

College Campus Mate Selection: A Quasi-Replication

Dr. Timothy O'Boyle

Associate Professor
Dept. of Anthropology/Sociology
Kutztown University
Kutztown, PA 19530, USA.

Ms Jennifer Dawson

Kutztown University
Kutztown, PA 19530, USA.

Abstract

This college campus mate selection study is a quasi-replication of the original research performed by Reuben Hill and Harold Christensen (1939), and the 5 additional replication studies performed in virtually every decade since then. Several of the traits originally listed utilized archaic terminology by today's standards and have been replaced by contemporary equivalent matching traits. By using the contemporary equivalents, some of these traits that had previously fallen in their level of importance, have now returned to virtually the same level of importance they held in the 1939 original survey.

Keywords: *Future Mate, Mate Characteristics, Mate Selection, Selection Traits*

Introduction

There have been numerous studies throughout the past 60 years that have examined the traits or characteristics that one looks for in a future mate (Hill, R., 1945; McGinnis, R., 1959; Hudson and Henze, 1969; Hoyt and Hudson, 1981; Buss and Barnes, 1986; South, S., 1991; Sprecher, Sullivan, and Hatfield, 1994; Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas, and Giles, 1999; Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, and Larson, 2001; and Cere, D., 2001). In 1939, Reuben Hill and Harold Christensen began this topic of research by creating a survey which contained 18 traits believed important in the mate selection process and asking undergraduate respondents to rate the traits. The undergraduate responses were rated on a scale from one to four, with four being deemed an indispensable trait and one being deemed an irrelevant or unimportant trait (Hill, R., 1945).

This study has been replicated in virtually every decade that followed, with the research closely following the format Hill originated (McGuinnis, R., 1959; Hudson and Henze, 1969; Hoyt and Hudson, 1981; Buss and Barnes, 1986; and Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, and Larson, 2001). Each of the replication studies that followed Hill's have been examined to determine whether the traits that one seeks in a mate have changed over time.

When comparing the results of Hill's original 1939 study with the five replications performed from 1959 through 1996, there were numerous minor fluctuations in the rankings of the 18 traits over the years, but many of the rankings have changed little, if at all (a significant change being defined for this paper as a trait that is raised or lowered by three positions or more). Over the previous 57 year replication period, for the male respondents, there have been significant changes in the rankings of half, 9 of the 18 original traits desired in future female mates: refinement, good cook/housekeeper, chastity, education/intelligence, sociability, good looks, good financial prospect, desire for home/children, and similar educational background (see table # 1). The female respondents over the same 57 year period, have significantly changed the rankings of 8 of the 18 original traits desired in future male mates: mutual attraction, refinement, ambition, chastity, education/intelligence, good looks, good health, and sociability (see table # 1).

There are many different possible explanations to account for the significant fluctuations since 1939, in the traits desired in a future mate. One such possibility is the fact that there have been a great number of cultural changes in the US since Hill's original 1939 study was performed. Buss et al. (2001), states:

The 20th century has witnessed changes more radical and irretrievable than any previous century in the history of the human species. Cars became commonplace during the first half of the century, and computers became commonplace during the second half. Internet dating, virtual sex, and the specter of AIDS altered the landscape of human mating. Women have entered the work force at levels and scales unprecedented, perhaps changing forever the nature of the work environment. Heightened awareness of sexual harassment, date rape, wife battering, and dozens of more subtle forms of sexism have forced people to reevaluate assumptions about men and women (p. 492).

In addition to the cultural changes noted by Buss et al. (2001), we are now witness to sexual behavior in the movies and on television, shock radio, explicit sexual descriptions in music, and reality television involving mate selection. There have also been radical changes in the make-up of college campuses throughout the replications of the original 1939 study, and since this research has always been performed strictly on college students, these changes could significantly impact the results. Not only has there been a huge increase in the college population since 1960 (750,000 to 1,750,000 in 2000), but currently, there are now more females than males attending college (350,000:408,000 in 1960 to 996,000:749,000 in 2000) (US Bureau of the Census; and US Department of Labor, 2001). College campuses are now much more diverse, with white (non-Hispanic) population now accounting for only about 66% of the US college students (Blacks 12.5%, Hispanics 11.5%, other 10%), and the class stratification of college students is much more evenly distributed (25% from the low quartile, 50% from the middle quartiles, and 25% from the high quartile income groups) (US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics 1999-2000 and the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, 2000). These are important changes when dealing with studies examining the mate selection traits valued by college students over the past 65 years. With the continuing evolution of US culture, an important question for social psychologists is: Have these changes affected the traits we value in a future mate, and if so, how have they changed? This comparative, quasi-replication of the mate selection traits valued by college students is an attempt to shed some light in this area.

