



INVESTIGATION ROMANCE AND MATE SELECTION MYTHS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Müge Yılmaz

Department of Education Science Kurupelit/Samsun, Turkey

Hüdayar Cihan Güngör

Department of Psychology, Çankaya/ Ankara, Turkey

Seher Balcı Çelik

Department of Education Science Kurupelit/Samsun, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Among the developmental responsibilities expected from the early adulthood period are selecting one's mate and managing to live together with him/her. The way in which individuals select their mates and the ideas and beliefs that guide them are among the most curious of subjects. The aim of this study is to investigate whether or not myths regarding romance and mate selection among university students change according to relationship status, gender and age whether or not they have had a romantic relationship before and, if so, how many they have had. The study sample consisted of 370 students attending different departments of the Faculty of Education at Ondokuz Mayıs University. In the study, Romance and Mate Selection Attitude Scale (RMSAS) was used. The results of the study indicated that in terms of gender, while the difference among the averages of the total scores was significant. In terms of kinds of relationship, total scores the difference was not significant. Regarding whether or not participants had experienced a romantic relationship before, there was not such a significant difference in the total scores. In terms of age, the difference among the averages in all the RMSAS subscales and the total scores is not significant.

Keywords: University student, Mate selection, Myth, Romance and mate selection attitude scale

JEL Codes: C12, J13

INTRODUCTION

The way in which individuals select their mates and the ideas and beliefs that guide them are among the most curious of subjects. Among the developmental responsibilities expected from the early adulthood period are selecting one's mate and managing to live together with him/her. With reference to this period, Ericson, in his psycho-social theory of development, points out that a

young adult who has successfully found his/her own self of identity can establish a relationship with others without being afraid of losing his/her own identity. In contrast, it is reported that an individual who experiences role conflicts tends to avoid close friendships and relationships with the opposite sex (Geçtan, 1995; Ersanlı, 2005). People start their marital relationship with various and different expectations and beliefs. Unrealistic marital expectations and beliefs cause problems in the marital relationship. Unrealistic beliefs about marriage are based on distorted assumptions and lead to experiencing less satisfaction in the relationship (Kurdek, 1993).

Since mate selection is both an important and difficult process, the beliefs of the individual are crucial in this process (Cobb *et al.*, 2003). Larson (1988), who talks about myths as a part of the beliefs about mate selection, defines myth as an idea that is commonly accepted even though there is no any evidence that it is true. Myths relating to mate selection and marriage preparation are among the factors that predict marital satisfaction.

Larson (1992) proposes nine constraining beliefs that individuals take into account in mate selection. These are:

- 1) One and Only: The person who believes in this thinks there is only one true person in the world with whom he/she can get married. This idea means that each individual has a soul mate or a second half in somewhere and the person can become a united whole with marriage.
- 2) The Perfect Mate: This belief proposes that one should not get married until he/she finds the perfect mate. The person who embraces this belief can wait a long time and have difficulty in deciding to get married as nobody is perfect.
- 3) The Perfect Self: The individual believing in this idea feels the urge to postpone marriage until after he/she is sure of himself/herself that he/she is going to be a perfect mate. Hence, he/she tends to experience difficulty in deciding to get married.
- 4) The Perfect Relationship: This belief emphasizes the idea that before marriage one should prove that the relationship will last. It is reasonable for an individual to look for a relationship and a mate with whom he/she can communicate completely and effortlessly and who is similar to him/her in terms of beliefs and values. Yet, this does not guarantee marital success.
- 5) Try Harder: This belief proposes that if a person tries harder, he/she can be happy with the person selected for marriage. However, this can only be achieved on the condition that two mature and sensitive individuals cooperate with each other.
- 6) Love Is Enough: An individual who believes in this notion considers love as the sole and sufficient reason to get married.
- 7) Cohabitation: This belief holds with the idea that if an individual lives together, before marriage, with the person he/she intends to get married to, then the possibility of a successful marriage is possibly higher.
- 8) Opposites Compliment: A person embracing this belief holds the idea that he/she should select a partner that has different characteristics from himself / herself. Despite the popularity of the notion that two different individuals can make up for each other's shortcomings, when premarital precursors are researched, it is clear that one of the most powerful precursors of marital success is similarity of attitudes, values, beliefs and characteristics.
- 9) Choosing Should Be Easy: This is the last constraining belief in selecting a partner which asserts that selecting a mate is coincidental and

random, and should be easy. This kind of person waits to meet the future partner in some random place and fall in love at first sight instead of joining various activities and participating in a social environment that can help establish a relationship.

