Romania's fall of communism in 1989, the cultural context was in the slow process of transformation to a more westernized, individualistic, egalitarian, though still relatively poor society. Therefore, studying acculturation may also be a preliminary step to uncovering how gender roles may also be evolving in that country. Age could also have a moderating effect on the acculturation process in that older immigrants may endorse more traditional values than their younger counterparts (Phinney et al., 2001). In addition, Phinney et al. (2001) and Schwartz et al. (2006) pointed out in a study on acculturating immigrants that male immigrants generally acculturated faster to life and values of the American culture than do female immigrants (the latter who felt perpetually torn between conforming to new social norms and the adherence to those of their native lands). Conversely, Phinney et al. (2001) and Schwartz et al. (2006) concluded that female immigrants acculturated more slowly than male immigrants and therefore, early on, endorsed their traditional female values and then, as they became more acculturated, they endorsed the more nontraditional female values such as those highly similar to male values. Specific mate preferences like chastity retained or gained greater importance among immigrants as they acculturated to American society as this characteristic has been shown to be of utmost import in contemporary American society (Buss et al. 2001). Consequently, it could be said that sociocultural factors could help explain gender differences in mate preferences. This is due to the fact that sex role socialization and poorer economic opportunities for women appeared to support the findings of former studies that men preferred women who are young and attractive and women preferred

men who can provide material wealth. Consequently, all three perspectives (evolutionary, social, and cultural) were important to this study as a context for understanding the current questions and findings. As stated by Feingold (1990) "because evolutionary forces could shape sociocultural roles, the [three types] of explanations are not necessarily mutually exclusive" (p. 990).

By employing sociocultural and evolutionary theories, a background for this research study has been formulated, which helped determine and understand the gender differences in mate preferences among single, heterosexual Romanians.

1.3 Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct ethnically-oriented research in the area of mate preferences for single, heterosexual Romanians and learn more about how evolutionary, social, and cultural factors moderated the gender differences in mate preferences. This study endeavored to look at mate differences within a culture specific context (in this case, Romanian). Subsequent information obtained from this study revealed gender differences in mate preferences among heterosexual Romanian males and females who resided in the United States at various levels of acculturation. In this way, the study helped to reveal the effects of acculturation on the participants. Since Romanian societal views were still in the process of change to a more Westernized perspective, results from this study would shed more light as to where this society fell on the traditionalist -Westernized continuum.

In addition, findings from the research could add to the existing body of literature which concerned gender differences with regard to mate preferences among a specific cultural group (single, heterosexual Romanian couples) and Eastern European mate

preferences as a whole. Idiosyncratic nuances, such as age, SES, marital status and years lived in the United States, which have been determined to be correlated with Romanian mate preferences, were elucidated in order to establish a starting point for beginning to understand a broader picture of Romanian mate preferences. Because the current study was an ethnically-oriented research, it utilized the viewpoints of and added to the knowledge base that concerned mate preferences and culture type as this historically collectivistic culture may be different from that of the dominant American, individualistic culture. No known previous studies have looked at how the variable of acculturation directly moderated gender differences in mate preferences.

1.4 Definitions of Important Terms

Important terms incorporated into and defined by my study included the following:

Intersexual Selection (AKA epigamic selection) tendency of members of one sex to preferentially have chosen certain members of the opposite sex as mates

Panmixia random mating

Assortative Mating nonrandom mating on the basis of genotypic/phenotypic characteristics

Evolutionary Theory of Mate Preferences theory that preferred mate characteristics correlated with reproductive investment

Social theory of Mate Preferences theory that preferred mate characteristics are connected to the roles attributed to men and women in society ---roles that they are socialized to accept

Acculturation changes that groups/individuals underwent when coming into contact with another culture

Assimilation a model of acculturation that involved absorption into the dominant or most desirable culture

Intrinsic Characteristics (Interdependencies) attributes interior to a person such as personality attributes, emotional stability, and religion

Extrinsic Characteristics (Interdependencies) attributes exterior to a person such as physical attractiveness, wealth, and age

Individualistic Culture Western, egalitarian cultures which valued love, sex, intimacy, and personal goals

Collectivistic Culture Eastern cultures that did not value love, sex, intimacy but valued group goals over personal goals.

1.5 Statement of Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions and corresponding hypotheses to be evaluated by the findings of this study, consistent with an evolutionary, social role, cultural and acculturation framework included the following:

Research Question #1

What were the mate preferences of single, heterosexual male Romanians significantly endorsed over that of females?

Hypothesis for Question #1

It was hypothesized that Romanian men would indicate mate preferences that signified reproductive value. Correspondingly, target variables of physical attractiveness, good cook, housekeeper, and desire for home and children would be significantly more

endorsed by Romanian men than women and would all be shown to play a role in the respondents' way of answering.

Research Question #2

What were the mate preferences of single, heterosexual female Romanians significantly endorsed over that of males?

Hypothesis for Research Question #2

It was hypothesized that Romanian women would indicate mate preferences that signified a "culturally successful" man. Correspondingly, target variables that signaled good financial prospects, favorable social status or rating, ambitiousness, and industriousness would be significantly more endorsed by Romanian women than men, and this would also be evident in the study's findings.

Research Question #3

How were Romanian male mate preferences moderated by acculturation to American society?

Hypothesis for Question #3

It was hypothesized that acculturation may have had a moderating effect on the predicted Romanian male and female mate preferences that were based on the basic tenets evolutionary and social role/cultural theories. Further, since male immigrants generally acculturated faster than female immigrants to the life and values of the American culture, it was hypothesized that, as they acculturated, they tended to value the non-traditional mate preferences (financial wealth, education) to a stronger degree than their female counterparts and preferences such as Good Looks or Housekeeping were endorsed to a lesser degree. Variables such as age at immigration (i.e., older vs. younger

immigrants) may also have had a moderating effect on the results as well as to nullify any significant deviance from traditional sex-linked mate preferences.

Research Question #4

How were Romanian female mate preferences moderated by acculturation to American Society?

Hypothesis for Question #4

It was hypothesized that acculturation may have had little interaction effect on the predicted Romanian female mate preferences based on evolutionary and social role/cultural theories. Further, since female immigrants generally acculturated slower to life and the values of the American culture than do male immigrants, it was hypothesized that Romanian female immigrants may still place slightly more value on those mate preferences associated with more prototypical traditional female values such as favorable social standing or education. Likewise, as with male mate preferences and acculturation, variables such as age at time of immigration may have had a moderating effect on these results.

1.6 Limitations of the Research

The research on mate preferences among Romanian males and females had some inherent limitations and weaknesses. First and foremost, there was the problem of generalizing results. This research was merely a preliminary step in understanding Romanian mate preferences and the role they played in human mating because it was limited to a convenience sampling of one cultural group that resided in a few sparse regions in the United States. More research needs to be done so as to ascertain the patterns of mate preferences and the effect of evolutionary and sociocultural factors on

them for those Romanians still living in Romania and those living in vastly different areas of the United States. Relatedly, another limitation of the study was the lack of a representation by other demographic groups apart of the Romanian community such as homosexual or married Romanians. The input of such a group could significantly alter the findings. In addition, more longitudinal research was needed to determine if the socialization process encouraged males and females to be more unified or even diametrically opposed in the traits they valued as Romanian society became more egalitarian towards women.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Previous studies that concern the topic of gender differences in traits desired in a mate have been conducted by social psychologists, sociologists, family researchers, and evolutionary biologists for several years. Some of these studies have been conducted with small, non-representative and nonprobability samples and some with national probability samples that utilized both married and single adults all within the context of various cultures. The purpose of this chapter was to review the body of knowledge accumulated thus far which regarded mate preferences for the provision of the context for this study's research hypotheses and for establishment of the conceptual basis for the current research questions.

2.1 Gender Differences in Mate Preferences

Seminal studies. Numerous research studies have explored the topic of gender differences in mate preferences. Seminal studies that research preferences in mate selection showed a generally high degree of consensus and similarity in outcomes. The findings of these studies suggested that there was a "generational stability in criteria used in mate selection . . . [which further proves that] a child . . . cannot escape the ideas conditioned in him . . . [because] social change in the area of mate selection has not been

as great as indicated by the press, feared by the parent, and perhaps hoped for by the youth" (Hudson & Henze, 1969, p. 775). The findings of the studies by Hill (1945), McGinnis (1958), and Hudson and Henze (1969) showed a high degree of similarity with only minor differences being attributed to changes in values and the orientation toward the family.

An excellent seminal research study of mate preferences in mate selection was conducted by Hill (1941) at the University of Chicago. In 1939-1940, Hill administered a questionnaire to 600 students so their attitudes toward sex and marriage could be obtained. The areas of inquiry chosen by Hill included attributes desirable in a mate, preferred age at marriage, and number of children hoped for. Findings of the study showed that, generally speaking, men wanted a mate younger than themselves, and women wanted a mate older than themselves. Likewise, both men and women agreed that having less than 3 children was not desirable since both desired to have three or more children (women's average 3.50 and men's 3.28). "There was almost no support for the 'companionate' family, even less for the one child family" (Hill, 1941, p. 556). Gender differences were also found with regard to certain traits desired in a mate. Women emphasized the following traits more than men: ambition and industriousness (rated 3rd and men rated it 8th) education and general intelligence, and good financial prospects, which showed a strong preference for resource acquisition. Men, on the other hand, placed more emphasis than women on the following traits: good cook and housekeeper, good looks, and desire for home and family, which showed a strong preference for reproductive capacity. These findings foreshadowed those of later studies on mate preferences, which stated that there was greater female preference for mates displayed

cues to high resource potential (education and financial prospects) and greater male preference for mates displayed cues to high reproductive capacity (good looks and desire for family). These findings all appeared to be in sync with the evolutionary theory that indicated that gender differences in mate preferences represented "adaptations to sex-differentiated reproductive constraints found in our evolutionary past" (p. 45).

In a follow-up study that concerned campus values in mate selection, McGinnis (1959) also used a questionnaire that surveyed students concerning their attitudes toward sex and marriage. However, whereas Hill's (1939) study involved giving the questionnaire to students in the classroom, McGinnis sent the questionnaire by mail to each member of the sample. McGinnis stated concerning this difference in dissemination of the questionnaires that "it should be safe to conclude that any differences in outcome resulting from this inconsistency must be trivial" (p. 369). Students in the study were asked to rate each of 18 personal characteristics as to their indispensability in a mate, and the mean ratings were computed for each. Comparisons with the 1939 study were made with regard to preferable age at marriage, difference in ages between marriage partners, and the number of children wanted. Findings showed that McGinnis's evaluation of the 18 personal characteristics were more similar to those of Hill's study than expected. In fact, there was "no marked change in consensus between the sexes in the relative importance of the 18 characteristics" (McGinnis, p. 369). However, there was some marked changes in that similar religious background and interests obtained the greatest increase in rank (increase of three positions) and chastity obtained the greatest decrease in rank (a decrease of three rank positions among men and five among women). With regard to age at marriage, there was no change in preferred age among males, but there

was evidence of a lower age at first marriage for females. A slight change with regard to age difference between husband and wife occurred in that preferences indicated the husband should be older but only one year older from the male point of view and two years older from the female point of view. Both men and women preferred a greater number of children in 1956 from 1939, but the increase in number of children was small. McGinnis hypothesized that these differences reflected changes in values and a change in the orientation toward the family---the companionship family form was, in 1956, more important than the traditional family form of 1939.

In their study of campus values with regard to mate selection, Hudson and Henze (1969) conducted an investigation on four campuses in widely separated geographic regions: three in the United States (University of Nebraska at Omaha, Arizona State University, and State University of New York at Stony Brook) and one in Canada (University of Alberta in Edmonton). A questionnaire was mailed to each of the 566 students in the study (337 males and 229 females). The questions they were asked dealt with age at the time of marriage, age difference between husband and wife, number of children desired, and 18 characteristics to be ranked (0-4) according to the degree of importance in choosing a mate. Findings showed that there was a preference for marriage at an earlier age than indicated in the previous seminal studies. Also, both males and females agreed that a husband should be older than the wife, but women preferred a greater age gap than men. In addition, women preferred more children than men but, overall, the trend was more children wanted in 1956 than 1939 and fewer children wanted in 1967 than in 1956 or 1939. For the most part, men and women rated the 18 personal characteristics in much the same way as the previous seminal studies (3

maintained the same rank and 11 did not vary by more than one place). Chastity declined to a greater degree than any other characteristic for both men and women. Males placed more emphasis on good looks than in any of the earlier seminal studies, and mutual attraction, good cook/housekeeper, and similar educational background moved consistently upward from 1939-1967. Females evaluated the 18 characteristics in much the same way as did those in 1939 and 1956 with emotional stability and dependability ranked highest and good looks and political background ranked the lowest. Chastity decreased to a greater extent than any other characteristic with education and intelligence showed the greatest fluctuation among the female respondents (9th in 1939, 14th in 1956, and 7th in 1967). Hudson and Henze went on to say that, generally speaking, "there has been a striking consistency in student evaluation of desired traits in a mate" (p. 775). From their findings, Hudson and Henze concluded that "the overall decline in . . . age at first marriage is probably a reflection of . . . economic conditions and the current high values placed on marriage" (p. 775). Furthermore, the age gap between husband and wife had narrowed due to the socialization process whereby young people were encouraged by parents and schools to get dating partners from the same age/social group.

Mate preferences for extrinsic values (1980's, 1990's, 2000 and beyond). Most of the studies on mate preferences undertaken in the 1980's, 1990's and 2000 and beyond indicated a male and female preference for a mate based on extrinsic values and the fact that they signaled reproductive value as well as resource acquisition. Men generally preferred physical attractiveness in women and women preferred men who could provide economic resources or at least the ambitiousness and determination with the acquisition

of such resources. Studies from 2005 on tended to show a trend toward more of an appreciation for the intrinsic values such as a pleasing disposition and emotional stability.

A comprehensive study about mate preferences that indicated shifts in selection criteria was conducted by Hoyt and Hudson (1981). This 1981 study tracked a total of 316 undergraduate sociology students and their self-reported preferences in "ideal" mates. They found overall preferences for physical attractiveness with men reported an even stronger preference for an attractive mate than the women. However, they also found that both sexes wanted more intelligent, better educated mates and a sociable mate as well since both men and women had "a greater exposure to a wider variety of social situations" (p. 95). Dependable character and emotional stability proved to be enduring criteria that maintained a stable degree of importance longitudinally. Departures from traditional findings included the fact that men did not put great emphasis on women being good cooks and housekeepers, and chastity was not a great concern to either sex. The authors concluded that these breaks from tradition were indicative of the fact "that married women [did] not change roles when they [became] gainfully employed, they only [added] roles (p. 95). Furthermore, they concluded that changes in mate preferences over time reflected social phenomena such as shifts in sex roles, mass media influences, idealization of romantic love, and the ever-changing social and economic conditions in society.

In exploration of human mate preferences and gender differences in mate preferences, Buss and Barnes (1986) completed a study of two heterosexual samples each of which utilized a different methodology and a differently composed sample. In the first sample, the study was composed of 184 individuals (92 married couples between the ages

of 18 and 40). The couples were tested in groups ranging from one to seven couples. Several measures were included in the assessment battery. Four data sources were used for assess the characteristics of each couple. Standard personality tests and background characteristics were assessed by self-reports. In the second sample, 100 unmarried undergraduates of a west coast university (50 males and 50 females) between the ages of 18 and 23 completed two questionnaires concerned their preferred characteristics in a potential mate. One questionnaire was free-form in which subjects were asked to list in order the 10 most desirable characteristics in a potential mate. The second questionnaire was a ranking procedure in which subjects ranked characteristics from 1 (most desirable) to 13 (least desirable). Results of the study showed that, with regard to sex differences, women tended to prefer certain spouse characteristics which were more inherently intrinsic such as considerate, honest, dependable, kind, understanding, good earning capacity, and ambitious. Men, on the other hand, preferred more extrinsic spouse characteristics such as physically attractive, good cook, and frugal. The second sample corroborated the findings of the first. Women more than men preferred males who showed good earning potential and were college-educated. Men more than women preferred mates who were physically attractive.

In an extension of the research of Buss and Barnes (1986), Howard, Blumstein, and Schwartz (1987) examined mate preferences in both heterosexual and homosexual couples to further elucidate "the adequacy of the social and evolutionary theories in explaining human mate preferences" (p. 194). The sample consisted of 4314 heterosexual, married couples and co-habitators, 969 male homosexual couples, and 788 lesbian couples. Each partner independently completed a lengthy questionnaire dealt

with a variety of topics. Respondents were asked questions concerning partner preferences on 14 - 9 point scales which ranged from 1- not important to 9- extremely important. The levels of preference for partner characteristics were computed. The degree of consensual mate preferences was obtained through the computation of levels of preference for partner characteristics. Correlations between ideal partner characteristics and satisfaction with the relationship were then computed. Findings of the study by Howard et al. showed that women had stronger preferences than men for expressive and ambitious mates or mates with professional status. Men preferred attractive mates more than did the women. These results were consistent with an evolutionary perspective since they "[mirrored] the presumed reproductive concerns of both men and women" (p. 199). Because homosexual couples had stronger preferences for expressiveness and athleticism than heterosexual couples, the study showed that "sex of the partner . . .[had] significant effects on partner preferences . . ." (p. 199). Furthermore, these effects illustrated how culture shapes the differences in mate preferences between men and women. Thus, according to Howard et al. (1987), the high correlation between partner preferences and relationship satisfaction extolled the adequacy of the social perspective. The social perspective stipulated that those traits in a mate that acted as cues to marital survival and satisfaction are preferred more than those that are unrelated or negatively correlated with relationship survival, and the use of homosexual couples in addition to heterosexual couples in this study helped to further extol the adequacy of the social perspective in understanding human mate preferences.