Purpose of the Study

The original intent of this study was to replicate Hill's 1939 mate selection study of college students, but after examining the original survey and receiving feedback from a small sample of college students, a different approach was deemed necessary. It was believed that due to a number of perceived flaws in Hill's (1939) original survey, performing another strict replication would add little to our current understanding of the traits one looks for in a mate. It was further believed that a strict replication of Hill's (1939) survey would fail to accurately reflect any changes in the mate selection traits valued by contemporary college students for the following reasons:

- (1) it is believed that some of the traits listed in the historical studies would no longer hold the same meaning in contemporary society, (e.g., chastity, refinement);
- (2) in the original study, the respondents were not given a chance to rank the traits in order of importance, Hill and Christensen simply provided the respondents with 18 traits and asked them to rank the traits as important or not, as did all subsequent replication studies; and
- (3) the respondents were asked to rank the original traits presented utilizing a simple four point scale rather than rating the 18 traits in order of importance using an 18 point scale.

As a quasi-replication, this research project attempts to provide a much more broad and contemporary list of mate selection traits for college students to choose from, which differs from Hill's (1939) original survey in a number of different ways:

1. Our list of traits was developed inductively from focus group responses that were given by college students;

2. The final survey provided the respondents with a contemporary listing of mate selection traits from which to choose;
3. The mate selection traits chosen by the respondents were gender specific;
4. The respondents were asked to identify and rank from one to twenty, the twenty traits that they regarded as most important, with one representing the most desired trait and twenty being a desired but less important trait; and,
5. For the purposes of providing a list of mate selection traits to be used as comparison group with Hill's (1939) and the other replication studies, we created a list of contemporary equivalent matching traits, to be used in the quasi-replication of Hill's (1939) study (see table 1).

Methodology

During the 2004 academic year, a focus group was created. It comprised 53 students (35 women and 18 men) from an introductory sociology class. The focus group was asked to describe, elaborating as much as possible, at least fifteen of the most important traits they desired in a future mate. The focus group responses yielded 1811 descriptions of desired traits, 1204 submitted by women and 607 by men. The 1811 descriptions were initially collapsed into 151 traits for females and 130 traits for men. Descriptions such as, "needs to be girly and take care of herself as socially acceptable women do," for instance, were coded as "feminine/classy," or "humorous, able to make me laugh at the hardest of times," as "sense of humor." In the next stage of the analysis, similar traits and characteristics were collapsed into a single or dual trait such as, "good body/works out."

A final list of gender specific traits, containing a total of 74 traits that females desired in males, and 79 traits that males looked for in females, provided the basis for a subsequent survey. Included in this list were, what we believed to be, the contemporized equivalent matching traits of Hill's (1945) original 1939 survey, to be used in the quasi-replication (see table 1).

In the next stage, the survey was administered to 263 male and 391 female college students enrolled in introductory courses in anthropology, criminology, psychology, and sociology at Kutztown University. The respondents, who were guaranteed anonymity, were asked to examine the lists and select the 20 most important traits they look for in a future mate and to rank them in order of importance. The completion rate was 83.8%, comprising 218 males and 330 females. The respondents were enrolled in 36 different major fields of study, with an age range of 18-34, and an average of 19.96 (female 19.81 and male 20.19) years of age.