When individuals create these ideals relating to relationships, they put the social thoughts that regulate interpersonal relationships at the base of these ideals. The main reason for this is that their ideas about romantic relationships cannot exist independent of their social environment (Fletcher and Simpson, 2000). In particular, the first romantic attempt can be affected by the individual's socio-cultural structure (Connolly *et al.*, 2004). Meanwhile, the influence of parents should not be ignored. The model of the parental romantic relationship in particular has great significance. According to Rader (2003), attachment and social support theories suggest that parents continue to play an important role as their young adult children form romantic relationships. In addition Day (2001) lists the factors which have an effect on marital beliefs as the level of romantic relationship, the nature of the relationship the individual had with his/her parents while growing up, the media and marriage education. In recent years, experimental studies support the notion that the quality of the desires in mate selection change in accordance with gender (Stasio, 2002). While selecting their partners, individuals tend to prefer someone who has a similar social background, educational level, socio-economic status, occupation and value system (Ramirez, 1997).

The aim of this study is to investigate whether or not myths regarding romance and mate selection among university students change according to relationship status, gender and age whether or not they have had a romantic relationship before and, if so, how many they have had.

METHOD

Participants

The study sample consisted of 370 students attending different departments of the Faculty of Education at Ondokuz Mayıs University who were chosen by means of random sampling. The mean age was $X = 22.67$ ($S = 2.13$). Of the participants, 216 were female (58.3 %), while 154 were male. (41.6 %).

Data Collection Methods

Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes Scale (RMSAS): This scale was developed by Cobb *et al.* (2003) and adapted to Turkish by (Cihan-Güngör *et al.*, 2011). It was extensively used for data collection in this study. The scale was applied to 501 students attending the Faculty of Education at Ondokuz Mayıs University ($n = 220$) and Gazi University (281) in the 2007-2008 academic year. In order to determine the construct validity of the RMSAS, factor analysis was conducted by using principal components analysis. The varimax rotation technique was also used to verify the construct validity of the scale. Out of 28 items in the scale, seven factors prevailed over the others. These were: One and Only, Love is Enough, Cohabitation, Complete Assurance, Idealization, Ease

of Effort and Opposites Complement. The scale explained 49.84 % of the variation. To evaluate the reliability of the scale, Cronbach-alpha was calculated and found to be $\alpha = .65$. The internal consistency coefficients of the RMSAS subscales varied between 0.33 and -0.98. Meanwhile, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to be 0.61 as a result of the test-retest method conducted two weeks apart. Consequently, it was noted that the scale consisted of 32 items, 4 of which were distracters, with seven subscales.

Data Analysis

The Measurement methods were applied to volunteer students and the analysis of the gathered data was carried out by means of SPSS 15.00. A t-test and one-way variance analysis were employed as statistical analysis methods.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows whether there was a difference among university students regarding Romance and mate selection attitudes in terms of gender.

Table-1. t- Values Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes Scores of University Students in Terms of Gender

	Gender	N	M	Sd	t	p
RMSAS	Female	216	88.3843	11.06242	-1.947	0.050*
	Male	154	90.8442	13.15872		
One and Only	Female	216	13.2685	2.74534	2.414	0.016*
	Male	154	12.5455	2.96844		
Idealization	Female	216	3.2824	2.81175	2.452	0.015*
	Male	154	12.5584	2.78180		
Love Is Enough	Female	216	12.9852	3.57185	-2.388	0.017*
	Male	154	13.8701	3.42940		
Ease of Effort	Female	216	13.0963	2.71142	1.010	0.313
	Male	154	12.7844	3.21057		
Cohabitation	Female	216	10.1102	4.46350	-3.021	0.003*
	Male	154	11.5571	4.64718		
Complete Assurance	Female	216	14.5630	3.20960	-0.415	0.678
	Male	154	14.7013	3.08513		
Opposites Complement	Female	216	10.3037	3.18116	0.510	0.611
	Male	154	10.1299	3.30715		

*p < .05

As can be seen in Table 1, in terms of gender, in the subscales of the Romance and Mate Selection Attitude Scale the difference among the averages of the total points is significant an One and Only,

Love Is Enough, Cohabitation and Idealization, however, there is not such a significant difference in the subscales Ease of Effort, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement.