Wiederman and Allgeier (1992) tested the structural powerlessness hypothesis as an explanation for women's greater emphasis on financial stability and earning power in

a mate. The structural powerlessness hypothesis helped explain the gender differences in mate selection as indicated by Caporael who stated "Males and females have identical [mate selection] preferences, but social structural arrangements produce gender differences" (as cited in Weiderman & Allgeier p. 117). That is to say, men's preference for physical attractiveness in a mate and women's relative preference for economic stability and resources in a mate "may be a byproduct of the culturally determined differential economic status of men versus women" (Weiderman & Allgeier, p. 117). Weiderman went on to explain that, generally speaking, if women were excluded from power and were seen as objects of exchange, then they would have sought mates who possessed traits associated with power and earning capacity so they could improve their economic status. Men, on the other hand, valued the quality of the "exchange object" itself and would therefore have valued physical attractiveness in a mate. To carry out the study, samples of college students (N=997) and community members (N=282) were used. Respondents were given questionnaires and asked to report expected personal income and to rate, on a Likert-type scale, the importance of listed characteristics in a potential mate. Results were consistent with previous studies in that "men placed more emphasis on the item 'good looks'; whereas women placed more importance on the item 'good financial prospect'" (p. 115).

Using data from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Sprecher, Sullivan, and Hatfield (1994) asked respondents to consider 12 possible assets or liabilities (8 of which were related to physical attractiveness, youth, and earning potential) in a marriage partner indicated their willingness to marry someone with the indicated traits. This study represented a heterogeneous sample of the national

population and compared gender differences among different sociodemographic groups. The major findings of the study were consistent across age groups and races. These findings included the fact that men were more willing than women to marry someone younger by five years, someone not likely to hold a steady job, someone who earned less, and someone who was less educated. Women, more than men, were willing to marry someone not good-looking, someone older by five years, someone who earned more than they did, and someone with more education. What's more, women were more willing than men to marry someone who already had children most likely because women's fertile years are limited. These results were consistent with two theoretical perspectives: the evolutionary perspective in which men preferred mates with traits signaled reproductive value (physical attractiveness, youth) and women preferred men with traits signaled ability to provide resources (potential for resource accumulation) and the sociocultural perspective or women's lack of access to societal resources as compared to men along with the traditional sex role socialization.

Through a detailed analysis of lonely heart advertisements, Bereczkei, Voros, Gal, and Bernath (1997) found that mate preferences of males and females were indicative of a "bargaining" of reproductive values. Females preferred resources in males, and males preferred attractiveness in females. However, the more attractive a female was, the more financial and occupational status they required in a male. Likewise, the more resources a male had, the greater the demands he made for an attractive partner. In terms of long-term commitment (marriage), both males and females placed greater importance to cues of family commitment rather than resources or physical attractiveness.

One of the most robust findings concerned gender differences in mate preferences among heterosexual long-term mating partners was formulated by Okami and Shackelford (2001) in their review of mate preference studies. The findings of a conglomerate of previous studies were also consistent with the evolutionary-based theory in which men valued physical attractiveness in a female mate and women valued social status and financial resources in a male mate. In this review by Okami and Shackelford, it was stated that "men, more than women, [valued] a mate's youth and physical attractiveness; women more than men, in contrast, [valued] a mate's social status, ability to acquire resources, and willingness to share them" (p. 195-196).

In a longitudinal study encompassed a span of 57 years, Buss, Shackleford, Kirkpatrick, and Larsen (2001) found that cultural changes created an important impact on values and mate preferences. Built on existing data on mate preferences, new data were collected in 1984/1985 and again in 1996 at geographically diverse locations. In the 1984-1985 study, four convenience samples of 1496 undergraduates (642 males and 854 females) rated the importance of 18 mate characteristics using a 4-point scale from 3 points (indispensable) to 0 points (irrelevant or unimportant). A second study completed in 1996 enlisted three convenience samples of 607 undergraduates (226 men and 381 women) who completed the same survey as those in the first study. Different regions of the United States showed a difference in values placed on a marriage partner. For example, Texans placed a greater value on chastity, social status, good financial prospects, and similar religious backgrounds. Consistent differences in mate preferences for the genders were found in that males in all samples placed greater importance on the extrinsic qualities of good looks or physical attractiveness, and women in all samples

placed greater importance on both the extrinsic quality of good financial prospects and the intrinsic quality of ambition and industriousness. Lastly, there was similarity across cultures and generations on the way the values were ordered. This study revealed that, though there was some convergence between the sexes on values in regards to mate preferences, there was much consistency because "several characteristics showed nearly identical levels of valuation across all six generations of assessments" (Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001, p. 502). The intrinsic values of dependable character, emotional stability, and pleasing disposition remained high priorities at all time periods. According to Buss et al. (2001), the stability of gender differences in mate preferences along with the convergence in prioritizing valued mate characteristics in this study showed "the value of an interactionist approach that integrates 'evolutionary' factors with 'cultural' factors" (p. 502).

Sprecher and Regan (2002) conducted a study that dealt with partner preferences in a romantic/sexual relationship. Their study examined the degree to which various characteristics are desired in five types of relationships including marriage partners. Participants in the study were 700 men and women who indicated their preference for several attributes on a questionnaire arranged on a Likert-type scale. Each participant received a list of 14 traits and indicated how important it was to obtain a partner with the desired level of each attribute. Results of the study revealed that participants preferred higher levels of extrinsic characteristics such as physical attractiveness, social status attributes, and intrinsic personality traits of warmth, expressiveness, humor, and intelligence.

Further data about mate preferences was provided by a commercial dating service for adult singles that lived in major metropolitan areas. Kurzban and Weeden (2004) completed a study in which data from 10, 526 participants in Hurry Date sessions was collected. In each session, 25 men and 25 women interacted for three minutes with each other. After these interactions, each indicated which people he/she would most likely have contact with in the future. General survey information was collected by Hurry Date for all participants along with additional survey information for 2650 participants. Results showed that both males and females preferred extrinsic rather than intrinsic characteristics in a mate or dating partner. These conclusions were based on the findings that the physically observable attributes were valued most (attractiveness, BMI, weight, age) and the harder to observe attributes were not so highly valued (education, education, desire for future children).

To study the temporal stability of mate preferences within a small sample of married couples, Shackelford, Schmitt, and Buss (2005a) conducted a research in which mate preferences were assessed during the first year of marriage and again during the fourth year of marriage (three years later). Two assessments of both members of 27 married couples were given in the newlywed year and three years later. Newlyweds rated the importance of each of 18 characteristics of a long term mate from 3 (indispensable) to 0 (unimportant). Participants also provided their age and completed a three-item assessment of current marital satisfaction. At the three-year follow-up, couples were mailed and asked to complete the same mate preference survey they completed three years earlier. After completion, the surveys were sent back to the researcher in a stamped, pre-addressed envelope. Results of the study showed that most mate

preferences remained stable from the newlywed year to the fourth year of marriage. Men placed a higher importance upon physical attractiveness of a marital partner, and this importance of physical attractiveness (extrinsic factor) significantly increased over time. Women placed importance on good financial prospects, and this extrinsic factor increased slightly over time. Men provided higher ratings for dependable character. Likewise, at the three-year follow-up, both sexes placed greater importance upon agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and a pleasing disposition (all intrinsic factors).

As stipulated in previous studies, more recent studies also determined that men more than women valued physical attractiveness and women, more than men valued social status and the ability and willingness to provide financial stability. Li, Yong, Tov, Sng, Fletcher, Valentine, Jiang, and Balliet (2013) used speed dating and online messaging that determined differences in mate preferences. Results of the study showed that "social status increased women's—but not men's—assessment of partner romantic desirability and yessing (p. 764) . . . and more physical attractiveness . . . led to men reporting higher romantic desirability and yessing than women did" (p. 769). "Yessing" in that context meant an agreement to meet face to face. Therefore, more physical attractiveness in a target caused men to have an increased romantic interest more so than women. However, "higher social status increased women's romantic interest more than it did men's" (Li et al., 2013, p. 771). These findings gave greater credence to the mate preference priority model and the evolutionary perspective on mate preferences. Likewise, they gave much "validity to . . .research that previously found preferences for physical attractiveness and social status to be sex-differentiated" (Li et al., 2013, p. 772).

Li et al. concluded that there were "indeed sex-differentiated preferences that "do indeed predict mate selection decisions" (p. 774).

Likewise, Meltzer, McNulty, Jackson, and Karney (2014) in their study stated that "sexual selection theory and the parental investment theory suggest that partner physical attractiveness should more strongly affect men's relationship outcomes" (p. 435). Studies designed to test this premise must, however, have meet certain methodological demands. Therefore, for it to be show that men valued partner attractiveness more than women within a long-term reproductively viable relationship, Meltzer et al. (2014) conducted studies that tested this sex difference by used three important criteria: (a) participants in long-term relationships, (b) women of child-bearing age, (c) measures of physical attractiveness accessed observable aspects of appearance. Seven methodological standards were applied to meet these criteria According to Meltzer et al. (2014), males needed fertile partners to meet the reproductive challenge as stated in the sexual selection theory (Darwin, 1871) and the parental investment theory (Trivers, 1972). According to these theories, Meltzer et al. believed that physical attractiveness and the visible aspects of female physical appearance were all indicative of a fertile partner for the men. Likewise, women would identify long-term partners as those "willing and able to provide resources to support child-rearing" (p. 436). Results of the study conducted by Meltzer et al. showed that "sex differences in preferences for partner physical attractiveness . . . [were found] to emerge in the context of long-term relationships compared with short-term relationships . . . given that there [were] no sex differences in preferences for a physically attractive partner in short-term relationships . . ." (p. 436). Furthermore, these sex differences in mate preference based on physical attractiveness were observed

because the study involved younger couples and the "sex differences . . . should emerge in reaction to observable indicators of physical attractiveness . . ." (p.437). Meltzer et al. concluded that sex differences in mate preferences occurred when the research test used measures of physical attractiveness that accessed observable aspects of partner appearance in young couples involved in a long-term relationship, but these differences disappeared when "measures of partner physical attractiveness . . . are confounded with other information that may be more important to women, older couples, and/or couples involved in short-term relationships . . ." (p. 439).

In a replication of a study undertaken by Sprecher, Sullivan, and Hatfield (1994), which found that sex differences in mate preferences for long-term relationships conformed to an evolutionary framework, Sorensen and Pollet (2016) examined if the findings of the previous study of Sprecher et al. were replicable with a different sample twenty years later. For this to be accomplished this, Sorensen and Pollet (2016) devised a study with participants recruited through a crowdsourcing site. These participants signed online consent forms and answered sociodemographic questions that concerned sex, age, ethnicity, education, citizenship, religion, sexual orientation, and relationship status. Sorensen and Pollet (2016) found that there were indeed "stable sex differences in long term mate preferences in line with an evolutionary framework" (p. 171). However, they also found "narrowed sex differences" for mate preferences that concerned ethnicity and education which suggested that "social change" and "societal norms" affected mate preferences (p. 171) since these differences were not present in the original study. In line with the study of Sprecher et al, (1994), Sorensen and Pollet (2016) found that women more than men were willing to marry someone older with high earning potential;

whereas, men, more than women, emphasized physical attractiveness and youth in their choice of a long-term mate. Despite the similarities of the two studies, there were contrasts between the two studies since "the overall magnitude of the sex differences [seemed] smaller" (Sorensen & Pollet, 2016, p. 174). For example, "sex differences in willingness to marry someone of a different race or with less education had narrowed" (p. 174). Sorensen and Pollet (2016) attributed these contrasts between the two studies to "shifting sociocultural changes (e.g. norms) . . . [and] broader social changes in stereotypes" (p. 174). Thus, the findings of Sorensen and Pollet (2016) indicated that mate preferences are in line with the evolutionary theory and did indeed evolve over time but are "malleable to socioeconomic temporal trends" (p. 175).

Mate preferences for intrinsic values and those contradicting evolutionary theory 1980's, 1990's 2000 and beyond. In some studies that were undertaken in the 1980's, 1990's and early 2000's, there appeared to be some inconsistencies with the findings of their counterpart studies. It was hypothesized that, as socioeconomic circumstances changed, so too did the characteristics that men and women valued in a mate, and results of some studies showed a preponderance for the intrinsic values over the extrinsic values. What's more, since they were more economically independent, women changed their opinions as to what characteristics were important in a mate. Though the present study did not focus on the evaluation of intrinsic mate preferences among the sexes, these researchers' findings were none the less important in the understanding of mate preferences.

Two studies examined the role of male body shape (defined as Waist-to-Hip-Ratio or WHR) in determination of female mate preferences which were undertaken by

Singh (1995). In study one, 87 women (68 white and 19 Hispanic) aged 18 to 22 volunteered to participate as part of undergraduate course requirements. These participants were shown 12 line drawings of males represented four levels of WHR (.7, .8, .9, 1.0) and three levels of body weight (normal, underweight, overweight). The remaining facial and bodily features were held constant. The female participants ranked all 12 figures from 1 (most attractive) to 12 (least attractive). Then the participants indicated their top three and bottom three rankings. In study two, 158 women ages 18 to 69 and predominantly white Caucasian (n=141) with a few Hispanics (n=17) served as respondents to ranked figures for attractiveness and healthiness. Likewise, participants were asked that figures be rated according to their willingness to engage in each of six types of relationship on a scale from 0 (not willing) to 9 (very willing). Both studies were similar in their findings. Results showed that, in determination of mate choice, women's mate preferences were similar across age, educational levels, family income, and marital status. However, unlike previous research in which men valued physical attractiveness, more than women (Shackelford et al., 2005; Okami & Shackelford, 2001; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Sprecher & Regan, 2002), results showed that women preferred men who were attractive (men with high WHR) and had a higher financial status indicated that both characteristics influenced female mate preferences. Therefore, there were both consistencies and inconsistencies with previous findings on mate preferences.

In a study conducted by Laner and Russell (1998), gender differences in mate preferences and best friends were examined. Participants of the study were 350 unmarried college students in a Courtship and Marriage class of a southwest university. The sample consisted of 126 men and 224 women (all ages 18-44) and was about 95%

Caucasian. All were asked to complete a questionnaire which contained demographic questions and a list of 23 characteristics one would want in a best friend or spouse. The participants were asked to mark with an "X" the six qualities (no more than six) they would definitely want in a spouse. Response bias was eliminated with the placement of the 23 characteristics in reverse sequence on half of the questionnaires. Men's and women's responses were analyzed separately, and proportional T-test analysis was used so that differences in spouse and best friend characteristics between and within the sexes could be found. Contrary to many previous findings, desired characteristics for a marriage partner and best friend overlapped, and the traits selected by men and women were very similar. In addition, Laner and Russell (1998) found that men valued sensitivity and warmth as a "'must have' quality in a spouse but rejected it in a best friend—in contrast to women who selected those[intrinsic] qualities for both spouses and best friends" (p. 198).

Dagmar (2001) studied the relationship of SES and gender to mate preferences in both female and male university students in Germany. The female students (n=243) and male students (n=351) from the German university were given a questionnaire (The Partner Choice Questionnaire) in order that data would be obtained on sociodemographic variables and mate preferences. A socioeconomic approach was used to describe gender differences in mate preferences since results indicated that although men preferred physical attractiveness, "women [did] not value the indicators of economic resources . . .consistently higher than men . . .and that Ss with lower SES placed more value on partner resources than [did] Ss with higher SES" (Dagmar, 2001, p. 95). Consequently,

their study revealed that, dependent on socioeconomic circumstances, women may not value social status or economic resources as most important.

Strassberg and Holty (2003) found a sharp contrast to the results of most research on gender differences in mate preferences. Personal ads were placed on an Internet Bulletin Board. Participants were 507 males who responded to four female seeking male (FSM) ads. The four ads used were original---the first one classified as the control and the other three were worded slightly different but equivalent to the first. The three experimental FSM ads added descriptors so that they were classified as the Slim/Attractive Ad, the Sensual/Passionate Ad, and the Successful/Ambitious Ad. The four ads were organized onto six possible paired combinations, and then each pair was posted to each of the two Internet personal ad bulletin boards for several days and then replaced by the next pair. In this way, each ad was posted for six weeks. The responses made by the males were then tabulated. Results showed that the most popular ad of females was one in which the woman described herself as "financially independent . . .successful [and] ambitious" (p. 253). Because physical attractiveness and youth were not the sought-after characteristics as in most personal ads, it would seem that, at least in the world of Internet Bulletin Board personals, an attractive woman, though still in demand, "seems to have less to offer . . .men than does her successful and ambitious counterpart" (Strassberg & Holty, p. 259).