Results

The results of our survey, when comparing our equivalent traits with those of the original 1939 and 1996 replication studies, show that a number of ratings remain virtually unchanged over the past 8 years and some remain similar over the entire 66 year time frame. Further, by comparing the rankings of the traits from the quasi-replication with the larger data set of traits rank-ordered by the respondents in the expanded survey, it reveals that barely half of the replication traits rank within the top thirty mate selection traits most desired by current college students.

Male Rankings – compared to 1996 replication survey

For the male rankings (table 2), of the top nine traits in this survey – four had significant movement of three places or more from the 1996 replication: good looks (moved up three places since 1996, from 8th to 5th - this trait has moved upward in virtually every replication since 1939); mature/responsible (moved up four places since 1996, from 11th to 7th – however, its 2004 ranking is the exact same as in 1939); emotionally stable (moved down five places since 1996, from 3rd to 8th); and, few sexual partners (moved up seven places since 1996, from 16th to 9th, but in the 1996 survey the trait was listed as "chastity").

It should be noted that the trait "mature/responsible" was originally listed as "refinement" and its ranking remained virtually unchanged from the original 1939 study until the 1977 replication where it significantly moved down three ranks and again, remained virtually unchanged until this study.

The current change in ranking back to its original standing may be due to the more contemporary change in terminology. The updated term mature/responsible may currently apply to the same trait as refinement did in 1939-1967. Additionally, The trait “few sexual partners” was originally listed as “chastity” in 1939. “Chastity” was ranked 10th in the original survey and has had a lower ranking in virtually every replication since. Due to the radical cultural changes, as well as the current acceptance, of individual sexual expression among both men and women in the US, it is believed that currently in 2003, the term “few sexual partners” is a more realistic expectation for present-day respondents and is similar to the expectation that “chastity” expressed in 1939. This cultural change in sexual expectations could explain why the ranking for “few sexual partners” in the 2003 survey is virtually identical to the ranking of “chastity” in 1939.

Of the bottom nine traits males desire, there was significant movement in only three traits: sociable (moved down four places since 1996, from 7th to 11th, but was ranked virtually identical to 1939); family oriented (moved down three places since 1996, from 9th to 12th); and, educated same as mate (moved down four places since 1996, from 12th to 16th).

Male Rankings – compared to 1939 survey

For the male rankings (table 2), of the top nine traits in this survey – only three had significant movement of three places or more from the original 1939 survey: intelligent (moved up seven places since 1939, from 11th to 4th); good looks (moved up nine places since 1939, from 14th to 5th); and, emotionally stable (moved down six places since 1939, from 2nd to 8th).

Of the bottom nine traits males desire, there was significant movement in only three traits: family oriented (moved down six places since 1939, from 6th to 12th); financially stable (moved up three places since 1939, from 17th to 14th); and, good cook/housekeeper (moved down seven places since 1939, from 8th to 15th).

Female Rankings – compared to 1996 replication survey

For the female rankings (table 3), of the top nine traits in this survey – more than half, five, had significant movement of three places or more from the 1996 replication: good personality (moved up three places since 1996, from 4th to 1st); mature/responsible (moved up nine places since 1996, from 12th to 3rd); healthy/hygienic (moved up four places since 1996, from 9th to 5th); attraction (moved down five places since 1996, from 1st to 6th, but its current placement is virtually identical to that of 1939); and, emotionally stable (moved down four places since 1996, from 3rd to 7th).

Of the bottom nine traits females desire, there was significant movement in only two traits: few sexual partners (moved up three places since 1996, from 17th to 14th); and, educated same as mate (moved down six places since 1996, from 10th to 16th).

Female Rankings – compared to 1939 survey

For the female rankings (table 3), of the top nine traits in this survey – only three had significant movement of three places or more from the original 1939 survey: mature/responsible (moved up five places since 1939, from 8th to 3rd); intelligent (moved up five places since 1939, from 9th to 4th); and, emotionally stable (moved down six places since 1939, from 1st to 7th).

Of the bottom nine traits females desire, there was significant movement in four traits: hardworking/ambitious (moved down six places since 1939, from 3rd to 9th); good looks (moved up five places since 1939, from 17th to 12th); few sexual partners (moved down four places since 1939, from 10th to 14th); and, educated same as mate (moved down four places since 1939, from 12th to 16th).

