

Kenrick, D.T., Ledlow, S., & Ackerman, J.M. (2003). Mate choice. In J. Ponzetti, et al., (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Marriage & Family Relationships*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Macmillan Reference USA .

## **Mate selection**

Because successful reproduction is central to natural selection, choosing a mate is a problem that humans share with most other animals. Peahens choose among the most attractive peacocks, female elephant seals pick males who have already attracted large harems, and even our promiscuous chimpanzee cousins exercise choice about the other chimps with which they will be promiscuous. Among mammals, however, humans are in a small minority in one important way: For over 95 percent of other mammals, family arrangements involving male care of offspring are nonexistent (Geary, 2000). Across human societies, though, men and women bond together in marriage (Broude, 1994; U.N., 2000). Not all human mating occurs within such bonds; and within and across societies, polygamous arrangements are relatively common (Broude, 1994). In considering how and why people choose mates, therefore, two points are significant: 1) there are variations as well as universalities across cultures, 2) there is a distinction between selection of mates for short term relationships versus long term relationships.

Discussion below begins with research and theory focused on relatively “proximal” causes, or immediate psychological triggers of mate choice (such as pleasant feelings in response to seeing a physically attractive other), and moves through progressively more distal factors (relationship exchange, cultural and historical factors, and evolutionary history). Like the single frames, scenes, and overall plot of a movie, these different approaches are complementary, and all are required to see the “big picture” of mate selection.

## **Factors Within The Individual**

Several theories of mate selection have focused on the psychological responses of the individual to potential mates. An influential early theory focused on reinforcement, emphasizing the observer’s affective response to potential mates (Byrne & Clore, 1970). The assumption was that a person is attracted to potential mates who make that person feel good. Researchers in this tradition focused on overt characteristics such as physical appearance and the expression of similar attitudes and values (Byrne, 1971). People indeed tend to mate with others similar in political attitudes, lifestyle values, personality, appearance, ethnicity, and many other characteristics (e.g., Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997; Keller, Thiessen, & Young, 1996). Consistent with the theory that such features make the judge feel good, it was found that people do find it pleasant to interact with similar others (Byrne, 1971).

There are exceptions to the similarity-attraction principle, however. Women at all ages tend to be attracted to men who are slightly older than themselves, and men shift their preferences throughout the lifespan, such that teenagers find older women most attractive, men in their twenties are most attracted to women their own age, and older men are most attracted to women who are younger than themselves (Kenrick, Gabrielidis, Keefe, & Cornelius, 1996; Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). Besides

this, women tend to emphasize status-linked characteristics in a partner, whereas men do not (Sadalla, Kenrick, & Vershure, 1987). Men, on the other hand place more emphasis on physical attractiveness (Townsend & Wasserman, 1998). The cues for attractiveness are also slightly different for the two sexes. Although symmetry is attractive in both men and women, small noses and relatively smaller jaws are relatively more attractive in women, and medium noses and large jaws are attractive in men (Cunningham, Druen, & Barbee, 1997). A small waist-to-hip ratio is attractive in a woman, but not in a man (Singh, 1995).

Another interesting exception to the similarity-attraction rule is that individuals raised in the same home tend not to experience strong sexual attraction and romantic feelings towards one another, even when they are not related (Shepher, 1983). Contrary to the general tendency for marriages to occur between neighbors and acquaintances, in a study of 211 kibbutzim, Shepher (1983) found no instances of marriage among adults who had been born on the same kibbutz and had stayed together in the same peer group without interruption during childhood.

Another theory focusing on individual psychological responses suggested that a person decides that he or she is feeling romantic attraction for another when he or she attributes feelings of arousal to that other (Berscheid & Walster, 1974). Findings that people became attracted to others present when they were experiencing arousal due to fear of electric shock, standing on a shaky suspension bridge, or recent exercise were interpreted as support for that theory (Dutton & Aron, 1974; White & Kight, 1984). An alternative interpretation of those findings emphasizes that arousal simply boosts attraction, without any necessary misinterpretation of arousal (Allen, Kenrick, Linder, & McCall, 1989).