Hasenkamp, Kummerling, and Hassebrauch (2005) conducted a study in which mate preferences were obtained from 57 individuals blind from birth (30 women and 27 men) and 62 sighted individuals (32 women and 30 men). These preferences were assessed via telephone interviews. Telephone interviews were used because individuals

blind from birth were incapable of perceiving physical attractiveness visually. Results showed that physical attractiveness was more important to blind women than blind men and seeing men valued physical attractiveness and material security more than blind men. These findings somewhat corroborated the precepts of the evolutionary theory and its emphasis on reproductive strategies and those of the social theory with its emphasis on structural powerlessness and equity. However, women's usual concern for earning capacity in a mate in provision of resources for progeny and men's usual concern for physical attractiveness in a mate were not strictly adhered to. Therefore, the results of this study suggested that the level of vision or some other variable may be at work here.

2.2 Cross-Cultural Studies

Cross-cultural; studies of mate preferences of the 1980's and 1990's. In alignment with the evolutionary perspective, cross-cultural studies of the 80's and 90's showed that males preferred physical attractiveness in females as a cue to their reproductive capacity. Females valued earning potential in males as cues to a high resource potential/acquisition as found in previous studies.

Several studies have explored mate preferences across cultures and different ethnic groups in order that both common threads and differences in mate preferences running through various groups located in diverse locations are found. In a cross-cultural study, which exceeded prior studies in many variables, Buss (1989) obtained 37 samples from 33 countries located on six continents and five islands. In all, there was a total of 10,047 participants that represented mean ages of 17 to 29 and a diversity of geographic, cultural, political, ethnic, religious, racial, and economic groups. Sampling techniques varied across countries (some were high school students, some were couples applying for

marriage license, some were obtained from newspaper ads, and so on.) Two instruments were used---one which revealed factors in choosing a mate and one which revealed preferences concerning potential mates. This procedure minimized the biasing effects of any particular sampling procedure. Data were collected by the natural residents and mailed to the United States for statistical analysis. The first instrument consisted of three parts. The first part was biographical data (age, sex, religion, marital status, number of siblings). The second part contained information on the age at which a respondent preferred to marry, the age difference preferred between self and spouse, who the respondent preferred to be older (self or spouse), and how many children were desired. The third part asked the respondents that each of the 18 characteristics on a 4-point scale (3= indispensable to 0= irrelevant or unimportant). The second instrument was developed from a factor analysis of a 76 item instrument (Gough 1973) and the subjects were asked that each characteristic be rank each characteristic according to its desirability in a mate from 1= least desirable characteristic in a mate to 13= most desirable characteristic in a potential mate. All terms applied to either sex and were "sex-neutral" in nature. Research collaborators translated the two instruments into the appropriate language. Results showed internationally consistent sex-linked differences in mate preferences which were "among the most robust psychological sex differences of any kind ever documented across cultures" (p. 13).

In a study reiterated that of Buss (1989), Buss et al. (1990) identified the effects of both culture and gender on mate preferences with the use of world-wide samples (37 samples from 33 different countries). Once again, gender differences were found in the value attached to earning potential (preferred by women) and physical attractiveness

(preferred by men). Both findings supported the evolution-based hypothesis which was concerned with the importance of reproductive value in mates (youth, attractiveness) and their resources. Results of the study revealed support for the hypothesis that males and females did indeed differ in reproductive strategies. Females overwhelmingly preferred mates that displayed cues to high resource potential or acquisition, and males preferred mates that displayed cues to high reproductive capacity (attractiveness, maternal skills). Results also revealed support for the importance of culture's effects on mate preference, as 14% of the variance across the 31 mate characteristics studied, was accounted for by culture. From this study, it was clear that there was cross-cultural evidence of gender differences in reproductive strategies.

Hatfield and Sprecher (1995) conducted another cross-cultural study in which survey data on young, single college students from three different universities in the United States, Russia, and Japan was gathered. The sample consisted of 1519 subjects (634 men and 885 women) who completed a questionnaire in which respondents were asked to rate 12 characteristics desired in a partner on a five-point scale (from 1—It does not matter if my partner has this characteristic to 5—This would be a necessity). A choosiness index was obtained by averaging the subjects' ratings across items. "The higher the index, the more demanding the subject can be considered to be . . . for the traits that were listed" (Hatfield & Sprecher, p. 739). Findings of this study showed the importance of both gender and culture on mate selection. Results of the study also revealed that men in all cultures rated the extrinsic characteristic of physical attractiveness as more important than did women. In all cultures, women rated intelligence, ambition, potential for success, money, status, position, kindness,

understanding, expressiveness, and openness (both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics) as more important than did men. In addition, Western, individualistic cultures like the United States demanded more of mates than those in mixed or collectivistic cultures like Japan and Russia.

Cross-cultural studies from 2000 and beyond. Cross-cultural studies undertaken in the year 2000 and beyond showed that males and females, on a cross-cultural level, began valuing intrinsic rather than extrinsic values more in a mate. Even though physical attractiveness and resources were both considered important in a mate, dependability, kindness, warmth, and understanding were also valued. These later cross-cultural studies showed how the cross-cultural mate preferences related to the socioeconomic development of a region as seen in the fact that those in less developed regions valued religious background and desire for home and family more than those in well-developed regions. Thus, the universality of certain mate preferences seen in the cross-cultural studies of the 1980's and 1990's became questionable in later cross-cultural studies.

Khallid (2005) replicated the cross-cultural study of Buss et al. (2001) with the use of an Arab Jordanian context. In his study, Khallid found that Jordanian male students showed a greater interest in youth and physical attractiveness, whereas female students preferred mates with economic stability and ability, commitment, and economic resources. Findings were interpreted from an evolutionary perspective in which mate selection was determined by different male and female sexual strategies, which evolved due to different challenges men and women encountered in mating. Khallid concluded that men valued physical attractiveness due to its cue to reproductive capacity, and

women valued mates who could provide resources due to the extensive parental investment they made in children.

So that universal mate preference dimensions would be identified, Shackelford, Schmitt, and Buss (2005b) used an archival database of preference ratings provided by several thousand participants from 36 cultures on six continents and five islands. All participants varied greatly in demographic variables (educational level, ethnicity, religion, political and economic work environment). Participants of the study from 37 cultures were 4499 men and 5310 women who ranged in age from 17 to 30. Eighty-six per cent of the men and women were currently unmarried. The participants were given a survey to assess mate preferences. They rated the importance of 18 mate characteristics on a four- point scale (3= indispensable, 2 = important, 1 = desirable but not very important, 0 = irrelevant or unimportant). Lastly, the instruments were translated into the appropriate language for their sample. Consistent with previous findings on mate preferences, Shackelford et al, (2005b) found that women, more than men, valued dependability, stability, social status, intelligence, and financial resources in a marriage partner. Conversely, men, more than women, valued good looks, health, and a desire for home and children. Men also valued the intrinsic qualities of kindness and warmth identified in the previous research work of Buss and Barnes (1986). This study was especially important because it identified "the cross-culturally universal structure of human mate preferences using a database that [included] the preference ratings of several thousand men and women from around the world" (Shackelford et al., 2005, p. 457).

Stone, Shackelford, and Buss (2008) explored the cross-cultural context of a country's socioeconomic development to determine mate preferences. Participants in the

study were 4499 men and 5310 women resided in 36 cultures on six continents and five islands. Both men and women ranged in age from 17-30. A survey was completed by each participant in which the respondent rated the importance of 18 mate preference characteristics on a four-point scale (3= indispensible, 2= important, 1= desirable but not important, 0= irrelevant or unimportant). An index of socioeconomic development was calculated which resulted in four common development indicators---a measure which strongly mediated women's marital opportunities. Their study revealed that "the effects of culture on mate preferences are potentially generally greater than those of biological sex" (Stone, Shackelford, & Buss, p. 448). Results of the study also showed that, in less developed countries, men and women placed a greater emphasis on attractiveness (health and health-related characteristics) in a potential long-term mate. Secondly, men and women in less developed countries rated status, education, and intelligence of a potential partner as more important "relative to ratings provided by individuals in more developed countries" (Stone, Shackelford, & Buss, 2008, p. 452). Nonetheless, there were gender shifts in preferences for ambition and industriousness. Men, rather than women, in less developed countries placed more importance on this characteristic. The third finding of the study was that men and women in less developed countries showed a greater desire for home and children than those in more developed countries. The pronounced effect of culture on mate preferences could be seen in the fact that men and women in the less developed countries both placed greater importance on a potential mate's similar religious background than did those in the more developed countries. Consequently, this study revealed how cross-cultural mate preference shifts related to socioeconomic development.

In studies on mate preferences conducted by Pillsworth (2008), it was shown that sex differences in mate preference may not be universal at all since they could vary in very predictable ways with regard to local culture and ecology. Pillsworth's studies investigated mate choice within small-scale societies which utilized multiple methods.

In Study 1, Pillsworth (2008) investigated men and women's mate preferences in a modern hunter-horticulturist population of Amazonian Ecuador. Data were collected from three Shuar villages (an interior village, a village located close to the road, and high school students who traveled to various villages to the Shuar high school located in a village close to the road. Each participant (24 males and 24 females) was interviewed privately and verbally with the use of 19 index cards labeled with mating-relevant traits (physical attractiveness, intelligence, etc.). Participants were shown two randomly chosen cards at one time. They chose the trait most important to them in a long-term romantic partner. The winning trait was then compared, one at a time, with others until paired with a trait deemed more important.

Pillsworth (2008) stated that the results of the study differed in two ways from those of previous studies of long-term mate preferences in that "the sexes were similar in their preferences for physical attractiveness in a partner whereas . . . [in most studies] the typical sex difference was observed with men preferring physical attractiveness more than women" (p. 262). In fact, physical attractiveness was ranked below all other traits. A second difference from other studies was the fact that "Shuar men and women were similar in their preferences for resource-related traits" (Pillsworth, p. 262) whereas, in most previous studies, women ranked these traits more important than men.

However, there appear to be a difference in preferences for specific resource-related traits, namely, the ability in which basic food resources. In the remote village sample, in which there was less wage labor and much of the daily calories were provided by women's gardens, "men ranked the ability of a partner to provide basic food needs as more important compared with women" (Pillsworth, 2008, p. 263). Pillsworth went on to state that, in an integrated village, in which more individuals were engaged in wage labor and more food was purchased, "women ranked the ability of a partner to provide food resources as significant more important compared with men" (p.263). It would seem then that the preferences for a partner's provision of food resources varied with their involvement in the economy (wage earner/purchaser vs. less wage laborers and women's gardens).

In Study 2, unmarried men and women rated those who formed one another's pool of potential marriage partners on their personal characteristics and desirability as a long-term partner. Participants (24 men and 24 women) took part in three private interview sessions each one week apart. Correlations between the participants' evaluations of peer qualities and their attraction to those individuals as possible relationship partners were studied.

Results of Study 2 showed that there was a similarity of correlations of personality and attractiveness to desirability for both men and women. Women preferred men with good personalities, physical attractiveness, and provider qualities as long-term partners. Men preferred women with physical attractiveness and good personalities but not provider qualities as long-term partners. Pillsworth (2008) stated that these findings were in line with the general theory of mate preferences in which "the correlation

between provider qualities and desirability was stronger among women than among men . . ." (p. 265). Likewise, in Study 2, both men and women ranked physical attractiveness higher than resource-related traits, and these findings were the reverse in study 1. As stipulated by Pillsworth (2008), these results did raise questions about the universality of sex differences in mate preferences documented in the existing literature" (p.256).

2.3 Relevance and Limitations of Literature Review to This Study

Prior literature revealed findings on gender differences in intrinsic and extrinsic mate preferences consistent with the evolutionary and sociocultural perspectives along with the social theories of structural powerlessness and equity. In this way, these previous studies were significant to this study (Bereczkei, Voros, Gal, & Bernath, 1997; Buss, 1989; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss et al., 1990; Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001; Dagmar, 2001; Hasenkamp, Kummerling, & Hassebrauck, 2005; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1995; Howard, Blumstein, & Schwartz, 1987; Kurzban & Weeden, 2005; Laner & Russel, 1998; Shackelford, Schmitt, & Buss, 2005a; Singh, 1995; Sprecher & Regan, 2002; Sprecher, Sullivan, & Hatfield, 1994; Stone, Shackelford, & Buss, 2008; Strassberg & Holty, 2003; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992).

The limitations of some of the previous studies on gender differences in mate preferences centered around their inability to generalize findings primarily due to their utilization limited samples of populations such as representations of university students of a particular country used for the research - only single adults rather than married couples as well or only females and not males (Dagmar, 2001; Kurzban & Weeden, 2005; Strassberg & Holty, 2003; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992; Singh, 1995) or limitations in research designs employed such as the utilization of the "rather atypical world of internet

bulletin board personals" (Strassberg & Holly, 2003, p. 259) in which there was deemed an insufficient number of male seeking female ads in which the hypothesis of men preferred physical attractiveness and women preferred financial resources in a mate was annualized in a mate.

The present study addressed the gaps in prior literature on gender differences in mate preferences with the study of gender differences in mate preferences and their correlates among single, heterosexual, Romanian adults. Likewise, this study looked at how acculturation interacts with gender along the dimensions of theoretical perspectives previously delineated, and how this ultimately had an impact on mate preferences among this group. For instance, would Romanian men who were more acculturated prefer a woman who was attractive (evolutionary perspective), or who was a good housekeeper (traditional social role perspective) compared to those who were more acculturated? Conversely, would Romanian women who lived who were more acculturated prefer a man who had a good economic resource potential (evolutionary theory and social role theory) compared to those who were more acculturated? Taking into consideration a cultural framework, would results obtained compare to those found in other Eastern European samples within the country of origin (Buss et al., 1989) or various American samples (Strassburg & Holty, 2003; Laner & Russell, 1998).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 described the research design, methods, participants, measures and statistics used in this dissertation research to fill the gaps identified in the reviewed literature in Chapter 2. This study of the gender differences in mate preferences and their correlates among single, heterosexual, Romanian singles attempted to narrow those gaps in knowledge. Additional information was sought as to how acculturation interacted with gender along the dimensions of theoretical perspectives previously delineated, and how this ultimately had an impact on mate preferences among this group. The research questions posed to accomplish that goal were as follows: what were the mate preferences of single, heterosexual male and female Romanians? How were Romanian male and female mate preferences moderated by acculturation to American society?

3.1 Sample and Sampling Procedure

In order to obtain optimal results, given determined data analyses procedures, the sample consisted of 46 heterosexual adult Romanian immigrant singles that was gathered using a cross sectional design. Care was taken to make sure that all participants were 18 years or older, heterosexual, single and self -identified as Romanian, noting their dates of immigration to the United States. Advertisements were placed on social media sites such as Facebook that targeted Romanian organizations, through online classified sites such as Craigslist which targeted known niches of Romanian communities in the Eastern half of the United States; further, ads were sent out to the local Romanian Catholic churches

(Romanian Orthodox respectively declined to participate) which were subsequently displayed on bulletin boards that asked for voluntary subjects for the study. Participants were also gathered in person at local church festivals. Purposeful sampling was also employed with the snowball technique, in which persons who fit the criteria to participate, and who the researcher knew, were requested to forward copies of the survey to others they may know who fit the above criteria for participation in the research, who would then subsequently forward it on to others, and so on. Recruitment materials contained basic information that regarded the nature of the study, what was involved in participating, incentives for participating ($10.00) and contact information for the investigator so that surveys could be distributed and returned if there was interest in participating. Due to a dearth of voluntary participation, the final sample size of 46 (25 men, 21 women) that was obtained was considered theoretically low but deemed adequate for acceptable minimal power level of .5, medium effect size of .3, alpha level of .05, and an allocation ratio N1/N2 of 1. The statistical application G* Power 3.0 was used to derive the sample size. Readers are referred to the Discussion section in Chapter 5 for further treatment of the issue of low sample size in the present research study.

3.2 Instruments

Mate preferences were assessed via a portion of an instrument considered in the field to be a "standard measure of mate preference" (Shakleford et al., 2005a) as it was first developed and used by Hill (1939) in his study of mate preferences with university students and continued to be used cross culturally as well as cross generationally 70 years since (Hoyt & Hudson, 1981; Buss et al., 1990, Buss at al. 2001; Khallid, 2005, Bech-Sorensen & Pollet, 2016). It was first entitled "Campus Values Questionnaire" (Hill,

1939) and then later adapted by Buss (1989) as "Factors in Choosing a Mate". Some of the demographic pieces of information of the survey asked participants to respond by identifying their sex and SES level, stating the number of years they been here and age at which they immigrated to America as well as in what capacity they came to this country (i.e. student, worker, tourist, and so on). The rest of the instructions then read as follows:

> "Below is a list of traits/characteristics that people may want in a mate/partner. Rate the importance of each characteristic by the scale given below as to what you would like in a long term mate/partner. Note that you cannot expect someone to be high on every characteristic; therefore, just indicate what would be most important for you to have and what would be less important."