Rankings of Replication Traits in Expanded 2003 Survey

As previously stated, we believe that the original Hill (1939) survey, as well as the replications that followed, suffered a number of flaws for contemporary respondents: the traits offered were either confusing or culturally outdated (chastity and refinement); the respondents were not allowed to choose from a variety of traits; the respondents were not asked to order rank the traits and only to rate each trait on a four point scale.

It is believed that these flaws could easily lead one to misinterpret which traits are the most desired in the mate selection process, as well as a misinterpretation of the effects that our cultural evolution has had on the mate selection process over the past 66 years.

To account for these perceived flaws, our expanded survey¹ was designed so that the respondents could choose from a greater variety of traits, the ones they felt were most important in selecting a future mate, and to rank the traits in order of importance from 1 to 20, with 1 being the most important and 20 the least, in descending order of importance. Additionally, we offered the respondents gender specific traits from which to choose. When compared to the quasi-replication of the original Hill (1939) survey, the results of our survey show dramatic differences in the traits respondents deem important when given a trait list of contemporary gender specific choices, ranked in order of desirability.

Male Rankings of Replication Traits in Expanded 2004 Survey

As can be seen for the male respondents (table 4), only the top 8 traits listed in the Hill (1939) survey are found among the top 25 traits listed in the expanded survey: trustworthy (3rd); attraction (5th); good personality (7th); intelligent (8th); good looks (9th); healthy/hygienic (13th); mature/responsible (21st); and, emotionally stable (24th). The remaining Hill (1939) traits ranked as follows: few sexual partners (27th); hardworking/ambitious (31st); sociable (38th); family oriented (46th); religious (52nd); financially stable (68th); good cook/housekeeper (69th); educated same as mate (73rd); good family background (75th); and, similar political background (77th).

Female Rankings of Replication Traits in Expanded 2004 Survey

Among the results for the female respondents (table 4) there are 9 traits listed in the Hill (1939) survey found in the top 25 traits listed in the expanded survey: good personality (3rd); trustworthy (6th); mature/responsible (8th); intelligent (14th); healthy/hygienic (16th); attraction (17th); emotionally stable (22nd); family oriented (24th); and, hardworking/ambitious (25th). The remaining Hill (1939) traits ranked as follows: sociable (28th); financially stable (30th); good looks (32nd); good family background (39th); few sexual partners (40th); religious (50th); educated same as mate (62nd); good cook/housekeeper (70th); and, similar political background (72nd).

Discussion

Attempting to strictly replicate any study over a 60 year period has numerous pitfalls, especially one dealing with the traits one looks for in a future mate. There have been societal changes over the past 60 years which have had a substantial impact on mate selection. The Women's Rights Movement, women entering the workforce, two income families, birth control, abortion, television, movies, and music have all had an impact on the way we view the mate selection process since Hill's original 1939 survey. Further, since 1939, speech patterns have changed in the US making some terminology, such as chastity and refinement, archaic and unused in present day terminology. Thus, it was decided that it was necessary to find modern equivalents for the presently archaic terms for the data gathered to have any real meaning.

Moreover, it was decided that the respondents choices of traits were severely limited by the Hill's original (1939) and subsequent replicated studies. It was felt that this type of limitation does not give an accurate assessment of the actual traits college students look for in a mate. Our study gave the students a wide range of traits from which to choose, that included equivalencies for all of Hill's original 18 traits. We believe that this quasi-replication of Hill's 1939 survey, using modern equivalents for some traits, gives a more accurate reflection of possible cultural influences on the traits one looks for in a future mate.

Generational Shifts for Males

It appears that many of the most sought after traits in 1939, remain firmly entrenched in the desires of present day college students. Trustworthiness, good personality, attraction, health and a mature and responsible person all are among the top seven traits in 1939 and in 2004. In a downward shift, the trait emotional stability dropped six places, possibly because today, personality disorders are better understood by the general public and treatable through established medications that were not available in 1939.

¹ See appendix A for the entire list of traits offered in the expanded survey.