Another set of factors within the person that affects mate choice involves personality traits. One line of research examined differences between those adopting an “unrestricted” versus “restricted” approach to relationships (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992). Unrestricted individuals, inclined to have sex without commitment and to be involved with more than one partner at a time, choose attractive and outgoing partners; restricted (or monogamously oriented) individuals favor partners manifesting personality characteristics associated with fidelity and good parenting.

## **Factors in the Relationship**

Mate selection is a two-way street, involving more than the preferences of a single individual. A second wave of mate selection theories emphasized processes of dyadic exchange of costs and benefits. The most prevalent models emphasize social exchange - I seek a mate who brings a mix of assets and liabilities with comparable value to my own personal portfolio (e.g., Hatfield, Traupmann, Sprecher, Utne, & Hay, 1985). Researchers focusing on reciprocal exchange have emphasized naturalistic studies of mate choice in relationships as they unfold over time (e.g., Cate, Huston, & Nesselrode, 1986). Some of these approaches have suggested that, over the course of time, relationships go through different stages or phases. Murstein’s (1970) filter theory, for example, suggested that partners are first selected based on obvious stimulus characteristics, such as attractiveness, and are then passed through finer filters based on similar values and role compatibility.

The earliest dyadic exchange models focused on complementarity (Winch, 1955). So, for example, it was expected that socially dominant partners will seek socially submissive others for relationships. Although support for personality complementarity was not abundant, there is some degree of cross-sex complementarity in preferred traits. For example, females emphasize social

dominance in their partners more than males do (Sadalla et al., 1987). Even there, however, dominant males are not particularly attractive to submissive females, and there is no evidence that dominant females have a preference for submissive males.

Support for general exchange theories, on the other hand, has been clearer. For example, there is evidence that physically attractive women tend to marry men of higher status, and that socially successful men tend to marry more attractive women (Taylor & Glenn, 1976). There is also evidence that people of both sexes are attracted to others with personal characteristics that make them easy to get along with in long-term relationships (Jensen-Campbell, Graziano, & West, 1995; Green and Kenrick, 1994).

### **Sociocultural and Historical Factors**

Taking still another step back from the isolated individual, some researchers have focused on the cultural and historical context of mate choice (e.g., Crook & Crook, 1988; Hatfield & Rapson, 1996). Adopting this perspective, one can ask both: How do human societies differ with regard to mate choice, and how are they similar? The range of differences is, at first glance, rather dazzling. As Broude (1994) noted, exclusive monogamy, the legally sanctioned form of mating in Europe and North America, is preferred in less than 20 percent of 238 cultures. Polygyny (more than one woman sharing the same husband) is practiced in most of the remainder (over 80 percent), and polyandry (more than one man sharing the same wife) is found in four societies. And although personal choice is emphasized in Western societies, males marry women chosen for them by third parties in 29.3 percent of 157 societies, and marriages are arranged for females in 44.1 percent of 161 societies (Broude, 1994). Furthermore, there are cultural variations in norms about desirable features in mates, including amount of body fat desired, size and shape of preferred breasts, and overt characteristics such as body markings (Anderson, Crawford, Nadeau, & Lindberg, 1992; Ford & Beach, 1951; Broude, 1994).

Looking across recent history, survey data on mate preferences among North American college students in 1939, 1956, 1967, 1977, 1985, and 1996, reveals regional as well as temporal variations. For example, students in Texas were more interested in chastity, religious background, and neatness than were students in Michigan. Over time, the value placed on chastity by both sexes dropped, and the value placed on mutual attraction and love increased (Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001).