The scale that rated the items was the same as used in previous research (Hill, (1945); Buss et al. (1989) and asked the participants to rate the items in accordance with the following scale: indispensable=3; important, but not indispensable =2; desirable, but not very important =1; and irrelevant or unimportant = 0.

The items on the survey were composed of both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics that someone would look for in a potential mate. All items from the original survey were retained and included target variables central to the inquiry of this study such as good cook and housekeeper, good looks and good financial prospects. Also included were variables of chastity (no previous experience in sexual intercourse), emotional stability and maturity, mutual attraction/love, desire for home and children and pleasing disposition. It was felt that these traits not only gave an inclusive list of both intrinsic/extrinsic attributes but were known to have been highly endorsed by both collectivistic and individualistic societies as well as fairly amenable to translation (Buss et al. (1989). Permission was granted by one of the most prominent researcher in the field of mate preferences who used this survey most extensively and adapted it most

recently, David M. Buss, for use of this instrument in the current investigation. (see Appendix E)

It could be said theoretically speaking that this instrument historically has possessed good reliability and validity as it was either directly tested for such or indirectly assessed as such over the 7 decades it has been used in mate preference research with various wide sampling bases (starting with replication of studies that sampled college students in the United States through the 40s, 50s and 60s and later included persons from cultures around the world). Face validity could therefore be demonstrated through the elucidated trustworthy results reported by previous researchers that used these same items on this instrument in the past (Buss et al. (1989); Shackelford et al. (2005), etc.). Buss et al. (1989) reported validity with the portion of the survey not used in the current investigation, which used an age check in their cross-cultural research on mate preferences. Indeed, it was reported that respondents' reported preferred age difference at marriage and preferred age at marriage corresponded favorably to their actual age difference at marriage as well as actual age at marriage. (Actual age was estimated from data found in the Demographic Year Book and Demographic Fact Book. Absolute values of actual age were also used). Magnitudes of correlations of actual age to preferred age for categories listed above were also calculated, cross-country, as a third validity check.

The second instrument participants were asked to fill out was called the "Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS) (Stephenson, 2000). This instrument was assessed as measuring acculturation amongst five diverse cultural groups. Its directions read as follows:

> Below are a number of statements that evaluate changes that occur when people interact with others of different cultures or ethnic groups. For questions that refer to "COUNTRY OF ORIGIN" or "NATIVE COUNTRY" please refer to the country from which your family originally came or the country with which you identify or feel you belong. For questions referring to "NATIVE LANGUAGE" please refer to the language spoken where your family originally came or how you self- identify.

This 32-item questionnaire was created utilizing exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis as well as the salient variable similarities (s) index (Cattell et al. 1969) across two different samples in the hopes of constructing a measure the present research used that assessed behaviors or immigrant attitudes that concerned their native land of Romania as well as their new home in the United States. Questions included items such as the following: "I speak my native language with my friends and acquaintances from my country of origin"; "I feel totally comfortable with (White, Anglo) American people"; "I feel at home in the United States"; "I like to listen to music of my ethnic group" and "I am familiar with important people in American history." The rating scale used to assess beliefs and behaviors that concerned these items were: False=0, Partly False=1, Partly True=2, and True=3. Participants marked which of these ratings best described them for each respective survey item.

Stephenson (2000) reported reliability coefficient alphas that ranged from .86 for the entire scale, to .97 and .90 for Factors 1 (17 items related to Dominant Society Immersion or DSI) and 2 (15 items related to Ethnic Society Immersion or ESI), respectively in Study 2 and .94 & .75 in Study 3 on the instrument. Item total correlations ranged from .51 to .57 on Factor 1 and .57 to .83 on Factor 2 in Study 2 as well. The current study replicated similar reliability alpha coefficients for the respective Romanian sample, which ranged from .92 for the DSI which included 15 items and .91

for the ESI which included 17 items. Strong predictive validity was reported as attested to by two one- way between group analysis of variances (ANOVAs) which found significant the relationship between generational status and performance on the DSI subscales ($F(3,432) = 73.444$, $p < .001$) and ESI ($F(3,432) = 31.476$, $p < .001$). Indeed, with each of the first three successive generations, DSI increased and ESI decreased. Further, acculturation was also found to play a mediating role in outcomes on assessment results between ethnic minority and ethnic majority groups using path analytic techniques; the assessment measure used being the Global Severity Index (GSI), of the Symptom Checklist 90 –Revised (SCL-90-R, Derogatis, 1994). Results of various regression analyses indicated that the DSI but not the ESI mediated the effects of ethnic group affiliation and assessment results when each factor as well as ethnic identity was controlled.

Concurrent and discriminant validity was assessed by correlating responses from this instrument against those of two other acculturation measures, the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans II (ARSMA-2) and the Bidirectional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS), According to Stephenson, findings were correlated in the expected direction for both the ESI and DSI subscales. Results indicated that the ESI was strongly correlated in the expected direction with the Mexican Orientation Scale (MOS) of the ARSMA-2 ($r = .87$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated in the expected direction with the Anglo Orientation Scale (AOS) ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$). The ESI was positively correlated in the expected direction with the Hispanic Domain Scale of the BAS ($r = .83$ $p < .01$) and negatively correlated in the expected with the non- Hispanic Domain Scale ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$). The DSI subscale was positively correlated in the expected direction with the AOS

(r= .49, p< .01) and negatively correlated in the expected direction, although not significantly so, with the MOS (r=-.15, p=ns). With the BAS, the DSI was positively correlated in the expected direction with the Non-Hispanic Scale (r=.48, p<.01) and negatively correlated in the expected direction, although not significantly so, with the Hispanic Scale (r=-.17, p= ns).

In summary, it was noted that overall the "reliability and validity studies done on the measure indicated high reliability and validity indexes as comparable with other published instruments". According to Stephenson "[the] instrument does provide an index of degree of immersion in both dominant and ethnic societies that can facilitate interpretation of research, assessment data and clinical presentation, particularly with more recent immigrants [first and second generation] to the United States" (p.85). Strong predictive validity was demonstrated in the instruments' ability to identify relationships between generational status and performance on the subscales. Additional support for the validity of the SMAS was the finding that the DSI subscale served as a mediator that corrected for the difference in the Global Severity Index (GSI) of the Symptom Checklist 90-Revised (SCL- 90-R) between ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. Good Concurrent validity was shown in the correlations of the DSI and ESI with the ARSMA – II and BAS in the expected direction. Permission for use of the instrument was requested; however, the original author could not be contacted for said permission.

3.3 Procedures for Data Collection

As a mandated formality to ensure no foreseeable major harm to participants, an informed consent form was presented, signed and dated. (see Appendix B)

Packets that contained an informed consent form and both surveys were mailed, emailed and/ or distributed in person as noted above, which included return paid postage envelope for surveys that were filled out and returned via the US postal service. (See Appendices C and D for copies of each)

The informed consent form asked that those who wish to participate to be at least 18 and to have been born in Romania or have been self- identified as Romanian immigrants. Surveys and informed consent forms were translated, back translated and had discrepancies resolved by three different persons fluent in Romanian and English as a way that made sure integrity of word meanings were maintained and therefore helped ensure that results obtained would be reliable. Instructions were provided to make all terms used on all forms "sex neutral" in the sense that they would be applicable to both males and females. As surveys were returned, responses that included demographic information were entered into the Statistical Software for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for subsequent analyses. Incentives for participation included monetary rewards for each survey completed and $50.00 gift cards that were raffled off after all data had been collected.

3.4 Procedures for Protecting Rights of Participants

The informed consent form all prospective voluntary participants were asked to read and sign notified all involved that they may have felt marginal psychological distress in the form of a feeling of obligation to participate in the study (especially if they are a friend or acquaintance). It went on to further read that they may have felt discomfort in answering some demographic questions such as annual income or in divulging their sexuality. However, it was noted that the main survey content on these instruments has

been used historically in countless research endeavors with no reported adverse effects on those that completed them. Some other safeguards that were put in place that helped ameliorate the aforementioned risks associated with participation in this research study included participants being instructed not to self-identify on either of the two surveys. The surveys and included demographic information were given the same identification number only for the purpose of participant response input into the statistical database. A linked list was subsequently created that associated participant responses with their respective demographic data without identifying information such as names. Signed informed consent forms were separated immediately and placed under separate lock and key. No one, not even the principal investigator, had access to the identities associated with the identification numbers or were able to link individual responses to subsequent results that the aggregate data generated; hence all participant identities were kept anonymous. A signature on the informed consent form was principally used to testify that the subject understood the purposes of the study and the participation process. Also included was the guarantee that participation was highly voluntary and consent to withdraw from participation could occur at any point in the participation process without penalty; further, identifying information was secondarily used for purposes of the "thank you" raffle drawing for those that chose to enter. Contact information for the Institutional Review Board, under which permission was granted to continue with data collection and analyses (See Appendix A), as well as the principal researcher and advisor's contact information were given out in case anyone would have a question regarding the study or their rights as participants. Transmission of subject data (completed surveys) took place over a secured email connection or via a proactively

secured snail mail (post office) system. As noted above, as soon as surveys and informed consents were received and all relevant data entered and given their respective identification number, they were then filed away separately under lock and key. Three years after conclusion of the study, all three forms filled out by participants were destroyed.

3.5 Approach to Data Analysis

Results were analyzed using the latest version of the Statistical Software for the Social Sciences, version 26 (SPSS). Most independent variables within the demographic portion of the mate survey (i.e. SES, age) were treated and entered as continuous independent variables. Categorical independent variables used for the subsequent analyses such as that of gender were dummy coded as 1=male, 0=female. Marital status was coded binarily as well with 1= single and 0= all other marital statuses. Year of Immigration was coded as follows: 1=before communism and 0= after communism. Dependent variables such as the rating scales on both the mate preference and acculturation measure were treated as continuous. Preliminary data transformations were performed that helped normalize data that presented with skewness and kurtosis, a consequence with garnering a low sample size. Transformations such as natural logarithmic functions, Z-scores and others were used towards this endeavor. Further, since Items 1 (Good cook and housekeeper), 10 (Desire for home and children), and 12 (Good looks) that were included on the Mate Preference Survey were historically valued by men over women, and Items 6 (Good financial prospect), 11 (Favorable social status or rating) and 14 (Ambition & industriousness) were historically valued by women over men (Buss et al. 1989; Bech-Sorensen & Pollet, 2016), it was thought noteworthy that

these be examined more closely to ascertain the strength of the validity of the evolutionary and social role frameworks as it pertained to the Romanian population of interest. Scores that made up the two scales of Reproductive Value (RV) and Culturally Successful (CS) were averaged and then run in a reliability analyses to ensure that these items could be said to have a relationship with each other and could be made into aggregate dependent variables used in subsequent analyses of the data. Thus, Items 1, 10 and 12 were made into the aggregate variable of Reproductive Value (RV) with a Cronbach's alpha of .998 and Items 6, 11, and 14 were made into the aggregate variable of Culturally Successful (CS) with a Cronbach's alpha of .75. As a final step towards data preparation, correlation coefficients were obtained from all demographic variables such as age and SES as they related to dependent variables of particular interest to this study, most notably, the aggregate variable of Reproductive Value and Items 1,10 and 12 that compromise it and the aggregate variable denoted as Culturally Successful and Items 6, 12, and 14 therein.

To corroborate findings from previous research on gender differences in mate preferences and so the effects of acculturation as a moderating influence be ascertained, 8 step-wise multivariate regressions (one for each dependent variable) were employed in which covariates from the correlation matrix that proved significant at the .05 level were entered into each model in the first step in order to ascertain if any of them could explain any variability in gender differences as they concerned mate preference ratings. Indeed, it was found from several past researchers sampling both a United States sample (Buunk et al. 2002; Evans & Brase, 2007; South, 1991; Sprecher et al. 1991) and an international sample (Moore, 2007; Stone et al., 2008) that variable correlates such as SES and age

tended to show a high degree of correlation and therefore highly moderated gender differences in mate preferences in comparison with other demographic variables. Gender and acculturation as separate main effects were entered into the model as coefficients in the second step to ascertain if there would be found any difference between the genders alone or level of acculturation alone in explanation of the mate preference ratings. The Dominant Immersion Scale scores of the Stephenson's Acculturation Measure was utilized in the current study as an appropriate estimation of acculturation level for the Romanian sample. Lastly, the interaction of gender and acculturation was entered as third steps to ascertain how a change in acculturation level would change how each respective gender rated the mate preferences. A Bonferroni correction (which involved division of the *p* value of .05 among the 8 regression models that needed to have been run) was employed to mitigate the inflation of Type I error or family wise error rate caused by multiple comparisons with the eight regression models that were run.

3.6 Limitations of Methodology

Most notable among the limitations was the lack of a theoretically sound sample size needed for the study to have adequate power level with sound validity. Other studies have also demonstrated an unwillingness on behalf of the Romanian population to participate voluntarily in survey research (Contantinescu,2013; Groza et al., 1999). Such studies have found low response rates for participation. For an in depth treatment of sample size limitations found in this study, please be referred to Chapter 5.

Where the research design of the study as a whole was concerned, there was a limitation in examination of just sex/gender and acculturation in the determination of mate preference values. Indeed, there could be many more variables that would moderate

the effect of gender and acculturation on mate preference ideologies (sex orientation, age at immigration, etc.) that were beyond the scope of this research to study.

Some limitations that involved the sample included one first recognized by Triandis (1989) in his study of Turkish society that people from collectivistic societies "are likely to present themselves in a socially-desirable way" (p. 25) which caused them to respond in a way that did not accurately portray their feelings. Also, some of the sample that had a high affiliation with the Romanian Orthodox Church and its belief systems could have produced responses that reflected this and so limited generalizability to Romanians not associated with this institutions (Readers are referred to commentary which concerned the church and its role in promotion of traditional gender roles under "Cultural perspectives" in Chapter 1). Relatedly, purposeful sampling that used snowballing could have biased the results and limited generalizability as participants were not randomly selected.

Limitations with regards to solicitation of hypothetical or potential mate preferences (as it has been done traditionally with surveys) included the notion that participants (dependent on their situation in life, like SES), could have reflected their luxuries in mate preferences and not necessarily their necessities. For instance, a person who was already well off in terms of SES could have already associated with other higher SES individuals within their environmental context, thus they would have overlooked their need for SES as a mate preference, as they assumed this to be a given and looked more towards luxuries in mate preferences such as chastity. Also, these hypothetical mate preferences perhaps were not easily translated to live dating situations or what people valued in a mate in real life. This comes about because of what Eastwick and

Finkle (2008) referred to as inaccurate a-priori hypotheses people created when asked about these types of preferences since people didn't really know what they desired in terms of preferences in mates. This led to questions that concerned the predictive validity of results obtained. Along the same lines, the affect or romantic attraction someone felt when initially meeting someone face-to-face was not reflected in these surveys. This led to inherent self-report bias when it came to answering questions about the importance of a delineated set of characteristics. Furthermore, people had the tendency to view each attribute in isolation, rather than considering them as a whole when they thought sbout what makes an ideal mate for them. For instance, someone could have rated SES as important but it may become less important if someone had an agreeable personality. In corroboration, Nunally (1978) suggested that single items that tried to measure sex differences of mate preferences could have been less reliable than composite clusters of items (as cited in Buss et al., 1989). Relatedly, another issue with survey research has been that persons were asked rate items once without placement of a validity measure to have made sure that respondents were paying attention while the questionnaire was being taken. A way to safeguard against this would have been to ask that participants rate multiple versions or synonyms of a handful of items.

In terms of the specifics of the Mate Preference Survey itself, a prominent limitation included the fact that items that were translated into Romanian could have been relegated to some bias if not everything translated equally precisely in both languages (i.e. the use of two terms-masculine and feminine- or a phrase - when one referred to a single survey item). Relatedly, there existed ambiguously worded characteristics such as "favourable social standing," in which what is referred to was unclear. Further, as Buss

et al. (1989) pointed out, there may have been some inherent bias in terms of survey items since they originated in the United States and were adapted for other cultures Buss et al.2001 also suggested that the 4-point rating scale may not have made as many discriminations as participants evaluated a potential mate might have made; some compound characteristics such as "education and intelligence" might have confounded ratings as each should have been evaluated separately for more accurate results. Some other limitations of the SMAS as reported by Stephenson (2000) included limited generalizability, since the construction of the SMAS as well as tests of its reliability and validity were initially based on non-random samples. Secondly, the SMAS may have carried a limitation in the sense of not having been translated into other languages other than English for participants who responded to its items, which in turn may have created some bias, especially since it contained a large number of strongly loaded language items. The author also reported that it did not measure all possible areas of acculturation, or beliefs, norms and values.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presented the data obtained from the demographic questionnaire, the Mate Preference Questionnaire and the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Scale (SMAS). The first part of the chapter provided a descriptive analysis of all potential covariates and scores on each of the two measures used. Concurrently, a correlation matrix was provided which demonstrated those covariates that should have been included for subsequent analysis. Finally, research hypotheses are once again presented along their relevant quantitative analyses.