Family oriented dropped six places and good cook/housekeeper dropped seven places, which may be a reflection on the need for two incomes and the career orientation of college students, especially women, in 2004.

Shifting upward were the traits intelligence (seven places) and good looks (nine places), which again reflect changes in our culture since 1939. The upward shift for the trait intelligence may again be a reflection on the need for a two income family and the career orientation of present day college students. The new importance placed on the looks of a future mate appears to be a reflection of the current media, where television, movies, and magazines consistently place a great deal of emphasis on a woman's looks, which may bring an increase for the desirability of this trait in men.

Finally, the trait few sexual partners shifted upward in importance by seven places. This shift appears to be less of a reflection of the present day importance of this trait than it is of the modernization of the terminology. Cultural changes in the US over the past 60 years have given much greater freedoms for women, including greater sexual freedom. Virginal marriages in 2004 are the exception rather than the norm of the past. However, it seems apparent that having a limited number of sexual partners is as desirable today as chastity was in 1939, since today's college students rank few sexual partners the same today as their 1939 counterparts ranked chastity.

Generational Shifts for Females

As with the males, the most important traits desired by females have remained similar as five of the top six traits today are among the top seven listed 1939. The traits trustworthiness, emotionally stable, good personality, health, and attraction all appear to be as sought after a commodity today as they were in 1939.

There were only three major downward shifts in the traits desired by females, all of which may be a reflection of cultural changes. The trait emotional stability dropped from the most sought after in 1939, to 7th in 2004, which may be explained by our modern laws protecting women from domestic violence. The drop in desirability for the traits ambitious/hard working (dropped seven places) and educated same as mate (dropped four places) may be explained by the current increase in females entering college and the career orientation of college females. By being more financially independent than in the past, college women may feel less need for an ambitious, educated mate.

Traits having a major upward shift in desirability by females, were mature/responsible (five places), intelligence (five places), and good looks (five places). The upward shift of the trait mature/responsible may be a reflection of the seriousness that current college females place in their education and future career and are looking for similar seriousness and responsibility in a mate. The upward shift in the desirability of intelligence in a mate may also be attributed to the increase in female education and career orientation. Finally, as stated previously, the increase in desirability for a mate with good looks appears to be a media driven phenomenon.

Conclusion

Despite numerous changes in US culture over the past 66 years, it appears that some traits sought after in a future mate are timeless. Traits such as trustworthiness, good personality, attraction, and good health are as sought after today as they were in Hill's original 1939 survey. However, it appears that cultural changes occurring in the U.S. over the past 66 years have had an impact on the traits college students desire in a mate. For college males, intelligence and good looks appear to be much more important today than in 1939, while family orientation and cooking/housekeeping abilities are not as highly prized. As with college males, college females have also placed a greater importance on intelligence and good looks than their counterparts did in 1939, while finding an ambitious and similarly educated mate are desired to a lesser degree.

The above stated traits of both an enduring and generational shifting nature are solely a reflection of this quasi-replication, and when given a greater number of choices, the traits sought by present day college students differ greatly from those originally offered by Hill in 1939 (see tables 3 and 4).

Study Limitations

This quasi-replication is limited in that the respondents were chosen from a regional university and were selected through a convenience rather than a random sample, thus limiting its generalizability to all present day college students. Further, the fact that this was not a strict replication, substituting modern terminology for some of the more archaic terms used to describe mate selection traits may have had an adverse effect on the results.

Future Research

Future research on mate selection should be made on a regional basis, utilizing random sampling, and allowing for a much greater selection of traits (such as those appearing in the appendix) if we are to gain an accurate understanding of the traits college students look for in a future mate.