Alongside cultural and historical variations in mate choice, there are many commonalities found across human societies. These range from overt characteristics such as clear skin and lack of disfigurement to personality traits making for good parents and agreeable companions (Broude, 1994; Ford & Beach, 1951). A general preference for similarity in a mate is also widespread (Botwin et al., 1997). Further, a number of sex differences found in Western society hold up across cultures and time periods, including the tendency to judge men on the basis of physical strength, social position and economic worth, and to place more emphasis on a woman's physical attractiveness (Broude, 1994; Buss 1989). The age difference in preference for older versus younger partners across the lifespan also holds up across numerous societies and historical time periods (Otta, da Silva-Queiroz, de-Sousa-Campos, da-Silva, & Silveira, 1999; Kenrick, Nieuweboer, & Buunk, 1995; Harpending, 1992; Kenrick & Keefe, 1992).

It is sometimes suggested that, in Western societies, the relative emphasis on status and power in men and physical attractiveness in women might be related to women's relatively lower economic

status, and that if opportunity and wage disparities could be rectified, women would not prefer a man with higher socioeconomic status (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Within the United States, however, there is evidence that women who gain social status do not shift to male-like preferences for relative youth and attractiveness, but instead continue to prefer older and higher status partners (Kenrick & Keefe, 1992; Townsend, 1987).

Due to warfare, migration, and random historical and geographic variations, there are sometimes relatively more available females than males in the pool of eligible mates, or the converse. Guttentag and Secord (1983) found that a surplus of women (putting men in a “buyers’ market”) is associated with later marriage, more divorce, and more permissive sexual norms. A surplus of men, on the other hand, is associated with more stable relationships and male willingness to commit to monogamous relationships. Other research suggests that polyandry, though rare, is associated with conditions of extreme resource scarcity (as found in the high Himalayas in Nepal) under which survival rates for children of single males and their wives are low. In Nepal and a few other places, several brothers often combine their resources and marry a single wife, increasing survival rates for resultant children (Crook & Crook, 1988). On the other hand, extreme polygyny (harems) is correlated with ecological conditions including: 1) steep social hierarchy, 2) generally rich environment allowing higher status families to accumulate vast wealth, 3) occasional famines so lower status families face possibilities of starvation (Crook & Crook, 1988). Under these circumstances, a woman who absorbs the cost of sharing a wealthy husband reaps a survival insurance policy for herself and any resultant children.

## **Evolutionary Factors**

Taking a still broader perspective, we can ask how mate selection in humans compares with mate selection in other animals. Looking across many animal species, evolutionary biologists have uncovered general principles that may help clarify some of the particulars of human mate selection.

At the broadest level, the theory of inclusive fitness suggests all animals are selected to behave in ways that, on average, benefit others sharing their genes (siblings and cousins as well as their own offspring). Sexual selection refers to a form of natural selection favoring characteristics that assist in attracting mates (e.g., peacock’s feathers) or in competing with the same sex (e.g., rams’ horns). Across species, females are more likely to be the selectors, and males are more likely to be banging their heads against one another to win the females’ attention. According to differential parental investment theory, the sex with the initially higher investment in the offspring (generally females) has more to lose from a poor mating choice and demands more before agreeing to mate (Trivers, 1972). In species in which males make the larger investment (e.g., by caring for the eggs and young, as in seahorses), males tend to be more selective about their mates (Daly & Wilson, 1983). In mammals, the normal discrepancy between males and females is especially pronounced, because females carry the young inside their bodies and nurse them after birth. Male mammals can reproduce with little cost, and, frequently, the male’s direct input does not go beyond the simple act of copulation. In such species, males tend to be nonselective about their mates, whereas females demand evidence of superior genetic potential before mating and will often mate only with males who have demonstrated superior capabilities. Humans also sometimes have sexual relations within less committed relationships, in the typical mammalian mode. Under those circumstances, males are less selective (Kenrick, Sadalla, Groth, & Trost, 1990). Unlike most mammals, however, humans tend to form long-term pair-bonds, in which males invest many resources in the offspring.

Under those circumstances, men's selectivity about mates approaches that of women (Kenrick et al., 1990).