4.1 Correlation Matrix

In order to appropriately have tested Hypotheses 1 through 4, covariates to be entered into each of the eight hierarchical regressions must first have been determined. Results of this endeavor were shown in Table 1. In regards to the relationships between variables, a high regard for reproductive value in a prospective mate had a statistically significant moderate positive correlation with cultural success ($r = .321$, $p = .031$) and year of immigration ($r = .454$, $p = .002$) while it had a statistically significant negative moderate correlation with age ($r = -.344$, $p = .001$; see Table 1). This indicated that as desire for a mate with reproductive value increased so did the desire for a mate with

cultural success. Furthermore, participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to desire a mate with reproductive value while older participants were less likely.

In regards to the relation between variables, a high regard for cultural success in a prospective mate had a statistically significant positive moderate correlation with reproductive value ($r = .321$, $p = .031$) and the year of immigration ($r = .463$, $p = .001$) while it had a statistically significant negative moderate correlation with age ($r = -.387$,

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Inter-correlations among Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. RV	1.96	0.69	**.99**													
2. CS	1.76	0.84	.32*	**.75**												
3. Gender	0.54	0.50	.26	-.26	-											
4. Acculturation	37.9	11.39	.32*	0.12	.04	-										
5. SES	1.70	0.70	.05	-.08	-.09	.18	-									
6. YI	0.85	0.36	.45**	.46**	.22	.03	-.01	-								
7. MS	0.87	0.34	.14	-.27	.16	.02	.12	-.17	-							
8. Age	38.11	16.49	-.48**	-.39**	-.13	-.27	-.03	-.54**	.19	-						
9.MP1	1.67	1.02	.72**	-.04	.41**	.27	-.12	.22	.19	-.24	-					
10. MP10	2.07	1.07	.82**	.41**	-.03	.31	.15	.37*	.14	-.40**	.39**	-				
11. MP12	2.16	0.82	.57**	.32*	.17	.09	.09	.38**	-.07	-.40**	.06	.27	-			
12. MP6	1.84	1.00	.25	.88**	-.41**	-.09	-.07	.37*	-.19	-.36*	-.10	.33*	.33*	-		
13. MP11	1.42	1.06	.26	.81**	-.11	-.18	-.13	.35*	-.29	-.25	.05	.30*	.21	.54**	-	
14. MP14	2.00	0.92	.31*	.85**	-.14	-.03	.00	.47**	-.21	-.37*	-.05	.43**	.267	.71**	.49*	-

Note. Internal consistency reliabilities were provided in boldface on the diagonal where appropriate. RV = Reproductive Value; CS = Culturally Successful; SES = Socioeconomic Status; YI = Year of Immigration; MS = Marital Status; MP1 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 1; MP10 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 10; MP12 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 12; MP6 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 6; MP11 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 11; MP14 = Mate Preferences Questionnaire Item 14. Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS). SES was coded 1 = low, 2 = moderate, and 3 = high. YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989. MS was coded 1 = single, 0 = in some form of a committed relationship. *p < 0.05 ** P < 0.01

p = .009). This indicated that as desire for a mate with reproductive value increased so did the desire for a mate with cultural success. Furthermore, participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to desire a mate with cultural success while older participants were less likely. In regards to the variable of acculturation, it had a statistically significant positive relationship with reproductive value. In regards to the relationships between variables, gender had a statistically significant positive moderate correlation with endorsement of Item 1 ("Good cook and housekeeper") of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire (r = .413, p = .005). This indicated that men were more likely to value these traits in a prospective mate. In regards to Item 10 ("Desire for home and children"), there was a statistically significant positive correlation with year of immigration (r = .373, p = .012) and a statistically significant negative correlation with age (r = -.399, p = .007). These relationships indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to value these traits while older participants were less likely to value these traits in a prospective mate.

In regards to Item 12 ("Good looks"), there was a statistically significant positive correlation with year of immigration (r = .383, p = .009) and a statistically significant negative correlation with age (r = -.399, p = .007). These relationships indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to value this trait while older participants were less likely to value this trait in a prospective mate. In regards to Item 6 ("Good financial prospect"), there was a statistically significant positive correlation with year of immigration (r = .367, p = .013) and statistically significant negative correlations with age (r = -.361, p = .015) and gender (r = -.412, p = .005). This indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to value this trait in a

prospective mate. Furthermore, women were more likely to value this trait in a prospective mate than men while older participants in general were less likely to value this trait in a prospective mate than younger participants. In regards Item 11 ("Favorable social status or rating"), there was a statistically significant positive correlation with year of immigration ($r = .350$, $p = .018$), which indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to value this trait in a potential mate than their counterparts. In regards to Item 14 ("Ambition and industriousness"), there was a statistically significant positive correlation with year of immigration ($r = .466$, $p = .001$) and a statistically significant negative correlation with age ($r = -.367$, $p = .012$). This indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to value these traits in a potential mate than their counterparts while older participants in general were less likely to value these traits in a potential mate than their peers.

4.2 Tests for Hypotheses 1 and 3

A total of eight hierarchical linear regressions were run. These included analyses run for the aggregate dependent variables of Cultural Success and Reproductive Value as well as their corresponding items. In order that the probability of Type I error, or false positive results in statistical analyses be reduced, the Bonferroni correction was employed (Bland & Altman, 1995). The Bonferroni correction was an adjustment made to the alpha level, or required probability value, in order that the null hypothesis be accurately rejected. In order to perform a Bonferroni correction, the selected alpha level was divided by the number of simultaneous analyses that were conducted. The selected alpha level for this project was .05, so .05 was divided by 8 since there were eight simultaneous analyses being run which resulted in the new alpha level of .006.

Table 2. Tests for Hypotheses 1 and 3-Relationship between Gender and the Desire for a Mate with High Reproductive Value Moderated by Acculturation

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	β
RV (n = 40)					
Step 1	.30**	0.30**			
Constant			1.77	.67	
YI			0.74*	0.30	0.36
Age			-0.02*	0.01	-0.28
Step 2	.39**	0.09			
Gender			-.65	0.65	-0.47
Acculturation			0.001	0.01	-0.01
Step 3	.43**	0.04			
Gender × Acculturation			0.02	0.02	0.74

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. RV = Reproductive Value; YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women; Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS). * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

In order to support Hypotheses 1 and 3, which stated that there would have been a statistically significant difference between men and women in the desires for a mate with high reproductive value and that relationship would have been moderated by the participants' self-reported levels of acculturation respectively, hierarchical regression was employed (see Table 2). Based on the correlation matrix in Table 1, the variables of year of immigration, and current age were used as covariates, or control variables. In Step 1 of this model, the R^2 statistic was 0.30 and the model was statistically significant. Year of immigration (B = .66, p = .04) and age (B= -.02, p= .03) were statistically significant predictors of desire for a mate with high reproductive value. This suggested that individuals who immigrated after 1989 and individuals who were younger tended to value a mate who had high reproductive value. With the Bonferroni correction, however, no covariates remained statistically significant. Approximately 30 percent of the variability in the importance of reproductive value in a potential mate was explained by year of immigration, and age. In Step 2 of the regression model, where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic was 0.39 and the model was statistically

significant. Approximately, an additional 9 percent of the variance in the importance of reproductive value as it related to mate preferences in the sample was explained by the addition of the gender and acculturation variables. The direction, magnitude, and significance of the relationships between reproductive value, year of immigration, and age remained largely consistent although Step 2 was not significantly different from Step 1 of the model ($\Delta F = 2.8$, $p = .07$). In this step of the model, the main effects of gender ($B = .28$, $p = .13$) and acculturation levels ($B = .01$, $p = .10$) were introduced, neither of which were statistically significant. In Step 3 of the regression model where the interaction between gender and acculturation was added, the R^2 statistic was 0.43 and the model was statistically significant. There was an additional 4 percent of the variance in the importance of reproductive value as it related to mate preferences in the sample explained by the addition of the interaction term. There was not a statistically significant change from Step 2 to Step 3 ($\Delta F = 2.21$, $p = .15$). When the previously introduced variables were held constant, the interaction between gender and acculturation ($B = 0.02$, $SE = 0.02$, $p = .15$) was not statistically significant as it related to reproductive value in mate preferences.

Table 3. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 1 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	B
MP1 ($n = 41$)					
Step 1	.24**	0.24**			
Constant			0.61	0.75	
Gender			0.57**	0.97	0.30
Acculturation			0.02	0.02	0.24
Step 2	.24*	0.00			
Gender x Acculturation			0.01	0.03	.11

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 2 of the analysis. MP1 = Item 1 response to the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS).* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The first hypothesis stated that there would be a gender-based difference in the desire for reproductive value in a mate; as such, it stood to reason there would be a gender based difference in the endorsement of the three items that made up reproductive value. Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if there was such a gender-based difference in how these individual items of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire that represent Reproductive Value were endorsed. The first item, Item 1, Good cook and Housekeeper, was analyzed to determine if gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation predicted its endorsement (see Table 3). In Step 1 of this model where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic was 0.24 and the model was statistically significant. This indicated that approximately 24 percent of the variance in the responses related to the endorsement of Item 1 was accounted for by gender and acculturation. The main effect of gender ($B = 0.753$, $p = .009$) was a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 1 on the mate preferences questionnaire while the main effect of acculturation ($B = .023$, $p = .063$) was not. These results indicated that men were more likely to endorse Item 1 than women. However, with the use of the Bonferroni correction, gender failed to reach statistical significance. In Step 2 of this model where the interaction of gender and acculturation was added, the R^2 statistic remained at 0.24 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant change from Step 1 to Step 2 of the model ($\Delta F = 0.038$, $p = .846$). In Step 2 of this model, the interaction of gender and acculturation was not statistically significant ($B = 0.005$, $p = .846$).

Table 4. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 10 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	β
MP10 (*n* = 41)					
Step 1	.30**	0.30**			
Constant			1.48	1.07	
YI			1.30*	0.49	0.41
Age			-0.2*	.01	-0.23
Step 2	.35**	0.05			
Gender			-1.10	1.04	-0.53
Acculturation			0.01	0.02	0.05
Step 3	.37**	0.02			
Gender × Acculturation			0.03	0.03	0.56

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. MP10 = Item 10 response to the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS). * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if year of immigration, age, gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation predicted the endorsement of the second reproductive value item of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire, Item 10, Desire for Home and Children, (see Table 4). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration was added, the R^2 statistic was 0.30 and the model was statistically significant. The main effect of year of immigration ($B = 1.10$, $p = .03$) was a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 10 on the mate preferences questionnaire, but not when the Bonferroni correction was employed. This indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to endorse Item 10. The main effect of age ($B = -.03$, p =.04) was also a statistically significant predictor of endorsing Item 10 on the mate preferences questionnaire but also not when the Bonferroni Correction was employed. This indicated that younger persons tended to endorse Item 10 to a higher degree than their older counterparts. The year of immigration and age accounted for approximately 30 percent of the variance in the responses related to

endorsement of Item 10 in the sample. In Step 2 of this model where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.35 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Steps 1 and 2 of the model ($\Delta F = 1.38$, $p = .27$). In Step 2 of this model, the main effect of gender ($B = -0.05$, $p = .86$) was not statistically significant and the main effect of acculturation ($B = 0.02$, $p = .11$) was not either. When Bonferroni correction was employed, again no significance was found. In Step 3 of this model, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.37 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Steps 2 and 3 of the model ($\Delta F = 1.12$, $p = .30$). The interaction of gender and acculturation in Step 3 ($B = 0.03$, $p = .30$) was not statistically significant. Approximately 37 percent of the variability in endorsement of Item 10 was accounted for by year of immigration, age, gender, acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation.

Table 5. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 12 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	β
MP12 ($n = 41$)					
Step 1	.20*	0.20*			
Constant			3.05	.92	
YI			.69	0.42	0.27
Age			-.02	0.01	-0.31
Step 2	.21	0.01			
Gender			-1.22	0.90	-0.73
Acculturation			-0.02	0.02	-0.30
Step 3	.27*	0.06			
Gender × Acculturation			0.04	0.02	0.91

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. MP12 = Item 12 response to the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS).* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if year of immigration, age, gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation

predicted the endorsement of the third reproductive value item of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire, Item 12, Good Looks, (see Table 5). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration was added, the R^2 statistic was 0.20 and the model was statistically significant. The main effect of year of immigration (B = 0.57, p = .16) was not a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 12 on the mate preferences questionnaire, even when the Bonferroni correction was employed. Age was also not a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 12 (B= -.02, p=.057). The year of immigration and age accounted for approximately 20 percent of the variance in the responses related to endorsement of Item 12 in the sample. A primary reason that the model was found to have had statistical significance but not the predictor variables that made it up involved the fact that age and year of immigration were found to have been highly interrelated, a phenomenon known as multicollinearity. They were correlated at .54 (see Table 1). This also made intuitive sense as most of the sample was younger persons who therefore would have immigrated after communisms fall in 1989. In order to have corrected for this, the variables could have been centered so the new mean would have equaled 0. Fortunately, as this happened with only the control variables and the Variance Inflation Factor or VIF for each variable (statistic which evaluated for severity of multicollinearity) was held at 1.19 (5 was considered high), interpretation of the experimental variables of gender or acculturation should not have been affected (Cohen et al., 2003). In Step 2 of this model where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.21 and the model was not statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Steps 1 and 2 in the model (ΔF = 0.19, p = .83). In Step 2 of this model, neither the main effect of gender (B = 0.16, p = .54) nor the

main effect of acculturation (B =- 0.001, p = .97) were statistically significant. Year of immigration, age, gender, and acculturation accounted for approximately 21 percent of the variability in endorsement of Item 12. In Step 3 of this model where the interaction between gender and acculturation was added, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.27 and the model was barely statistically significant. There was not a statistically difference between Steps 2 and 3 (ΔF = 2.56, p = .12). In Step 3 of this model, the interaction of gender and acculturation (B = 0.04, p = .12**)** was not statistically significant. Year of immigration, age, gender, acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation accounted for approximately 27 percent of the variability in endorsement of Item 12.

4.3 Tests for Hypotheses 2 and 4

Table 6. Tests for Hypotheses 2 and 4-Relationship between Gender and the Desire for a Mate with High Cultural Success Moderated by Acculturation

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	B	$SE\ B$	B
CS (n = 41)					
Step 1	.30**	0.30**			
Constant			2.32**	.81	
YI			1.23**	0.37	0.48
Age			-0.02	0.01	-0.24
Step 2	.44**	0.14*			
Gender			-0.88*	0.79	-0.52
Acculturation			-0.02	0.02	-0.26
Step 3	.44**	0.03			
Gender × Acculturation			0.01	0.02	0.21

Note. B coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. CS = Culturally Successful. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS). * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

In order for support to have been shown for Hypotheses 2 and 4, which stated that there would have been a statistically significant difference between men and women in the desire for a mate with high cultural success but that said relationship would not have been moderated by the participants' self-reported levels of acculturation respectively,

hierarchical regression was employed (see Table 6). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration and age were introduced, the R^2 statistic was 0.30 and the model was statistically significant. In Step 1 of this model, year of immigration (B = 1.08, p = .007) was a statistically significant predictor of desire for a mate with cultural success while age (B = -.01, p = .16) was not. This indicated that individuals who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to desire a mate who was culturally successful. With the use of the Bonferroni correction, year of immigration failed to remain statistically significant. Year of immigration and age accounted for approximately 30 percent of the variability in the desire for a mate who was culturally successful. In Step 2 of the regression model where gender and acculturation were introduced, the R^2 statistic was 0.44 and the model was statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference between Steps 1 and 2 of the model (ΔF = 4.66, p = .02). In Step 2 of the model, the direction, magnitude, and significance of the relationships between cultural success and year of immigration and age remained largely consistent. The main effect of gender (B = -.56, p = .01) was statistically significant while the main effect of acculturation (B = -.014, p = .16) was not. This relationship suggested that men valued cultural success less than women in consideration of a mate. However, with the use of the Bonferroni correction threshold, gender failed to maintain statistical significance. The second Step of the model which included the variables of year of immigration, age, gender, and level of acculturation accounted for approximately 44 percent of the variance in the importance of cultural success as it related to mate preferences in the sample. In Step 3 of the regression model, the R^2 statistic remained at 0.44 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Steps 2 and 3 of

the model ($\Delta F = 0.19$, $p = .67$). In this step of the regression model the interaction between gender and acculturation ($B = 0.010$, $SE = 0.020$, $p = .67$) was not statistically significant as it related to cultural success in mate preferences. This model did not add any additional predictive capability over Step 2 and still accounted for approximately 44 percent of the variance in the importance of cultural success as it related to mate preferences in the sample.