References

- Brehm, Sharon, Rowland S. Miller, Daniel Perlman, and Susan M. Campbell (2002). **Intimate Relationships, 3rd edition.** 554 p. New York: McGraw Hill
- Buss, David, Todd Shackelford, Lee Kirkpatrick, and Randy Larson. (2001). A Half-Century of Mate Preferences: the cultural evolution of values. **Journal of Marriage and the Family.** Vol. 63 (2), pp. 491-504.
- Buss, David and Michael Barnes (1986). Preferences in Human Mate Selection. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.** Vol. 50 (3), pp. 559-570.
- Cere, Daniel (2001). Courtship Today: the view from academia. **Public Interest.** Issue 143, pp. 53-72.
- Cornish, Derek and Ronald Clark (1986). **The Reasoning Criminal: rational choice perspectives on offending.** New York: Springer Verlag.
- Cramer, Robert and Jeffrey Schaeffer (1996). Identifying the Ideal Mate: more evidence for male-female convergence. **Current Psychology** Vol. 15 (2). pp. 157-167.
- Fletcher, Garth, Jeffrey Simpson, Geoff Thomas, and Louise Giles (1999). Ideals in Intimate Relationships. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.** Vol. 76 (1), pp. 72-89.
- Hill, R. (1945). Campus Values in Mate Selection. **Journal of Home Economics.** Nov. pp. 554-558.
- Hoyt, Les and John Hudson (1981). Personal Characteristics Important in Mate Preference Among College Students. **Social Behavior and Personality.** Vol. 9 (1), pp. 93-96.
- Hudson, John and Lura Henze (1969). Campus Values in Mate Selection: a replication. **Journal of Marriage and the Family.** Nov. pp. 772-775.
- Kenrick, Douglas, Edward Sadalia, Gary Groth, and Melanie Trost (1990). Evolution, Traits and the Stages of Human Courtship: qualifying the parental investment model. **Journal of Personality.** Vol. 58 (1), pp. 97-116.
- Lauer, Robert H. and Jeanette C. Lauer (2004). **Marriage And Family: the quest for intimacy, 5th edition.** 426 p. New York: McGraw Hill
- McGinnis, R. (1959). Campus Values in Mate Selection: a repeat study. **Social Forces.** May, pp. 368-373.
- Schmitt, David (2002). A Meta-Analysis of Sex Differences in Romantic Attraction: do rating contexts moderate tactic effectiveness judgments? **British Journal of Social Psychology.** Vol. 41 (3), pp. 387-403.
- Sedikides, C., M.B. Oliver, and W.K. Campbell (1994). Perceived Benefits and Costs of Romantic Relationships for Women and Men: implications for exchange theory. **Personal Relationships,** Vol. 1, pp. 5-21.
- Sprecher, Susan, Quintin Sullivan, and Elaine Hatfield (1994). Mate Selection Preferences: gender differences examined in a natural sample. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.** Vol. 66 (6), pp. 1074-1080.
- Sprecher, Susan, and Pamela Regan (2002). Liking Some Things (in some people) More Than Others: partner preferences in romantic relationships and friendships. **Journal of Social and Personal Relationships** Vol. 19 (4). Pp. 463-481.

- South, S.J. (1991). Sociodemographic Differentials in Mate Selection Preferences. **Journal of Marriage and the Family**. Vol. 53 (4), pp. 928-941.
- Surra, C.A. (1990). Research and Theory on Mate Selection and Premarital Relationships in the 1980's. **Journal of Marriage and the Family**. Vol. 52 (4), pp. 844-866.
- Townsend, John and Laurence Roberts (1993). Gender Differences in Mate Preference Among Law Students: divergence and convergence of criteria. **Journal of Psychology**. Vol. 127 (5), pp. 507-529.
- Wootton, Barbara (1997). Gender Differences in Occupational Employment. **Monthly Labor Review**. April, 1997. pp. 15-24.

Appendix A

Complete List of Gender-Specific and Non-Gender-Specific Traits Used In The 2004 Mate Selection Study

Trait choices offered only to males.

Classy/Feminine; Common Sense; Dependent; Flirtatious; Good Cook/Housekeeper; Long Hair; Low Maintenance; Nice Legs; Non-Bitchy; Non-Flirtatious; Opinionated; Sexually Submissive/Passive; Sexy; Short Hair; Shorter Than Me; Thin; Younger Than Me

Trait choices offered only to females.

Aggressive; Belief in Gender Equality; Complimentary; Generous; Nice Car; Older Than Me; Power/Prestige; Sensual/Passionate; Sexually Arousing; Strong/Protector; Taller Than Me; Wealthy

Trait choices offered to both genders.

