Human Mate Selection: An Exploration of Assortative Mating Preferences

Kristin Liv Rauch, McNair Scholar, Pennsylvania State University

Faculty Research Advisers
Dr. Jeffrey Cohen, Assistant Professor of Cultural Anthropology
Dr. Patricia L. Johnson, Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology
Pennsylvania State University

This study seeks to identify mate choice preferences for dating, sexual encounters, and marriage. Specifically, preferences concerning demographic characteristics such as age, race, religion, income, and education were of interest. A survey was used to test whether people preferred mates whose characteristics matched their own, a phenomenon known as assortative mating. Past studies on assortative mating have focused on the behavior of individuals (i.e. who they actually choose as mates in their decisions about marriage). This study differs in two ways: one, it focuses on preferences, rather than behavior, and two, it includes questions about dating partners and sex partners in addition to questions about marriage partners. The results suggest that mate choice preferences reflect actual mate choice behavior. In light of this, one might very well ask, "What's love got to do with it?"

Background

Assortative mating addresses the question of who we choose as mates, particularly in terms of marriage. Studies over several decades have revealed a strong tendency for people to select mates who are similar to themselves with respect to a variety of demographic characteristics (see Atkinson & Glass 1985, Glenn 1982, Labov & Jacobs 1986, Rockwell 1976, Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan 1990, and Vera, Berardo, & Berardo 1985 for recent examples). These characteristics include, but are not limited to, age, race, religion, nationality, education, and income. Two major theories explain the tendency toward marital homogamy, or 'like' marrying 'like' (Warren 1968). The first pertains to the effect residential propinquity, or nearness has on our pool of potential mates, and the second involves cultural norms of endogamy, or the choice to marry within a group.

<u>Propinquity</u>

There are two aspects of propinquity: proximity and differential association. Proximity has an effect on our choice of a partner because we tend to live near potential mates. The people with whom we are perpetually in contact are the people who share our spheres of activity (e.g. work, school, church, stores, gyms, restaurants, etc.). It is this close contact with those who live near us that enables romantic interests to develop. Various studies have determined that propinquity does in fact play an important role in our mate choices. Brossard (1932) used the addresses found on 5,000 consecutive Philadelphia marriage licenses to determine that one-sixth of the couples lived within a block of one another, one-third lived within five blocks, and 51.9% lived within twenty blocks of each other (Kephart 1961:268). Similarly, a study in New Haven, Connecticut found that 51.3 percent of the applicants for marriage licenses had lived within a twenty-block radius (Davie & Reeves 1939). Other research, in Columbus, Ohio found that over 50% of married couples lived within one mile at the time of their first date together (Clarke 1952). At least thirteen subsequent published studies have supported Brossard's original findings concerning the relationship between residential propinquity and marital selection (see Katz & Hill 1958 for an overview).

Marital homogamy can be seen as a result of proximity due to the effects of differential association. Not only do we tend to live near our potential mates, but we also have a strong tendency to live near people who are like ourselves. As Richard Udry puts it, "Cities are found to be patterned with people who are alike on important social variables living together and those who are different from one another spatially separated" (1971:185). Our neighborhoods are demarcated along socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, religious, and even educational lines. Rarely will a High School dropout be found living next door to someone with a Ph.D. Unskilled laborers don't generally share their neighborhoods with white-collar professionals. So, if our pool of potential mates consists mainly of those who live near us, and those who live near us tend to be similar to ourselves, then more than likely our mates will reflect our own demographic characteristics. In other words, we will mate assortatively. This is consistent with the findings of Davie & Reeves, who state: "nearly three-quarters (73.6 per cent) of all persons marrying within the city [of New Haven] chose mates residing in the same type of neighborhood. Practically no intermarriage (3.9 per cent) occurred between areas far removed in social, economic, and cultural traits" (1939:517).

Most studies that focus on propinquity to explain assortative mating are out of date. People are quite mobile within their cities in the modern era. The number of young, single people who own or have access to an automobile has risen substantially over recent decades. These mate-seekers have the means to go beyond their demographically homogamous neighborhoods to shop, attend church, work, and play; and therefore they have opportunities to encounter a more diverse pool of potential mates. The number of people who leave their home area to attend college is also larger than it was fifty years ago. For these reasons, Udry argues propinquity may not exert as great an influence over current mate choices as in the past (1971:185).

A second point of interest is that propinquity studies are based on information derived from research on married couples. The data collected is based on the outcomes of decisions (who did I marry), not preferences (who might I marry). This means that homogamous mate choices may reflect spatial constraints on one's pool of potential

mates, but not necessarily reflect a specific *preference* for assortative mating. Perhaps if dissimilar people were included in one's sphere of activity, they would be as likely to be chosen. The results of my study suggest otherwise. When surveyed about their general mate preferences (which were not limited to any particular pool of choices), the subjects responded that, even when given a diverse set of options, they preferred mates who reflected their own characteristics. This lends much greater support to the second theory of why people mate assortatively: "Norms of Endogamy".