Table 7. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 6 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	B
MP6 ($n = 41$)					
Step 1	.22**	0.22**			
Constant			2.73	.93	
YI			1.22*	0.42	0.41
Age			-0.02	0.01	-0.24
Step 2	.48**	0.25**			
Gender			-1.28**	0.90	-0.64
Acculturation			-0.02	0.02	-0.20
Step 3	.48**	0.00			
Gender × Acculturation			0.01	0.02	0.18

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS)*$p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The second hypothesis stated that there was a gender-based difference in the desire for cultural success in a mate; therefore, it stood to reason that there would be a gender based difference in the endorsement of the three items that made up cultural success. Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if there was such a gender-based difference in endorsement of those individual items of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire that represented cultural success. The first item, Item 6, Good Financial Prospect, was analyzed to determine if year of immigration, age, gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation would have predicted its endorsement (see Table 7). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration was added, the R^2 statistic was 0.22 and the model was statistically significant. The main

effect of year of immigration (B = .97, p = .046) was a statistically significant predictor in the endorsement of Item 6 on the mate preferences questionnaire, except when the Bonferroni correction was employed. This indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to endorse Item 6. The year of immigration accounted for approximately 22 percent of the variance in the responses related to the endorsement of Item 6 in the sample. Age turned out not to have been a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 6 (B= -.02, p= .13). In Step 2 of this model where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.48 and the model was statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference between Step 1 to Step 2 of the model (ΔF = 8.65, p = .001). In Step 2 of this model, the main effect of gender (B = -.96, p <.001 was statistically significant even when the Bonferroni correction was employed while the main effect of acculturation (B = -0.01, p = .26) was not. The results indicated that men were less likely to have endorsed Item 6 than women. Year of immigration, age, gender, and acculturation accounted for approximately 48 percent of the variability in endorsement of Item 6 in the Mate Preferences Questionnaire as it related to the sample. In Step 3 of this model where the interaction term was added, the R^2 statistic remained at 0.48 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Step 2 and Step 3 of the model (ΔF = 0.13, p = .72). In Step 3 of this model, the interaction of gender and acculturation (B = 0.01, p = .72**)** was not statistically significant. There was not an increase in the amount of variability in endorsement of Item 6 that was accounted for by this model.

Table 8. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 11 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	B
MP11 (n = 41)					
Step 1	.10*	0.10*			
Constant			1.53	.90	
YI			1.14*	0.50	0.36
Step 2	.17	0.07			
Gender			-0.64	1.18	-0.30
Acculturation			-0.02	0.02	-0.24
Step 3	.17	0.00			
Gender × Acculturation			0.01	0.03	0.15

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of each analysis. MP11 = Item 11 response to the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS). * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if year of immigration, gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation predicted the endorsement of Item 11, Favorable Social Status or Rating, of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire (see Table 8). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration was added, the R^2 statistic was 0.10 and the model was statistically significant. The main effect of year of immigration ($B = 1.01$, $p = .05$) was a statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 11 on the Mate Preferences Questionnaire, except when the Bonferroni correction was employed. These results indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to endorse Item 11. The year of immigration accounted for approximately 10 percent of the variance in the responses related to endorsement of Item 11 in the sample. In Step 2 of this model where gender and acculturation were introduced, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.17 and the model was not statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between

Step 1 and Step 2 ($\Delta F = 1.47$, $p = .24$). In Step 2 of this model, the main effects of gender ($B = -0.36$, $p = .27$) and acculturation ($B = -0.02$, $p = .22$) were not statistically significant. The addition of gender and acculturation to year of immigration accounted for approximately 17 percent of the variance in the endorsement of Item 11 in the sample. In Step 3 of this model, the R^2 statistic remained at 0.17 and the model was not statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant change between Steps 2 and 3 of the model ($\Delta F = 0.06$, $p = .81$). In Step 3 of this model, the interaction of gender and acculturation ($B = 0.01$, $p = .81$) was not statistically significant. There was not an increase in the amount of variability accounted for by this model.

Table 9. Item Level Analysis - Predicting the Endorsement of Item 14 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire

Dependent Variable, Step, and Predictor	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*SE B*	B
MP14 ($n = 41$)					
Step 1	.38**	0.38**			
Constant			2.22*	.91	
YI			1.46**	0.41	0.52
Age			-.02	.01	-0.26
Step 2	.44**	0.05			
Gender			-0.78	0.88	-0.41
Acculturation			-0.02	0.02	-0.18
Step 3	.44**	0.00			
Gender × Acculturation			0.01	0.02	0.34

Note. *B* coefficients corresponded to Step 3 of the analysis. MP14 = Item 10 response to the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. YI = Year of Immigration; YI was coded 0 = before 1989 and 1 = after 1989; Gender was coded 1 = men and 0 = women. Acculturation was comprised of the scores on the Dominant Immersion Scale (DIS) on the Stephenson's Multicultural Acculturation Sale (SMAS)*$p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Hierarchical regression was employed to determine if year of immigration, age, gender, level of acculturation, and the interaction between gender and acculturation predicted the endorsement of Item 14, Ambitiousness and Industriousness, of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire (see Table 9). In Step 1 of this model where year of immigration and age were added, the R^2 statistic was 0.38 and the model was statistically significant. The main effect of year of immigration ($B = 1.34$, $p = .002$) was a

statistically significant predictor of endorsement of Item 14 on the Mate Preferences Questionnaire even when the Bonferroni correction was employed while the main effect of age (B = -0.02, p = .08) was not. These results indicated that participants who immigrated after 1989 were more likely to endorse Item 14 of the Mate Preferences Questionnaire. The year of immigration and age accounted for approximately 38 percent of the variance in the responses related to endorsement of Item 14 in the sample. In Step 2 of this model where gender and acculturation were added, the R^2 statistic increased to 0.44 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically significant difference between Steps 1 and 2 of this model (ΔF = 1.63, p = .21). In Step 2 of this model, the main effects of gender (B = -0.37, p = .13) and acculturation (B = -0.01, p = .42) were not statistically significant. There was an increase in the amount of variability accounted for by this model of five percent, which was not statistically significant. In Step 3 of this model where the interaction term was added, the R^2 statistic remained at 0.44 and the model was statistically significant. There was not a statistically difference between Steps 2 and 3 of the model (ΔF = 0.23, p = .63). In Step 3 of this model, the interaction of gender and acculturation (B = 0.01, p = .63**)** was not statistically significant. This model did not add any additional predictive capability over Step 2 and still accounted for approximately 44 percent of the variance in the importance of the valuation of Item 14 as it related to mate preferences in the sample.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study proposed to examine whether there would have been a difference between heterosexual Romanian men and women in their endorsement of desirable mate characteristics. In line with the precepts of evolutionary theory, women should have preferred characteristics that signified cultural success (Financial prospect, education, and so on) and men should have preferred those that signified reproductive value (Good looks, Gook cook, and so on). Furthermore, this difference was purported to have been moderated by acculturation so that a swing in desire for evolutionary sex-linked mate preferences would have been shown to have been not as prominent.

There was shown to have been partial support for the gender based hypotheses (1 & 2) only. There was shown to have been a difference between mens' and womens' responses associated with the aggregate variable of Reproductive Value which was in line with evolutionary theory (Buss et al.,1989). That was to say, on average men seemed to place more importance on those variables that signified reproductive value as a whole over women, though no individual items that compromised this aggregate variable were found to have shown a significant difference between the sexes, which differed from previous studies (Buss & Barnes, 1986). Perhaps men were not putting as much of an

emphasis on good looks, good cook and housekeeper and desire for home and children in and of themselves as they once did. This could have signaled a change of societal roles such as those that came with women who made a stronger presence in the workforce, a precept that supported the Social Role Theory. On the other hand, the aggregate variable of cultural success as well as Item 6, Good financial prospect (which demonstrated a big difference in response between men and women) showed a significant difference in the way men and women responded. In this case, again in line with the precepts of evolutionary theory, women seemed to have valued these variables to a higher degree than men (Buss et al. 1989). Acculturation on its own did not demonstrate any significance in any of the analyses done; neither did its interaction with gender. Perhaps this could have been said to have been a testament to the overarching effect of the Evolutionary Theory of mate preferences or an artifact of low sample size that was gathered..

The covariate of Year of Immigration (YI) was shown to have been the most significant predictor in the analyses. Persons that immigrated after communism (or 1989) endorsed almost all items and aggregate items more so than those that immigrated before communism. The only exception was Item 1, Good Cook and Housekeeper. In this circumstance, Year of Immigration was not correlated or related with this dependent variable to be included in the subsequent regression analysis. It could be said to have most likely accounted for most of the variability (anywhere from 10 to 30 percent), or put another way, was a big driving force behind the selection of the items on the survey above any other variable. Perhaps having had more of the sample in the current study that immigrate after the fall of communism (39 to 7) contributed to these results. It could

also have been that Romanian gender roles could still have been said to have been in a state of flux towards a more egalitarian perspective. Age as a covariate and predictor was not shown to have been as significant in all facets of the analyses. It was significant in that younger persons were shown to have endorsed the aggregate variable of Reproductive Value (RV) and the individual item that made it up, Item 10 or Desire for Home and Children, over older persons. This made intuitive sense as younger persons would have tended to have sought out characteristics that signified Reproductive Value that fell in lie with their stage of life. However, this still contradicted past findings (South, 1991) where older participants tended to have shown preference for the evolutionary sex linked mate preference items such as Good Looks or Financial Prospect versus their younger counterparts. One explanation for this discrepancy could have been the fact that younger persons comprised a larger proportion of the total sample. Fifty percent of the sample was under 35. Only five persons or 10 percent of the sample was over 55.

5.1 Limitations

The most prominent and ubiquitous issue that may have contributed to the obtained results, especially the low significance, was the lack of a truly random sample due to low sample size. Bigger sample size would have lent to more generalizability of findings because the Romanian sample would have been more representative in terms of age (which proved to have not been diverse in the sample) and other sociodemographic variables of the Romanian population that have currently been residing in America. The current research obtained a power size of .5. This meant that there was only a 50% chance that replication of this study would have yielded similar results. With a more

representative sample, power or probability of having found significance if it was there, would have been increased in the study and results may have produced more substantial findings. Low sample size for the current study was due to low response rate. Other studies that sampled the Romanian population have found similar response rate patterns. For instance, Contantinescu (2013) in her study on ethics within Romanian organizations, reported low response rates on questionnaires due to concerns which revolved around the guarantee of true anonymity while having participated in the research. Further, in a follow up study of Romanian families who adopted Romanian children, with the use of both surveys and interview questions that concerned issues with adoptions families faced as well as the quality of services they found to have been useful through the process, Groza et al. (1999) found a rather low response rate of 47 percent towards participation from those who lived in Bucharest, even with the use of oral consents that helped safeguard against this predicament. Also mentioned was the guardedness Romanian people may have still possessed with signing consent forms or having been audio or video recorded, which stemmed from the oppression of communism and the secret police. Even though the current study had recruited some participants through face to face contact, other forms of participant recruitment were also used such as remote methods like email. Further all participants were required to sign an informed consent form for purposes of record keeping and in accordance with the standards for ethical treatment of research participants. It was also hypothesized that this population felt uncomfortable with mate preference type of questions as they may have felt it too personal in nature. Some participants indeed stated the SMAS in their opinion was not a valid measure of acculturation at all as food and language should not have been the focal point in

consideration of one's level of acculturation and further that the measure was not clear about what was meant by some items such as "American food" when it asked for respective preferences. Lastly, survey research with this population could have been made more cumbersome by the fact that the principal investigator was looked as an outsider to the Romanian community and therein there may have been much distrust, especially as it involves perceived intentions for this research. Further, another limitation that was related to sampling procedures had to do with the fact that the current research relied on convenience sampling of one cultural group, namely Romanian. Indeed, as was explained in Chapter 2, regional differences within the United States have been found with regards to mate preferences (Buss et al. 2001). For instance, the South, with its history steeped in genteelism and good moral character, showed a preponderance for the endorsement of the intrinsic characteristic chastity. It could have been said that where one lived moderated or tempered the effect of the precepts of Evolutionary Theory in terms of mate preferences. Relatedly, the use of the snowball technique in garnering participants was not without its limitations. As this technique potentially targeted like-minded individuals for inclusion in the sample, results garnered could have been said to have been biased and not representative of the population at large which would have lowered the validity of the results obtained. Due to all these sample considerations, this research should have been seen as merely a preliminary step in understanding Romanian mate preferences and the role they played in human mating.

5.2 Directions for Future Research

As the lack of an adequate sample size could have effected results observed due to low power and the diminished capacity for generalizability of results obtained, this study

first and foremost should have been replicated with use of a bigger sample size. Variables not found to have had significance in the current investigation may have been found to have been of greater importance in future investigations- variables such as age at immigration or SES. With a bigger, more representative sample size that included more participants that immigrated before the fall of communism in 1989, which this study lacked, results could have been shown to have been vastly different. Likewise, future research should continue to explore the use of analysis of aggregate (averaged) variable scores along with individual item scores with regard to mate preference research or survey methodology in general. Indeed, aggregate scores in the current research were found to have been more significant than the individual items that made them up which was an artifact of increased power size. Relatedly, as an aside, the Romanian Orthodox Church was hypothesized to have played a role in respondents favoring sex stereotyped mate preferences Oprica, 2008; Vance & White, 2011). However, religious affiliation (Orthodox or Catholic) was not shown to have played a role in response outcome. Perhaps with a bigger sample size, this variable too may have been shown to play a bigger influence in response sets as it related to mate preferences. Garnering such a sample may have required pre collection preparations, such as forging positive working relationships with prominent Romanian community members who could and would have been able to provide access to major organizations that form the heart of the Romanian community such as the Romanian Orthodox Church. As another limitation of the study was the lack of or little representation by other demographic groups apart of the Romanian community such as homosexual /married Romanians, older persons, or even persons who have lived in different regions of the United States, future research could

have looked at the ways input from such groups could have possibly significantly altered the findings. Likewise, as we were dealing with the study of human interaction, many variables could have been said to have influenced results obtained when acculturation was examined in the context of mate preference differences. Future research could have accounted for this with examination of other possible correlates such as length of time spent in the United States. In this way, possible relationships between the variables of acculturation and length of time spent in the United States could also have been ascertained and more fully understood. Moreover, the present research could have been replicated every few years to have assessed for changes in mate preference and indirectly, have gotten insight into how current gender roles and societal ideologies were changing. Further, it was intuitively thought that those that immigrated before communism or 1989 would have endorsed stereotypical sex differences to a greater degree than those that came post communism. The opposite was found in this study. Future research should have explored this phenomenon to investigate other variables that could have explained these results garnered, such as acculturation or length of time in the United States or perhaps even the more recent socio political climate in Romania. Future research could also have explored any gender differences in mate preferences with the other dependent variables (mainly intrinsic) that were rated but not examined in the present research. Perhaps other theoretical frameworks may have been shown to be supported therein with use of a bigger sample just as evolutionary and social role theories found some support with the use of the current limited Romanian sample.

An extension of the current research could have been conducted with the use of a qualitative or mixed methodology. A case studies approach that used focus groups or

individual interviews, participants of which were deemed relevant for inclusion based on responses to a demographic type survey, could have been utilized. In this regard, the reasons behind why persons would have desired certain qualities in a mate could have been more fully elucidated; further, what emerging paradigms could have supported their opinions and how their perceptions could have been altered over time due to their personal life changes, could have been examined. In this way, concentration on a smaller well-represented sample could have resulted in richer and more detailed findings with regard to gender differences in mate preferences.

Above all else, it was hoped this study would have been a catalyst for future research that sought to illuminate the disparities in equity that still existed within gender role norms in society and further acted as a catalyst for those so enlightened to have taken up arms against such inequities in the service of a most fair and democratic future for all.

REFERENCES

Ataca, B., & Berry, J. W. (2002). Psychological, sociocultural, and marital adaptation of Turkish immigrant couples in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology, 37*(1), 13-26.

Bech-Sorensen, J. & Pollet, T.V. (2016). Sex differences in mate preferences: A replication study, 20 years later. *Evolutionary Psychological Science, 2*, 171-176.

Bereczkei, T., Voros, S., Gal, A., & Bernath, L. (1997). Resources, attractiveness, family commitment: Reproductive decisions in human mate choice. *Ethology, 103*(8), 681-699.

Bishop, P. (2014, December 22). Nicolae Ceausescu and Romania's Christmas revolution. Retrieved March, 2019 from the World Wide Web: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/romania/11307063/Nicolae-Ceausescu

Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1995). Multiple significance tests: the Bonferroni method. BMJ (Clinical research ed.), 310(6973), 170. doi:10.1136/bmj.310.6973.170

Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(3), 559-570.