Adventurous/Fun Loving; Affectionate/Romantic; Attraction; Caring/Loving; Committed/Dedicated; Compassionate; Confident; Considerate/Thoughtful; Creative; Educated Same as Mate; Emotionally stable; Even Tempered; Expresses Emotions; Extroverted/Outgoing; Faithful/Loyal; Family Oriented; Few Sexual Partners; Financially Stable; Goal Oriented; Good Body/Works Out; Good Communicator; Good Family Background; Good Kisser; Good Listener; Good Looks; Good Personality; Hard Working/Ambitious; Honest/Truthful; Healthy/Hygienic; Independent; Intelligent; Introverted/Shy; Laid Back; Likes Sports; Mature/Responsible; Modest; Nice Ass; Nice Eyes; Nice Smile; Non-Clingy; Non-Drug User; Non-Jealous; Non-Possessive/Controlling; Non-Smoker; Open Minded; Optimistic; Personable; Places Mate's Needs First; Polite/Sociable; Religious; Sense of Humor; Sensitive; Sexually Aggressive; Sexually Adventurous; Sexually Compatible; Sexually Competent; Similar Interests/Values; Spontaneous; Supportive; Trustworthy; Understanding; and Well Dressed/Stylish

Table: 1

Listing of Hill's 18 Original Traits and the 2003 Expanded Survey Equivalent Traits

<u>Hill's Original Traits</u>	<u>2003 Survey Equivalent Traits</u>
Dependable Character	Trustworthy
Emotional Stability	Emotionally Stable
Pleasing Disposition	Good Personality
Mutual Attraction	Attraction
Good Health	Healthy/Hygienic
Desire for Home - Children	Family Oriented
Refinement	Mature/Responsible
Ambition - Industriousness	Hardworking/Ambitious
Chastity	Few Sexual Partners
Education - Intelligence	Intelligent
Sociability	Sociable
Similar Religious Backgrounds	Religious
Good Looks	Good Looks
Similar Educational Backgrounds	Educated Same as Mate
Favorable Social Status	Good Family Background
Good Financial Prospect	Financially Stable
Good Cook - Housekeeper	Good Cook/Housekeeper
Similar Political Background	Similar Political Background

Table: 2

Comparison of the Male Rankings of Hill's 1939 Original and the Five Subsequent Replicated Trait Selection Surveys with the 2004 Quasi-Replication Survey

<u>Hill's Original Characteristics</u>	<u>Male Rank</u>							<u>2004 Survey Equivalent Characteristics</u>
	1939	1956	1967	1977	1984	1996	2004	
Dependable Character	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	Trustworthy
Emotional Stability	2	2	3	1	2	3	8	Emotionally Stable
Pleasing Disposition	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	Good Personality
Mutual Attraction	4	3	2	2	1	1	2	Attraction
Good Health	5	6	9	5	6	6	6	Healthy/Hygienic
Desire for Home - Children	6	5	5	11	9	9	12	Family Oriented
Refinement	7	8	7	10	10	11	7	Mature/ Responsible
Good Cook - Housekeeper	8	7	6	13	13	14	15	Good Cook/ Housekeeper
Ambition - Industriousness	9	9	8	8	11	10	10	Hard Working/ Ambitious
Chastity	10	13	15	17	17	16	9	Few Sexual Partners
Education - Intelligence	11	11	10	7	5	5	4	Intelligent
Sociability	12	12	12	6	8	7	11	Sociable
Similar Religious Backgrounds	13	10	14	14	15	15	13	Religious
Good Looks	14	15	11	9	7	8	5	Good Looks
Similar educational Background	15	14	13	12	12	12	16	Educated Same as Mate
Favorable Social Status	16	16	16	15	14	17	17	Good Family Background
Good Financial Prospect	17	17	18	16	16	13	14	Financially Stable
Similar Political Background	18	18	17	18	18	18	18	Similar Political Values

Table: 3***Comparison of the Female Rankings of Hill's 1939 Original and the Five Subsequent Replicated Trait Selection Surveys with the 2004 Quasi-Replication Survey***