Men and women make different contributions to the offspring. Women contribute their bodies, through internal gestation and nursing, and men value indications of fertility including healthy appearance and a waist-hip ratio characteristic of youthful sexual maturity (Cunningham et al., 1997). On the other hand, men primarily contribute their genes and indirect resources such as money and shelter. Women could appraise a man's genetic potential from physical attractiveness and position in a dominance hierarchy (Gangestad, Thornhill, & Yeo, 1994). His ability to provide resources could be gauged indirectly by his ambition and directly by his social status and acquired wealth (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Daly & Wilson, 1983). Even with these differential tendencies, humans often cooperate in raising their offspring. Hence a number of characteristics should be (and are) desired by both sexes, such as agreeableness, kindness, and faithfulness (Buss, 1989; Kenrick, et al., 1990).

## Conclusion

Individual psychological factors that influence mate choice must play out in the context of dyadic interaction, and those dyadic interactions unfold within a broader cultural context. The variations across individuals, dyads, and cultures are in turn affected by the preferences and proclivities inherited from ancestral humans, shaped by ecological forces common to all members of this particular species of social mammal. Thus, mate selection can be understood at several different, yet interconnected, levels of analysis.

The broader ecological factors discussed earlier provide a good example. Cultural variations in mate choice are not completely random, but often fit with general principles applicable to many animal species (Crook & Crook, 1988; Daly & Wilson, 1983). For example, polyandry is more common when the males are brothers in humans and other animals, in keeping with the general principle of inclusive fitness. Polygyny is more common than polyandry in humans and other mammals, as is the female preference for high status males, consistent with principles of differential parental investment (female mammals have less to gain from taking additional mates, so will demand more in a mate). Mate selection thus offers insight into fundamental questions about human nature and its interaction with human culture.

## References

- Allen, J., Kenrick, D.T., Linder, D.E., & McCall, M.A. (1989). Arousal and attraction: A response facilitation alternative to misattribution and negative reinforcement models. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 57, 261-270.
- Anderson, J.L., Crawford, C.B., Nadeau, J., & Lindberg, T. (1992). Was the Duchess of Windsor right? A cross-cultural review of the sociobiology of ideals of female body shape. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 13, 197-227.
- Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. (1974). A little bit about love. In T. Huston (Ed.), *Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction* (pp. 355-381). New York: Academic Press.
- Bossard, J.H.S. (1932). Residential propinquity in marriage selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, 38, 219-224.

- Botwin, M., Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 65, 107-136.
- Broude, G. J. (1994). Marriage, family, and relationships: A cross cultural encyclopedia. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO. Buss, D. M. (1985). Human mate selection. *American Scientist*, 73, 47-51.
- Buss, D.M. (1985). Human mate selection. *American Scientist*, 73 (1), 47-51.
- Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12 (1), 1-49.
- Buss, D.M. (1999). Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind.
- Buss, D.M. & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50 (3), 559-570.
- 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 the Family*. 63, (2), 491-503.
- Byrne D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D. & Clore, G.L. (1970). A reinforcement model of evaluative responses. *Personality: An International Journal*, 1, 103-128.
- Cate, R.M., Huston, T.L., & Nesselroade, J.R. (1986). Premarital relationships: Toward the identification of alternative pathways to marriage. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4, 3-22.
- Crook, J.H. and Crook, S.J. (1988). Tibetan polyandry: Problems of adaptation and fitness. In Betzig, L., Borgerhoff-Mulder, M., & Turke, P. (Eds.) *Human Reproductive Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningham, M.R., Druen, P.B., & Barbee, A.P. (1997). Angels, mentors, and friends: Tradeoffs among evolutionary, social, and individual variables in physical appearance. In J. Simpson, & D.T. Kenrick (Eds.) *Evolutionary Social Psychology* (pp. 109-141). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1983). *Sex, evolution and behavior*, 2nd ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Dutton, D.G. & Aron, A.P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction under conditions of high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30 (4), 510-517.
- Eagly, A.H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved predispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54, 408-423.
- Ford, C.S. & Beach, F.A. (1951). *Patterns of sexual behavior*. New York, NY: Harper and Paul B. Hoeber.
- Gangestad, S.W., Thornhill, R. & Yeo, R.A. (1994). Facial attractiveness, developmental stability, and fluctuating asymmetry. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 15 (2), 73-85.
- Geary, D.C. (2000). Evolution and proximate expression of human paternal investment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, (1), 55-77.