Table-2. One-Way Variance Analysis Results Regarding Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes of University Students in Terms of Relationship Status

	Relationship Status	N	M	SD	F	p
RMSAS	None	181	88.2431	10.94210	2.483	0.061
	Married	15	86.4000	8.14862		
	Engaged	41	93.2683	12.83944		
	Dating	133	90.1429	13.25973		
	Total	370	89.4081	12.02384		
One and Only	None	181	12.5580	2.79945	4.718	0.003*
	Married	15	13.4667	2.77403		
	Engaged	41	14.3415	2.39384		
	Date	133	13.0451	2.95897		
	Total	370	12.9676	2.85874		
Idealization	None	181	13.1713	3.04201	0.546	0.651
	Married	15	12.8000	2.59670		
	Engaged	41	12.7317	2.91569		
	Date	133	12.8195	2.48887		
	Total	370	12.9811	2.81829		
Love Is Enough	None	181	12.9878	3.44481	4.314	0.005*
	Married	15	14.4000	3.62137		
	Engaged	41	15.0244	3.03717		
	Date	133	13.2180	3.65840		
	Total	370	13.3535	3.53565		
Ease of Effort	None	181	12.8785	2.90911	0.245	0.865
	Married	15	12.6533	3.82508		
	Engaged	41	12.9463	3.41732		
	Date	133	13.1278	2.70357		
	Total	370	12.9665	2.92937		
Cohabitation	None	181	9.9989	4.42345	3.839	0.010*
	Married	15	9.5333	5.02660		
	Engaged	41	11.6341	5.49434		
	Date	133	11.5323	4.31290		
	Total	370	10.7124	4.59052		
Complete Assurance	None	181	14.2906	3.33749	1.322	0.267
	Married	15	15.0000	3.11677		
	Engaged	41	15.0488	2.54903		
	Date	133	14.8947	3.05570		
	Total	370	14.6205	3.15490		
Opposites Complement	None	181	10.0862	3.06262		

Married	15	8.8667	2.72204	1.608	0.187
Engaged	41	10.1707	2.95722		
Date	133	10.6015	3.54610		
Total	370	10.2314	3.23090		

*p < .05

As can be seen from Table 2, which gives data in terms of relationship status, whereas the difference among the averages and the RMSAS subscales One and Only, Love Is Enough and Cohabitation is significant, there is not such a significant difference in the subscales Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement and the total scores. As a result of the LSD test conducted to find out in which group this difference occurs, it became apparent that in the subscales One and Only, Love Is Enough and Cohabitation, the score averages were higher in the engaged group than in the group who were not in a relationship. Besides, in the Cohabitation subscale, the score averages of the dating group were higher than those of the group who were not in a relationship.

Table-3. t- Values Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes of University Students in Terms of Having a Previous Romantic Relationship

Having a previous romantic relationship		N	M	SD	t	p
RMSAS	Yes	186	90.8226	11.63758	2.261	0.024*
	No	183	88.0055	12.29647		
One and Only	Yes	186	12.6290	2.99315	-2.267	0.024*
	No	183	13.3005	2.68540		
Idealization	Yes	186	12.9086	2.71079	-0.460	0.646
	No	183	13.0437	2.93300		
Love Is Enough	Yes	186	13.7097	3.77497	1.965	0.050*
	No	183	12.9880	3.25476		
Ease of Effort	Yes	186	13.0688	2.98407	0.640	0.522
	No	183	12.8732	2.88202		
Cohabitation	Yes	186	11.4559	4.41544	3.129	0.002*
	No	183	9.9770	4.66077		
Complete Assurance	Yes	186	14.9129	3.10834	1.787	0.075
	No	183	14.3268	3.19108		
Opposites Complement	Yes	186	9.9398	3.24792	-1.806	0.072
	No	183	10.5454	3.19341		

*p < .05

As can be observed from Table 3, which takes into account whether or not the participants have had a previous romantic relationship, whereas the difference among the averages in the RMSAS subscales One and Only, Love Is Enough, and Cohabitation and total scores was significant, there

was not such a significant difference in the subscales Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement.