<u>Hill's Original Characteristics</u>	<u>Female Rank</u>						<u>2003 Survey Equivalent Characteristics</u>
	<u>1939</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>2004</u>
Emotional Stability	1	2	1	2	2	3	7 Emotionally Stable
Dependable Character	2	1	2	3	3	2	2 Trustworthy
Ambition - Industriousness	3	4	6	6	6	7	9 Hard Working/ Ambitious
Pleasing Disposition	4	5	4	4	4	4	1 Good Personality
Mutual Attraction	5	6	3	1	1	1	6 Attraction
Good Health	6	9	10	8	9	9	5 Healthy/Hygienic
Desire for Home - Children	7	3	5	10	7	6	8 Family Oriented
Refinement	8	7	8	12	12	12	3 Mature/ Responsible
Education - Intelligence	9	14	7	5	5	5	4 Intelligent
Chastity	10	15	15	18	18	17	14 Few Sexual Partners
Sociability	11	11	13	7	8	8	10 Sociable
Similar educational Background	12	8	9	9	10	10	16 Educated Same as Mate
Good Financial Prospect	13	12	12	11	11	11	11 Financially Stable
Similar Religious Backgrounds	14	10	11	13	15	14	15 Religious
Favorable Social Status	15	13	14	14	14	15	13 Good Family Background
Good Cook - Housekeeper	16	16	16	16	16	16	17 Good Cook/ Housekeeper
Good Looks	17	18	17	15	13	13	12 Good Looks
Similar Political Background	18	17	18	17	17	18	18 Similar Political Values

Table: 4***Male and Female Trait Ranking Comparison of the Equivalents to Hill's Original 1939 Traits to the Overall Male and Female Trait Rankings of the 2004 Expanded Trait Selection Survey***

<u>MALE - desired traits in females</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>FEMALE - desired traits in Males</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Faithful/Loyal	1	Honest/Truthful	1
Caring/Loving	2	Faithful/Loyal	2
Trustworthy	3 ***	Good Personality	3 ***
Sense of Humor	4	Caring/Loving	4
Attraction	5 ***	Sense of Humor	5
Honest/Truthful	6	Trustworthy	6 ***
Good Personality	7 ***	Affectionate/Romantic	7
Intelligent	8 ***	Mature/Responsible	8 ***
Good Looks	9 ***	Supportive	9
Committed/Dedicated	10	Committed/Dedicated	10
Common Sense	11	Personable(w/friends & family)	11
Affectionate/Romantic	12	Understanding	12
Healthy/Hygienic	13 ***	Good Listener	13
Adventurous/Fun Loving	14	Intelligent	14 ***
Good Body/Works-Out	15	Considerate/Thoughtful	15
Similar Interests/Values	16	Healthy/Hygienic	16 ***

Sexy	17		Attraction	17	***
Considerate/Thoughtful	18		Similar Interests/Values	18	
Nice Ass	19		Adventurous/Fun Loving	19	
Non-Smoker	20		Open Minded	20	
Mature/Responsible	21	***	Confident	21	
Supportive	22		Emotionally Stable	22	***
Non-Drug User	23		Compassionate	23	
Emotionally Stable	24	***	Family Oriented	24	***
Open Minded	25		Hard Working/Ambitious	25	***
Understanding	26		Good Communicator	26	
Few Sexual Partners	27	***	Non-Drug User	27	
Personable (w/friends & family)	28		Sociable	28	***
Confident	29		Goal Oriented	29	
Nice Smile	30		Financially Stable	30	***
Hardworking/Ambitious	31	***	Good Looks	32	***
Sociable	38	***	Good Family Background	39	***
Family Oriented	46	***	Few Sexual Partners	40	***
Religious	52	***	Religious	50	***
Financially Stable	68	***	Educated Same as Mate	62	***
Good Cook/Housekeeper	69	***	Good Cook/Housekeeper	70	***
Educated Same as Mate	73	***	Similar Political Values	72	***
Good Family Background	75	***			
Similar Political Values	77	***			

*** = Hill's original 1939 traits