Buss, D. M., (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12,* 1-49.

Buss, D. M. et al. (1990). International preferences in selecting mates: A study of 37 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*(1), 5-47.

Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100*(2), 204-232.

Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Larsen, R. J. (2001). A half century of mate preferences: The cultural evolution of values. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 491-503.

Buunk, B. P., Dukstra, P., Fetchenhauer, D., & Kenrich, D. T. (2002). Age and gender differences in mate selection criteria for various involvement levels. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 271-278.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences (3rd ed).* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Constantinescu, M. (2013). Empirical research into ethics management programs: A study on Romanian organizations. *The Romanian Journal of Analytic Philosophy, 8*(2), 5-21.

Dagmar, L. (2001). Gender-specific mating preferences: A contribution to the discussion between evolutionary psychology and social role theory. *Zeitschrift fur Sozialpsychologie, 32*(2), 95-106.

Darwin, C. (1871). The descent of man and selection in relation to sex. London, United Kingdom: John Murray.

Dion, K. & Dion, L. (2001). Gender and Cultural Adaptation in Immigrant Families, *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 511-521.

Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex differences social behavior: A social-role analysis:* Hillsdale,NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions vs. social roles. *American Psychologists, 54*, 400-423.

Eastwick et al. (2006). Is traditional gender ideology associated with sex-typed mate preferences? A test of nine nations. *Sex Roles. 54*. 603-614.

Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Sex differences in mate preferences revisited: Do people know what they initially desire in a romantic partner? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(2), 245-264.

Ellis, B. (1992). The evolution of sexual attraction; Evaluative mechanisms in women. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 267-288). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, N. (2009). The role of women in creating nationalism in socialist and post-socialist Romania. *Undergraduate Journal of Anthropology, 1*, 11-18.

Evans, K., & Brase, G. L. (2007). Assessing sex differences and similarities in mate preferences: Above and beyond demand characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(5), 781-791.

Feingold, A. (1990). Gender differences in effects of physical attractiveness on romantic attraction: A comparison across five research paradigms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 981-993.

Feingold, A. (1992). Sex differences in mate selection preferences: A test of parental investment model. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 125-139.

Fletcher, G.J.O., Tither, J.M., O'Loughlin, C., Friesen, M., & Overall, N. (2004). Warm and homely or cold and beautiful? Sex differences in trading off traits in mate selection. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30,* 659-672.

Gangestad, S. W., Haselton, M. G., Buss, D. M. (2006a). Evolutionary foundations of cultural variations: Evoked culture and mate preferences. *Psychological Inquiry, 17*(2), 75-95.

Gangestad, S. W., Haselton, M. G., & Buss, D. M. (2006b). Toward an integrative understanding of evolved and transmitted culture: The importance of specialized psychological design. *Psychological Inquiry, 17*(2), 138-151.

Geary, David C., Vigil, Jacob, Byrd-Craven, Jennifer. (2004). Evolution of Human Mate Choice. *Journal of Sex Research*, *41*(1).

Gough, H.G. (1973). Personality assessment in the study of population. In J.T. Fawcett (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on Population* (pp.329-353). New York: Basic Books.

G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.

Groza, V. (1999). Institutionalization, behavior, and international adoption. *Journal of Immigrant Health, 1*(3), 133-143.

Hall, G. C. N., & Barongan, C. (2002). *Multicultural Psychology.* New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hasenkamp, A., Kummerling, A., & Hassebrauck, M. (2005). Are blind men looking for beautiful women? Evolutionary psychology and sociocultural explanations for mate –choice decisions. *Zeitschrift fur Sozialpsychologie, 36*(2), 77-89.

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1995). Men's and women's preferences in marital partners in the United States, Russia, and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26*(6), 728-750.

Helmuth, L. (2012, September 6). New study ids good news for women who want men who cook and clean. Retrieved July, 2019 from the World Wide Web: http://slate.com/human-interest/2012/09/sex-differences-in-mate-preferences-equality-of-society-influences

Hill, R. (1945). Campus values in mate selection. *Journal of Home Economics, 37,* 554-558.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences, international differences in work-related values (cross-cultural research and methodology).* Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Howard, J. A., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1987). Social or evolutionary theories? Some observations on preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(1), 194-200.

Hudson, J.W., & Henze, L.F. (1969). Campus values in mate selection: A replication. Journal of Marriage and Family, *31*, (4), 772-775.

Hoyt, L.L., & Hudson, J.W. (1981). Personal characteristics important in mate preference among college students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 9*(1), 93-96.

Khallid, Y. (2005). Mate selection in Jordan: Effects of sex, socioeconomic status, and culture. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(2), 155-168.

Kurzban, R., & Weeden, J. (2005). Hurry date: Mate preferences in action. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 26*, 227-244.

Laner, M. R., & Russell, J. N. (1998). Desired characteristics of spouses and best friends: Do they differ by sex and/or gender? *Sociological Inquiry, 68*(2), 186-202.

Li, N.P., Yong, J.C., Tov,W., Sng, O., Fletcher, G.J.O., Valentine, K.A., Jiang, Y.F., & Balliet, D. ((2013). Mate preferences do predict attraction and choices in the early stages of mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(5), 757-776.

Li, N.P., Bailey, J.M., Kenrick, D.T., & Linsenmeier, J.A.W. (2002). The necessities and luxuries o mate preferences: Testing the tradeoffs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* Social 947-955.

McGinnis, R. (1958). Campus values in mate selection: A repeat study. *Social Forces, 36,* 368-373.

Meltzer, A.L., McNulty, J.K., Jackson, G.L., & Karney, B.R. (2014). Men still value physical attractiveness in a long-term mate more than women: Rejoinder to

Eastwick, Neff, Finkel, Luckies, & Hunt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(3), 435-440.

Moore, F. R., & Cassidy, C. (2007). Female status predicts female mate preferences across nonindustrial societies. *Cross-Cultural Research, 41*(1), 66-74.

Negura, G. (2009). Organizational behavior and culture in the Romanian military institution. *Romanian Military Thinking,* 139-147.

Okami, P., & Shackelford, T. K. (2001). Human sex differences in sexual psychology and behavior. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 12*, 186-241.

Oprica, V. (2008). Gender equality and conflicting attitudes toward women in post-communist Romania. *Human Rights Review, 9*, 29-40.

Phinney, J. Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K. Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic Identity, Immigration and Wellbeing: An Interactional Perspective. Journal of Social Issues, 57 (3), 493-510.

Pillsworth, E.G. (2008). Mate preferences among the Shuar of Ecuador: Trait rankings and peer evaluations. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 29,* 256-267.

Pongracz, M. (2005). Opinions on gender roles. In Ildiho Nagy, Marietta Pongracz, Istvan Gyorgy Toth (Eds.). *Changing Roles: Report on the Situation of Women and Men in Hungary* (pp. 71-84). Budapest: TARKI Social Research Institute.

Regan, P.C. (1998). What if you can't get what you want? Willingness to compromise ideal mate selection standards as a function of sex, mate value, and relationship context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 1294-1303.

Romanian Ministry of Public Health. (2002-2007). The state of health in Romania. Retrieved from http://www.cred.ro

Rudmin, F. W. (2009). Acculturation, acculturative change and assimilation: A research bibliography with URL links. Retrieved from http://orpc,iaccp.org/index.php/option=com_content7view=article7id=112:rudmin biblio

Schwartz, S. J., Sullivan, S., Prado, G., & Szapocznik, J. (2006). Nativity and years in the receiving culture as markers for acculturation in ethnic enclaves. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*(3), 345-353.

Shackelford, T. K., Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2005a). Mate preferences of married persons in the newlywed year and three years later. *Cognition and Emotion, 19*(8), 1262-1270.

Shackelford, T. K., Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2005b). Universal dimensions of human mate preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 447-458.

Singh, D. (!995). Female judgment of male attractiveness and desirability for relationships: Role of waist-to-hip-ratio and financial status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(6), 1089-1101.

South, S. J. (1991). Sociodemographic differentials in mate selection preferences. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 53*, 928-940.

Sprecher, S., Sullivan, Q., & Hatfield, E. (1994). Mate selection preferences: Gender differences examined in a national sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(6), 1074-1080.

Sprecher, S., & Regan, P. C. (2002). Liking some things (in some people) more than others: Partner preferences in romantic relationships and friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*(4), 463-481.

Stephenson, M. (2000). Development and validation of the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS). *Psychological Assessment 12*(1), 77-88.

Stone, E. A., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2008). Socioeconomic development and shifts in mate preferences. *Evolutionary Psychology, 6*(3), 447-455.

Strassberg, D. S., & Holty, S. (2003). An experimental study of women's Internet personal ads. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*(3), 253-260.Toro-Morn, M., & Sprecher, S. (2003). Cross-cultural comparison of mate preferences among university students; United States vs. People's Republic of China (PRC). *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 34*(2), 151-170.

Toro-Morn, M., & Sprecher, S. (2003). Cross-cultural comparisons of mate preferences among university students: United States vs. People's Republic of China (PRC). *Journal of Comparative Family Studies 34*(2), 151-170.

Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B.Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man.* (pp. 136-179). Chicago, Il: Aldine.

Triandis,H. C. (1989). Self and social behavior in different cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*, 269-289.

Vanc, A. & White, C. (2011). Cultural perceptions of public relations gender roles in Romania. *Public Relations Review, 37,* 103-105.

Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1992). Gender differences in mate selection criteria: Sociobiological or socioeconomic explanation? *Ethology and Sociobiology, 13*(2), 115-124.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Cleveland State University
engagedlearning

Memorandum

Institutional Review Board

To: Kathryn MacCluskie
CASAL

From: Bernie Strong (b.r.strong@csuohio.edu, X3624) BRS
IRB Coordinator
Sponsored Programs & Research Services

Date: August 15, 2014

Re: Results of IRB Review of your project number: # 30143-MAC-HS
Co-Investigator(s): Monica Nainiger
Title: Gender differences in the perception of mate preferences that contribute to long term relationships among Romanians residing in America.

The IRB has reviewed and approved your application for the above named project, under the category noted below. It has been determined that the research being performed under this protocol is Exempt. This determination does not expire and does not require an annual review.

However, by accepting this decision, you agree to notify the IRB of: (1) any additions to or changes in procedures for your study that modify the subjects' risk in any way; and (2) any events that affect that safety or well-being of subjects. Notify the IRB of any revisions to the protocol, including the addition of researchers, prior to implementation.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

Approval Category: **Approval Date: August 15, 2014**

_X_ **Exempt (B2)**

cc: Project file

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form

Dear Prospective Participant-

Hello! My name is Monica Nainiger and I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education, more specifically, part of the program of Urban Education with a counseling specialization at Cleveland State University. Working on this project alongside of me is my mentor and graduate program advisor Dr. Kathryn MacCluskie. I am conducting the study you are being requested to participate in, as part of my exit requirements for satisfactory completion of my degree. Should you agree to participate, you will be asked to fill out a short survey containing some demographic items along with a second questionnaire. The purpose of this study is to gain insight into what characteristics single heterosexual Romanian men and women deem as essential for a long lasting relationship as well as how adaptation to American way of life may or may not influence each of these respective perspectives. The survey entitles "Factors in Choosing a Mate" will ask you to rate a set of mate characteristics (intrinsic and extrinsic) on a scale from 0 to 3 to indicate your valuation of them in terms of relative importance. The second questionnaire entitled "Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation

Scale" will likewise ask you to rate the extent to which you identify with your Romanian heritage or American way of life through a set of statements, each of which will be endorsed on a scale of 1 -4.

There are no for-seeable major risks and at worst only minimal risks to participating in the study. Even though the study instruments have been used extensively in previous research with no reported subject discomfort or distress, some may feel they are "obligated" to participate or may find some of the demographic items to be too personal in nature to which to divulge answers. However, there is completely no obligation to participating in the study and your consent to participate may be withdrawn by you at any time without consequence. As a "thank you", benefits to participation include an incentive of $ 10.00 compensation for your time. If you are interested in being paid, please be sure to include your mailing address, where indicated at the end of this form. It is my hope that through your participation, results from this research will illuminate those mate preferences that are highly endorsed by each representative and respective gender sample comprising the local Romanian community in which you live which can then be generalized to include those attributes believed by all those that self-identify to be Romanian as those which contribute to a satisfying long term relationship. Further, these respective mate preferences will be brought to light as being a function of adaptation to American way of life. More indirectly, results of this investigation may begin to shed some light on the current sociocultural climate in Romania, notwithstanding ideologies enveloping current gender standards and norms. This is particularly timely and salient, given that Romania's sociocultural climate is in transition from its Eastern Orthodox collectivistic perspective, post communism.

Completion of the both questionnaires should only take one session of approximately 15-20 minutes. Responses will be kept anonymous and, unless your consent is given, no identifiable personal information will be known to anyone- including the researcher. You will not be asked to put any personal information on either of the response documents. Only a single numerical ID code will be affixed to each questionnaire, solely for data entry purposes. Signatures and personal identification information obtained on this informed consent form will be kept separate from the rest of the survey items and will only be used to identify those that which to be compensated for their time in participation with the survey research. All of these forms will be kept under secured lock and key and will subsequently be destroyed after 3 years.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the CSU Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

For further information about the study, including any future study outcomes or findings, you may contact me at (216)392-0637 or e-mail me at peridot015@aol.com. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Kathryn MacCluskie at (216)523-7147 or email her at kcm1223@mac.com.

Please indicate your understanding of the information above and agreement to participate by signing below.

I am 18yrs or older and have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate.

** PLEASE SIGN ONLY ONE COPY OF THIS FORM AND RETURN WITH BOTH COMPLETED SURVEYS. KEEP THE OTHER FOR YOUR RECORDS**

NAME (PRINT)_____ DATE_____

SIGNATURE_____

Please fill out personal identification information below in order to be compensated for your time. Thank you.

Name_____

Address_____

Email_____

Phone No._____

Formular de consimțământ informat

Stimate viitor participant(ă),

Vă salut călduros! Numele meu este Monica Nainiger și urmez cursurile de doctorat ale Facultății de Științele Educației, făcând parte, mai precis, din programul *Educația Urbană,* cu specializare în consiliere la Cleveland State University. Persoana care a lucrat la acest proiect alături de mine este mentorul meu și consilier al programului de absolvire - Dr. Kathryn MacCluskie.

Conduc studiul la care sunteți rugat să participați, ca cerință a procesului de absolvire, în vederea obținerii cu succes a titlului de doctor. Dacă sunteți de acord să participați, vi se cere să completați un scurt sondaj, privind câteva date demografice, împreună cu un al doilea chestionar. Scopul acestui studiu este acela de a obține o perspectivă din interior asupra caracteristicilor pe care românii heterosexuali, barbați sau femei, care nu au încă un partener de viață, le consideră esențiale pentru o relație de lungă durată și, în același timp, asupra felului în care adaptarea la modul de viață american le-a influențat sau nu fiecare din aceste caracteristici. Sondajul de opinie, care se numește ”Factori în alegerea unui partener”, vă cere să apreciați un set de trăsături pereche (intrinseci și extrinseci) pe o scară de la 0 la 3, pentru a arăta valoarea pe care acestea o

au pentru dumneavoastră, în termenii unei importanțe relative. Cel de-al doilea chestionar, intitulat ”Scala Stephenson a aculturației grupului multiplu”, vă solicită, în mod asemănător, să evaluați în ce măsură vă asumați moștenirea românească sau modul de viață american printr-un set de afirmații, fiecare din acestea fiind notată pe o scară de la 1 la 4.

Nu există riscuri previzibile majore, în cel mai rău caz, vă asumați doar riscuri minimale dacă participați la acest studiu. Deși instrumentele de studiu la care am făcut referire au fost folosite pe scară largă în cercetarea de până acum, fără raportarea niciunui disconfort sau stres din partea subiecților, unii dintre aceștia s-ar putea simți ”obligați” să participe sau ar putea să considere prea personale unele din întrebările cu caracter demografic încât să indice răspunsurile. Oricare ar fi situația, nu este absolut nicio obligație de a participa la acest studiu și consimțământul dumneavoastră poate fi retras în orice moment, fără nicio consecință. Ca un "mulțumesc", beneficiile participării includ un stimulent de a fi oferit $ 10.00 compensație pentru timpul acordat. Dacă sunteți interesat în a fi plătit, vă rugăm să asigurați-vă că pentru a include adresa poștală, în cazul în care este indicat la sfârșitul acestui formular. Mai mult decât atât, sper ca, prin participarea dumneavoastră, rezultatele acestui studiu să facă lumină în privința preferințelor ce vizează alegerea unui partener și care sunt cel mai des întâlnite la fiecare dintre sexe, reflectând comunitatea românească locală, din care și dumneavoastră faceți parte, și care pot fi generalizate, pentru a sintetiza acele atribute considerate de oricine se recunoaște a fi român ca fiind cele ce contribuie la o relație satisfăcătoare de lungă durată. Mai departe, aceste preferințe în alegerea partenerului, vor fi descoperite drept o rezultantă a adaptării la stilul de viață american. Intr-un mod mai degrabă indirect,

rezultatele acestei anchete ar putea aduce lumină în ceea ce privește climatul sociocultural din Romania, dincolo de ideologiile ce învăluie standardele și normele actuale referitoare la gen. Este deosebit de oportun și remarcabil faptul că acest climat sociocultural din România este în tranziție de la perspectiva colectivistă estic-ortodoxă la postcomunism.