Table-4. One-Way Variance Analysis Results Relating to Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes of the University Students in Terms of the Number of Romantic Relationships

		Number of Romantic Relationships	N	M	SD	F	P
RMSAS	Only one		151	89.7020	13.03472	1.956	0.143
	More than one		125	90.5680	11.73933		
	None		94	87.3936	10.47805		
	Total		370	89.4081	12.02384		
One and Only	Only one		151	13.4834	2.83044	5.487	0.004*
	More than one		125	12.3520	2.76865		
	None		94	12.9574	2.88830		
	Total		370	12.9676	2.85874		
Idealization	Only one		151	12.7815	2.72003	0.804	0.449
	More than one		125	13.0240	2.83544		
	None		94	13.2447	2.95372		
	Total		370	12.9811	2.81829		
Love Is Enough	Only one		151	13.7086	3.45174	2.132	0.120
	More than one		125	13.3760	3.51647		
	None		94	12.7532	3.65047		
	Total		370	13.3535	3.53565		
Ease of Effort	Only one		151	12.9245	2.85543	0.073	0.930
	More than one		125	13.0480	3.07659		
	None		94	12.9255	2.87458		
	Total		370	12.9665	2.92937		
Cohabitation	Only one		151	10.2834	4.62782	12.433	0.000*
	More than one		125	12.2464	4.37391		
	None		94	9.3617	4.27257		
	Total		370	10.7124	4.59052		
Complete Assurance	Only one		151	14.7616	3.04567	1.790	0.168
	More than one		125	14.8464	3.20142		
	None		94	14.0936	3.23791		
	Total		370	14.6205	3.15490		
Opposites Complement	Only one		151	9.9934	3.12089	0.787	0.456
	More than one		125	10.4784	3.49727		
	None		94	10.2851	3.03705		
	Total		370	10.2314	3.23090		

*p < .05

As can be seen in Table 4, which gives data regarding the number of romantic relationships students have had, while the difference among the averages in the RMSAS subscales One and Only and Cohabitation was significant, there was not such a significant difference in the subscales Love Is Enough, Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement and the total scores. As a result of the LSD test conducted to ascertain why there are such differences, it was found that in the One and Only subscale, the score averages of the group that had experienced only one romantic relationship revealed a higher rate than those that experienced more than one romantic relationship. Moreover, in the Cohabitation subscale, the score averages of the group that had had more than one romantic relationship were higher than those that had had only one romantic relationship.

Table-5. t-Values Concerning Romance and Mate Selection Attitudes of University Students in Terms of Age

	Age	N	M	SD	t	p
RMSAS	22 and above	198	89.9949	11.99386	1.007	0.314
	23 and below	172	88.7326	12.05778		
One and Only	22 and below	198	13.1970	2.79895	1.660	0.098
	23 and above	172	12.7035	2.91184		
Idealization	22 and below	198	13.0455	2.79647	0.471	0.632
	23 and above	172	12.9070	2.84955		
Love Is Enough	22 and below	198	13.3374	3.51538	-0.094	0.925
	23 and above	172	13.3721	3.56902		
Ease of Effort	22 and below	198	12.8990	2.93412	-0.475	0.635
	23 and above	172	13.0442	2.93053		
Cohabitation	22 and below	198	10.8273	4.55097	0.516	0.606
	23 and above	172	10.5802	4.64540		
Complete Assurance	22 and below	198	14.7111	3.28179	0.592	0.554
	23 and above	172	14.5163	3.00836		
Opposites Complement	22 and below	198	10.3677	3.15961	0.871	0.385
	23 and above	172	10.0744	3.31335		

*p > .05

As can be seen from Table 5, which provides data in terms of age, the difference among the averages in all the RMSAS subscales and the total scores is not significant.

Discussion and Suggestions

In this study, we aimed to determine if the myths held by university students concerning romance and mate selection differed in accordance with gender, age and relationship status, and whether or not they had experienced a previous romantic relationship and the number of romantic relationships. In the RMSAS subscales One and Only, Love is Enough, Cohabitation and Idealization, the results of the study indicated that in terms of gender, while the difference among the averages of the total scores was significant, there was not such a significant difference in the

subscales Ease of Effort, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement. At the same time, in terms of kinds of relationship, in the subscales One and Only, Love Is Enough and Cohabitation, the difference among the averages was significant, while in the subscales Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement and the total scores the difference was not significant.