- Green, B.L. & Kenrick, D.T. (1994). The attractiveness of gender-typed traits at different relationship levels: Androgynous characteristics may be desirable after all. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (3), 244-253.
- Guttentag, M. & Secord, P.F. (1983). *Too many women: The sex ratio question*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harpending, H. (1992). Age differences between mates in southern African pastoralists. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 15, 102-103.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R.L. (1996). *Love and sex: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hatfield, E., Traupmann, J., Sprecher, S., Utne, M., & Hay, J. (1985). Equity and intimate relationships: Recent research. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships* (pp. 1-27). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Jensen-Campbell, L.A., Graziano, W.G., & West, S.G. (1995). Dominance, prosocial orientation, and female preferences: Do nice guys really finish last? *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 68, 427-440.
- Keller, M. C., Thiessen, D., & Young, R.K. (1996). Mate assortment in dating and married couples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 217-221.
- Kenrick, D.T. & Keefe, R.C. (1992). Age preferences in mates reflect sex differences in human reproductive strategies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 15 (1), 75-133.
- Kenrick, D.T., Gabrielidis, C., Keefe, R.C. & Cornelius, J.S. (1996). Adolescents' age preferences for dating partners: Support for an evolutionary model of life-history strategies. *Child Development*, 67 (4), 1499-1511.
- Kenrick, D.T., Nieuweboer, S., & Buunk, A.P. (1995). Age differences in mate choice across cultures and across historical periods. Paper presented at joint meetings of *Society of Experimental Social Psychology* and *European Association of Experimental Social Psychology*. Washington, D.C., October.
- Kenrick, D.T., Sadalla, E.K., Groth, G. & Trost, M.R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of human courtship: Qualifying the parental investment model. *Journal of Personality*, 58, 97-117.
- Murstein, B. (1970). Stimulus-value-role: A theory of marital choice. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 32, 465-481.
- Otta, E., da Silva-Queiroz, R., de-Sousa-Campos, L., da-Silva, M.W.D. & Silveira, M.T. (1999). Age differences between spouses in a Brazilian marriage sample. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 20 (2), 99-103.
- Sadalla, E.K., Kenrick, D.T. & Vershure, B. (1987). Dominance and heterosexual attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (4), 730-738.
- Shepher, J. (1983). *Incest: A biosocial view*. New York: Academic Press.
- Simpson, J.A. & Gangestad, S.W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, 60 (1), 31-51.

- Singh, D. (1995). 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.
- Taylor, P.A. & Glenn, N.D. (1976). The utility of education and attractiveness for females' status attainment through marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 484-498.
- Townsend, J. M. (1987). Sex differences in sexuality among medical students: effects of increasing socioeconomic status. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16, 427-446.
- Townsend, J. M., Wasserman, T. (1998). Sexual Attractiveness: Sex Differences in Assessment and Criteria. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 14, 171-191.
- Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In: B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 136-179.
- United Nations. (2000). World marriage patterns 2000. Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. DEV/2251, POP/771. **[I have no idea how to cite this]**
- Walster, E. & Berscheid, E. (1971). Adrenaline makes the heart grow fonder. *Psychology Today*, 5 (1), 47-50, 62.
- White, G.L. & Kight, T.D. (1984). Misattribution of arousal and attraction: Effects of salience of explanations for arousal. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20 (1), 55-64.
- Winch, R.F. (1955). The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: Final results on the test of the general hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, 20, 552-555.