Completarea celor două chestionare se încadrează, ca durată, într-o singură sesiune de aproximativ 15-20 de minute. Se va păstra anonimatul răspunsurilor dumneavoastră și, dacă nu vă veți da acordul, nicio informație cu caracter identificabil, personal nu va fi cunoscută vreunei alte persoane, inclusiv cercetătorului care conduce studiul. Nu vi se va cere să dați nicio informație personală în niciuna dintre fișele cu răspunsuri. Doar un singur cod numeric de identificare va fi aplicat pe fiecare dintre chestionare, în scopul introducerii datelor. Semnături și informații de identificare cu caracter personal obținute în acest formular de consimțământ informat vor fi păstrate separat de restul elementelor anchetei și vor fi folosite doar pentru a le identifica pe cele care care urmează să fie compensate pentru timpul lor în participarea cu cercetarea.

Toate aceste formulare vor fi păstrate securizate sub cheie și vor fi distruse ulterior, după 3 ani.

Dacă aveți nelămuriri în privința drepturilor dumneavoastră de participant la acest proiect de cercetare, puteți contacta Comitetul Instituțional de Revizuire din cadrul Universității de Stat din Cleveland (CSU Institutional Review Board) la numărul de telefon (216)687-3630. Pentru mai multe informații privind studiul, incluzând orice rezultate sau constatări, mă puteți contacta personal la numărul de telefon (216)392-0637 sau la e-mailul peridot015@aol.com. Puteți, de asemenea, să o contactați pe doamna profesor

coordonator, Dr. Kathryn MacCluskie la tel. (216)523-7147 sau la email: kcm1223@mac.com

Vă rog să indicați faptul că ați înțeles informația de mai sus și sunteți de acord să participați, semnând mai jos.

Am cel puțin 18 ani, am citit și am înțeles acest formular de consimțământ și sunt de acord să particip.

** VĂ ROG SĂ SEMNAȚI DOAR O SINGURĂ COPIE A ACESTUI FORMULAR ȘI SĂ O RETURNAȚI ÎMPREUNĂ CU CELE DOUĂ CHESTIONARE COMPLETATE. PĂSTRAȚI O A DOUA COPIE PENTRU DUMNEAVOASTRĂ**

DATA_____

NUME (COMPLET, LIZIBIL) _____

SEMNĂTURĂ _____

Vă rugăm să completați informații de identificare personală de mai jos pentru a fi compensate pentru timpul acordat. Multumesc.

Name_____

Address_____

Email_____

Niciun telefon._____

APPENDIX C

Factors in Choosing A Mate

Part I: Biographical Data

1. Self- Identify (please circle): Romanian Hungarian Roma Other(please name)_____
2. Were you born in Romania? Yes_____ No_____
3. Sex: (male or female)_____
4. Age:_____
5. Sexual preference (check): Homosexual_____ Heterosexual_____ Bisexual_____
6. SES (estimated annual income)_____
7. Religion you **practice** (be specific—ie Eastern Orthodox Catholic):_____
8. Marital status (please circle): single dating engaged married divorced widowed
9. How long have you lived in America? (years) _____
10. At what age did you immigrate to America? ____
11. Approximate date that you arrived in America? (at least state the year)_____
12. How did you legally enter US? (ie student, worker, fiance(e), with (ex)-spouse/family, tourist visa, lottery visa, family reunion or other ways)_____

Part II: Evaluative Section

1. Please evaluate the following factors in choosing a mate. If you consider it

indispensable, give it……3 points

important, but not indispensable……..2 points

desirable, but not very important……1 point

irrelevant or unimportant……..0 points

_____ (1) Good cook and housekeeper

_____ (2) Pleasing disposition

_____ (3) Sociability

_____ (4) Similar educational background

_____ (5) Refinement, neatness

_____ (6) Good financial prospect

_____ (7) Chastity (no previous experience in sexual intercourse)

_____ (8) Dependable character

_____ (9) Emotional stability & maturity

_____ (10) Desire for home and children

_____ (11) Favorable social status or rating

_____ (12) Good looks

_____ (13) Similar religious background

_____ (14) Ambition & industriousness

_____ (15) Similar political background

_____ (16) Mutual attraction—love

_____ (17) Good health

_____ (18) Education & intelligence

Factori în alegerea unui partener

Partea I: Date biografice

1. Identificare (vă rugăm să încercuiți): român; ungur; rromani; altă naționalitate (vă rugăm să specificați care)_____

2.Sunteti nascut in Romania? Da_____ Nu_____

3. Sex: (bărbat sau femeie)_____

4. Vârsta: _____

5. Orientarea sexuală (marcați cu V): homosexual_____ heterosexual _____ bisexual _____

6. SES (venitul anual estimat):_____

7. Religia **practicată** (specificați exact, de ex. creștin ortodox, romano-catolic):_____

8. Starea civilă (vă rugăm să încercuiți): celibatar (singur); într-o relație; logodit; căsătorit; divorțat văduv

9. De cât timp sînteți în America? (în ani) _____

10. La ce vârstă ați emigrat în America?_____

11. Data aproximativă când ați ajuns în America (specificați cel puțin anul):_____

12. Cum ați intrat legal în Statele Unite ? (de exemplu, cu viză de student, de lucru, de logodnic(ă), pentru (fost,-ă) soț/soție, turist, cu loteria vizelor, prin reîntregirea familiei etc.)_____

Partea a II-a: Secțiunea de evaluare

1. Vă rugăm să evaluați următorii factori în alegerea unui partener. Dacă veți considera că este

indispensabil, dați-i..... 3 puncte

important, dar nu indispensabil .....2 puncte

de dorit, dar nu foarte important.....1 punct

nerelevant sau neimportant.....0 puncte

_____(1) Gătește bine și întreține curățenia

_____(2) Dispoziție plăcută

_____(3) Sociabilitate

_____(4) Educație similară

_____(5) Rafinament, finețe

_____(6) Situație financiară de perspectivă

_____(7) Castitate (fără relații sexuale anterioare)

_____ (8) Caracter de încredere

_____(9) Stabilitate emoțională și maturitate

_____(10) Dorința de a avea un cămin și copii

_____(11) Statut social avantajos sau apreciat

_____(12) Înfățișare plăcută

_____(13) Credință și educație religioasă similară

_____(14) Ambiție și perseverență

_____(15) Apartenență (sau simpatii) politică similară

_____(16) Atracție reciprocă, dragoste

_____(17) Stare de sănătate bună

_____(18) Educație și grad de inteligență

APPENDIX D

Stephenson Acculturation Multiple Group Scale (back translated version)

Below is a series of statements, assessing the changes that occur when people interact with their fellow beings from different cultures or ethnic groups. For questions aimed at the "COUNTRY OF ORIGIN" or "HOMELAND", please refer to the originating country of your family of origin or the country in which you identify or feel that you belong. For questions aimed at the "native language", please refer to the language of the place where your family originates or with which you identify.

Circle the answer that fits best with what you feel about each statement.

False = 1, Partially False = 2, Partially true = 3, True = 4

1.	I understand English, but I'm not fluent.	1	2	3	4
2.	I am informed about current events in the United States.	1	2	3	4
3.	I speak my native language with friends and acquaintances from my home country.	1	2	3	4
4.	I never learned to speak the language of my country of origin.	1	2	3	4
5.	I feel very comfortable with (Anglo) Americans.	1	2	3	4
6.	I eat traditional food from my home country and culture.	1	2	3	4
7.	I have many acquaintances among the (Anglo) Americans.	1	2	3	4
8.	I feel comfortable when I speak my native language.	1	2	3	4
9.	I am aware of current events in my country.	1	2	3	4
10.	I can read and write in my native language.	1	2	3	4

11.	I feel at home in the United States.	1	2	3	4
12.	I attend social events with people from my home country.	1	2	3	4
13.	I feel accepted by (Anglo) Americans.	1	2	3	4
14.	At home I speak my native language.	1	2	3	4
15.	I regularly read my ethnic minority media.	1	2	3	4
16.	I know how to speak my native language.	1	2	3	4
17.	I know how to prepare (Anglo) American food.	1	2	3	4
18.	I am familiar with the history of my home country.	1	2	3	4
19.	I regularly read American newspapers.	1	2	3	4
20.	I like listening to music of my specific ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
21.	I like to speak my native language.	1	2	3	4
22.	I feel comfortable to speak English.	1	2	3	4
23.	I speak English at home.	1	2	3	4
24.	I speak my native language with my partner or friend.	1	2	3	4
25.	When I pray, I use my native language.	1	2	3	4
26.	I attend social events with (Anglo) Americans.	1	2	3	4
27.	I think in my native language.	1	2	3	4
28.	I remain in close contact with family members and relatives in my home country.	1	2	3	4
29.	I am familiar with important figures in American history.	1	2	3	4
30.	I think in English.	1	2	3	4
31.	I speak English with my friend /partner.	1	2	3	4
32.	I like to eat American food.	1	2	3	4

Scala Stephenson a aculturației grupului multiplu

Găsiți mai jos o serie de enunțuri, care evaluează schimbările ce au loc atunci când oamenii interacționează cu semeni de-ai lor din diferite culturi sau grupuri etnice. Pentru întrebările care au în vedere ”ȚARA DE ORIGINE” sau ”ȚARA NATALĂ”, vă rugăm să vă referiți la țara originară, din care provine familia dumneavoastră sau țara cu care vă identificați ori simțiți că-i aparțineți. Pentru întrebările care au în vedere ”LIMBA NATIVĂ”, vă rugăm să faceți referire la limba vorbită în locul de unde provine familia dumneavoastră sau cu care vă identificați.

Încercuiți răspunsul care se potrivește cel mai mult cu ceea ce considerați referitor la fiecare enunț.

Fals=1, Parțial fals=2, Parțial adevărat=3, Adevărat=4

1.	Înțeleg engleza, dar nu o vorbesc fluent.	1	2	3	4
2.	Sunt informat în legătură cu actualitățile din Statele Unite.	1	2	3	4
3.	Vorbesc limba nativă cu prietenii și cunoștințele din țara mea de origine.	1	2	3	4
4.	Nu am învățat niciodată să vorbesc limba țării mele de origine.	1	2	3	4
5.	Mă simt foarte confortabil alături de (anglo)americani.	1	2	3	4
6.	Consum mâncare tradițională, specifică țării mele natale și culturii acesteia.	1	2	3	4
7.	Am multe cunoștințe printre (anglo)americani.	1	2	3	4
8.	Mă simt în largul meu când vorbesc în limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
9.	Sunt la curent cu actualitățile din țara mea natală.	1	2	3	4
10.	Știu să citesc și să scriu în limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
11.	Mă simt acasă în Statele Unite.	1	2	3	4

12.	Particip la evenimente sociale cu oameni din țara mea de origine.	1	2	3	4
13.	Mă simt acceptat(ă) de (anglo)americani.	1	2	3	4
14.	Acasă vorbesc limba nativă.	1	2	3	4
15.	Citesc cu regularitate presa aparținând minorității mele etnice.	1	2	3	4
16.	Știu să vorbesc în limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
17.	Mă pricep să pregătesc mâncare (anglo)americană.	1	2	3	4
18.	Sunt familiarizat cu istoria țării mele natale.	1	2	3	4
19.	Citesc cu regularitate ziare americane.	1	2	3	4
20.	Îmi place să ascult muzică specifică grupului meu etnic.	1	2	3	4
21.	Îmi place să vorbesc în limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
22.	Mă simt în largul meu să vorbesc engleza.	1	2	3	4
23.	Acasă vorbesc englezește.	1	2	3	4
24.	Vorbesc în limba mea nativă cu partenerul(a) sau prietenul(a) mea.	1	2	3	4
25.	Când mă rog, folosesc limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
26.	Particip la evenimente sociale cu (anglo)americani.	1	2	3	4
27.	Gândesc în limba mea nativă.	1	2	3	4
28.	Păstrez o strânsă legătură cu membrii familiei și rudele din țara mea natală.	1	2	3	4
29.	Sunt familiarizat cu personalități importante din istoria Americii.	1	2	3	4
30.	Gândesc în engleză.	1	2	3	4
31.	Vorbesc în engleză cu partenerul/-a (sau prietenul/-a) meu.	1	2	3	4
32.	Îmi place să mănânc mâncare americană.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX E

Research Instruments

These research instruments may be freely used for scientific research purposes only. Any commercial use is prohibited. We would also appreciate it if you email us any papers or interesting results that emerge from research using these instruments.

Characteristics Desired in a Friend

Relevant article:

Bleske, A.L., & Buss, D.M. (2001). Opposite sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1310-1323.

Conflict Between the Sexes Instrument

Relevant articles:

Buss, D. M. (1989). Conflict between the sexes: Strategic interference and the evocation of anger and upset. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 56, 735-747.

Buss, D. M. (1991). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. Journal of Personality, 59, 663-703.

Buss, D.M., & Malamuth, N. (1996). Sex, Power, Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press.

Costs and Benefits of Friendship

Relevant article:

Bleske, A., & Buss, D.M. (2000). Can men and women just be friends? Personal Relationships, 7, 131-151.

Derogation of Competitors Instrument

Relevant articles:

Buss, D. M., & Dedden, L. (1990). Derogation of competitors. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 395-422.

Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (1996). Mate attraction and competitor derogation: Context effects on perceived effectiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 1185-1204.

Bleske-Rechek, A., & Buss, D.M. (2006). Sexual strategies pursued and mate attraction tactics deployed. Personality and Individual Differences, 40, 1299-1311.

Jealousy Instrument

Relevant article:

Buss, D.M., Shackelford, T.K., Kirkpatrick, L.A., Choe, J., Hasegawa, M., Hasegawa, T., & Bennett, K. (1999). Jealousy and beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competing hypotheses in the United States, Korea, and Japan. Personal Relationships, 6, 125-150.

Mate Attraction Tactics

Relevant articles:

Buss, D. M. (1988). The Evolution of Human Intrasexual Competition:Tactics of Mate Attraction. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54, 616-628.

Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (1996). Mate attraction and competitor derogation: Context effects on perceived effectiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 1185-1204.

Bleske-Rechek, A., & Buss, D.M. (2006). Sexual strategies pursued and mate attraction tactics deployed. Personality and Individual Differences, 40, 1299-1311.

Mate Preferences Questionnaires

Relevant article:
Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. Behavioral & Brain Sciences, 12, 1-49.

Foreign Translations

Spanish - 18 item
Spanish - 13 item

Mate Poaching Inventory

Relevant article:
Schmitt, D.P., & Buss, D.M. (2001). Human mate poaching: Tactics and temptations for infiltrating existing relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80, 894-917.

Mate Retention Inventory

Relevant articles:
Buss, D. M. (1988). From Vigilance to Violence: Tactics of Mate Retention in American Undergraduates. Ethology & Sociobiology, 9, 291-317.
Buss, D.M., & Shackelford, T.K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 346-361.
Buss, D.M. (2002). Human Mate Guarding. Neurendocrinology Letter Special Issue, 23, 23-29.
Shackelford, T.K., Goetz, A.T. & Buss, D.M. (2005). Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory. Personality and Individual Differences, 39, 415-425.

Mate Retention Inventory: Short Form

MRI-SF: men's self-report
MRI-SF: men's partner-report
MRI-SF: women's self-report
MRI-SF: women's partner-report

Relevant articles:
Buss, D. M. (1988). From Vigilance to Violence: Tactics of Mate Retention in American Undergraduates. Ethology & Sociobiology, 9, 291-317.
Buss, D.M., Shackelford, T.K., & McKibbin, W. F. (2008). The Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF). Personality and Individual Differences, 44, 322-334.

Reasons for Dissolving a Friendship

Relevant article:
Bleske, A.L., & Buss, D.M. (2001). Opposite sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1310-1323.

Reasons for Friendship Initiation

Relevant article:
Bleske, A.L., & Buss, D.M. (2001). Opposite sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1310-1323.

Reasons for Having Sex Questionnaire

Relevant article:
Meston, C., & Buss, D.M. (2007). Why humans have sex. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36, 477-507.

The Sexy Seven: An Adjective Measure of Sexual Strategies

Relevant article:
Schmitt, D.P., & Buss, D.M. (2000). Sexual dimensions of person description: Beyond or subsumed by the Big Five? Journal of Research in Personality, 34, 141-177.

Susceptibility to Infidelity Instrument

Relevant article:
Buss, D.M., & Shackelford, T.K (1997). Susceptibility to Infidelity in the First Year of Marriage. Journal of Research in Personality, 31, 193-221.