Regarding whether or not participants had experienced a romantic relationship before, whereas there was a significant difference among the averages in the RMSAS subscales One and Only, Love Is Enough and Cohabitation, and the total scores, there was not such a significant difference in the subscales Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement. In terms of the number of romantic relationships, while the difference among the averages in the RMSAS subscales One and Only and Cohabitation was significant, there was not such a significant difference in the subscales Love Is Enough, Ease of Effort, Idealization, Complete Assurance and Opposites Complement and the total scores. In terms of age, the difference among the averages in all the RMSAS subscales and the total scores is not significant.

Burnett *et al.* (2009) while revealing the connection between romantic relationships and mate selection myths, along with age, gender, relationship status and whether or not the relationship continued, observed significant differences in terms of relationship span and subscales. As a whole, it is possible to state that people who had had a previous romantic relationship had fewer unrealistic beliefs than those who had not. These results show similarity to the findings of this research.

The nature of the relationship established with the opposite sex showed differences in accordance with the gender of the individual. Beliefs concerning romantic relationships changed according to gender (Abowitz *et al.*, 2009; Schwarz and Hassebrauck, 2012). People's belief systems influence their life, decision and behavior, their belief systems are also likely to influence their behavior in relationships (Connell, 2012). Trotter (2010) highlighted the idea that parental romantic relationships and marriages had a considerable effect on the romantic relationships of never married university students. The meanings attributed by culture to gender are significant in terms of romantic relationships. Indeed, the individual bases his/her constraining beliefs in line with these meanings. Similarly, he/she attributes social meanings to the kind of relationship. For instance, being engaged has a more serious connotation than a dating, and requires more responsibilities. The fact that the engaged group had high averages in the One and Only, Love Is Enough and Cohabitation subscales supports these facts. The characteristics of marriage candidates which are suitable to or different from each other are deeply influenced and shaped by gender differences, methods of upbringing, educational status, psycho-social differences, religious beliefs, socio-cultural structures and geographic locations (Yilmazçoban, 2010). Nowadays, different kinds of relationships have evolved due to developing technology and cultural differences (Bayhan and Işitan, 2010). Bearing in mind all these factors, it can be asserted that the constraining beliefs of individuals are directly affected by relationships and the kinds of romantic relationship.

In a study which investigated the efficiency of Integrative Learning Techniques in changing the unrealistic and romantic beliefs of university students concerning marriage, [Sharp and Ganong \(2000\)](#) found that males in both the control and experimental groups had on a higher degree of unrealistic and romantic beliefs than females and that these beliefs were more resistant to change. Moreover, in a study concerning the beliefs about marriage myths of never married university students, it was also reported that females checked fewer items related to marriage myths than males; hence they were more prepared for marriage roles than males. Likewise, students who were less romantic checked fewer items concerning marriage myths than romantic students; and students who completed the marriage-family course checked fewer items than those who had not ([Larson, 1988](#)). In another study conducted with university students, it was discovered that marital myths, relationship experiences and the marriage status of parents had an effect on the viewpoint of individuals regarding marriage ([Day, 2001](#)).

In his study which reviewed the marital myths of university students, [Honeycutt \(1991\)](#) observed a negative relationship between age and marriage myths, along with the notion that males and Catholics embraced more marital myths. Priest, [Burnett et al. \(2009\)](#) studied the way in which breaking up affects beliefs about mate selection. The study consisted of 261 university students and it proved that there were considerable differences between those who had experienced a breakup and those who had not. It was also found that individuals who had experienced a breakup believed in mate selection myths less than others. One of the most important findings of this study was that these individuals less often held the constraining beliefs that love is enough for a relationship to be successful, both the individual and the partner must be perfect, and there is only one true person with whom they can have a relationship. It has also been noticed that individuals who have experienced many breakups had less faith in the beliefs that love is enough for a relationship to be successful and opposites compliment. Females believed in the idea that trying harder is required for a relationship to be successful more than males. As opposed to single individuals, engaged individuals had less faith in the beliefs that choosing a partner should be easy and that love is enough for a relationship to be successful. The study further showed that the more relationship experiences individuals had, the fewer unrealistic beliefs they had about mate selection.

The findings of this study are crucial in terms of presenting the constraining beliefs of university students regarding romance and mate selection. People working in the field of psychological support should share the constraining beliefs about romance and mate selection and their effects with individuals who conduct family, marriage and premarital studies and provide training about these topics. Considering the fact that premarital myths have a great influence on the behavior of individuals, it can be claimed that the way to healthy relationships before and after marriage pass through a phase of changing and/or minimizing the constraining beliefs. For this reason, knowledge of the constraining beliefs of young people helps determine their future marriage relationships. Thus, it is believed that consideration of the constraining beliefs about romance and mate selection could contribute to studies related to before and after marriages.

Comparisons could then be made considering the behavioral patterns individuals use in relationships, parental romantic relationship examples, maladaptive and adaptive schemes.

REFERENCES

- Abowitz, D.A., D. Knox, M. Zusman and A. Mcneely, 2009. Beliefs about romantic relationships: Gender differences among undergraduates. *College Student Journal*, 43(2): 276-284.
- Bayhan, P. and S. İřitan, 2010. Relationships in adolescence: A general outlook on peer and romantic relationships. *Family and Society*: 33-44.
- Burnett, M., R. Thompson, A. Vogel and P.L. Schvaneveldt, 2009. Relationship dissolution and romance and mate selection myths. *Family Science Review*, 14.
- Cihan-Güngör, H., M. Yılmaz and S. Balcı-Çelik, 2011. Romantizm ve eş seçimi tutum ölçeğinin uyarlanması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(36): 180-190.
- Cobb, N.P., J.H. Larson and W.L. Watson, 2003. Development of the attitudes about romance and mate selection scale. *Family Relations*, 52: 222-231.
- Connell, E.G., 2012. Soulmates: A phenomenological study of women who believe they knew their romantic partner in a previous lifetime. . A Psy. Dr. Clinical Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the California School of professional Psychology at Alliant International University San Diego.
- Connolly, J., W. Craig, A. Goldberg and D. Pepler, 2004. Mixed-gender groups, dating, and romantic relationships in early adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 14(2): 1185-2007.
- Day, R., 2001. Assessment of the romanticism, beliefs in marital myths and view of marriage in never married college students. Unpublished master's thesis. Lamar University in Beaumont, TX, USA. .
- Ersanlı, K., 2005. Davranışlarımız. Eser ofset matbaacılık. Samsun.
- Fletcher, G.J.O. and A.J. Simpson, 2000. Ideal standards in close relationships: Their structure and functions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3): 102-105.
- Geçtan, E., 1995. Psikanaliz ve sonrası. 6., Basım, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Honeycutt, J.M., 1991. The endorsement of myths about marriage as a functional of gender, age, religious denomination and educational level. *Communication Research Reports*, 8.
- Kurdek, L.A., 1993. Predicting marital dissolution: A 5-year prospective longitudinal study of newlywed couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64: 221-242.

- Larson, J.H., 1988. The marriage quiz: College students' beliefs in selected myths about marriage. *Family Relations*, 37: 3-11.
- Larson, J.H., 1992. You're my one and only": Premarital counseling for unrealistic beliefs about mate selection. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 20: 242-253.
- Rader, H.N., 2003. Influences of current parent-child relationships on young adults. Dissertation prepared for the degree of doctor of philosophy, university of north texas.
- Ramirez, S.A., 1997. Mate selection preferences among african americans,. Unpublished Master Thesis, UMI Microform 1390620.
- Schwarz, S. and M. Hassebrauck, 2012. Sex and age differences in mate selection preferences. . *Hum Nat*, 23(447-466).
- Sharp, E.A. and L.H. Ganong, 2000. Raising awareness about marital expectations: Are unrealistic beliefs changed by integrative teaching?., *Family Relations*, 49(1): 71-76.
- Stasio, M.J., 2002. Aspects of cognition in human mate selection. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, The Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University.
- Trotter, P.B., 2010. The influence of parental romantic relationships on college students' attitudes about romantic relationships. *College Student Journal*, 01463934, 44(1).
- Yılmazçoban, M.A., 2010. Evlilikte çiftleri etkileyen unsurlar ve arkadaşlık ilişkileri. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. Sayı, 1: 178-195.