Norms of Endogamy

If a group prefers that its members select mates from within the group, it is said to be endogamous. If the social norm is to select mates from outside of the group, then it is exogamous. Whether or not a mate comes from inside or outside of the group depends, of course, on how the boundaries of the group are defined. As Levi-Strauss puts it, " . . . it is merely a question of knowing how far to extend the logical connotation of the idea of community, which is itself dependent upon the effective solidarity of the group" (1969:46). People can divide and categorize themselves along an endless number of lines—religion, race, ethnicity, social status, geographic location, political affiliation, sexual orientation, and so on. As social animals, a great deal of our personal identity is formed according to our membership in certain groups. A sense of security often accompanies group membership, and for this reason people are reluctant to behave in opposition to group norms. Too much rebellion could lead to expulsion from the group, and a consequent loss of security and identity. The "distress resulting from collective hostility" (Levi-Strauss1969: 42) is enough to make most people behave according to the norms of the group. This, of course, includes social rules concerning the choice of an appropriate mate—be they endogamous or exogamous.

Why would a given group hold norms of endogamy? One possible explanation for religious endogamy is offered by Albert Gordon (1964) who states: "Catholics, Protestants, and Jews respond in much the same way. The religious teachings emphasizing the unique, if not the superior and distinctive qualities of each of these religions, clearly urge young people to marry within their group to maintain these special qualities" (p. 69). In other words, members of groups share a belief in the superiority of their own group over other groups. Otherwise, why not belong to some other group? It is easy to see how this logic can extend beyond religion to other types of groups. There are elements in each group that attract and retain its members, in spite of competition from other groups. Selecting a mate from a different group implies settling for less. After all, if your group is indeed special, then members of different groups must be inferior to the members of your own group (there is an element of community-level narcissism in this). Thus, norms of endogamy maintain group integrity.

This same idea manifests itself as ethnocentrism when applied to racial or ethnic groups (Boas 1928). Racial endogamy results from a desire to preserve a group's existence. Although the concept of 'race' in any biological sense is now disputed, many people believe that one's racial identity is a fundamental genetic trait. Following this view, racially mixed marriages will result in the elimination of distinct racial groups, and therefore the loss of identity and security.

Evidence can be found which suggests that American culture does indeed have norms of endogamy, especially concerning certain types of social groups. One readily

available source of information is the Media, which at the very least reveals—and often endorses—cultural expectations for behavior. For example, consider the types of couples that are featured in movies, television shows, and advertisements (both print and TV). When was the last time you saw an interracial couple in an ad for floor wax? How about a sitcom where the husband drives a taxicab and the wife is a scientist? How often do Hollywood films feature couples that have different religious backgrounds? Rarely, and when the Media does feature some type of mixed couple, the story revolves around the scandals caused by their being together. Jungle Fever, Guess Who's Coming to Dinner?, Brooklyn Babylon, Zebrahead, Mississippi Masala, and My Big Fat Greek Wedding are all films in which the plot revolves around the very fact that the couple is not homogamous.[1] Never do we see a couple that "just happens" to be mixed, with the content of the story revolving around some other issue. What this pattern reveals is that mixed marriages (however the mix is defined) are considered abnormal, a novelty, or scandalous. In other words, they go against prescribed cultural norms.

Further evidence for strong norms of endogamy in American culture can be found in recent history. Antimiscegenation laws, forbidding the union of two people from different races, existed from the slavery era until merely 36 years ago. In June of 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled the law unconstitutional, and the sixteen states that still had antimiscegenation laws were forced to abandon them (Wadlington 1966). The fact that norms of endogamy found their way into the law books illustrates the degree to which such norms are enforced.

Rules have also existed within certain churches concerning religious intermarriage. In sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe, there were strict laws forbidding marriage between Catholics and Protestants (Barbara 1989:40). There was also a "previous requirement of the Catholic church, annulled in 1966, that non-Catholic partners in Catholic marriages agree that children are to be raised Catholic" (Johnson 1980:11). This rule ensured that any progeny would be fully committed to the Catholic group, and would not have allegiances to any outside groups. The rule essentially said that a heterogeneous union was permissible, as long as it resulted in the production of more Catholics. Levi-Strauss interprets a 1914 German text on Mormonism ('Der Sexuelle Anteil an der Theologie Der Mormonen') as claiming: "if a girl cannot find a partner possessing the true faith, it is better for her to marry her father, for it is the possession of this faith which is the prime essential in [the Mormons'] definition of a human being" (1969:47). This suggests that religious norms of endogamy are so strict among Mormons (or were at that time) as to supersede incest taboos. Overall, norms of religious endogamy are so important that nearly two out of every three couples belong to the same religion at the time of their marriage (Warren 1970:144). In fact, seven out of every ten men who change their religious affiliation when they get married, change to the same religion as their wife (Warren 1970:144).

Our society is selective about which characteristics are most important for a couple to share. For instance, Hollywood movies commonly feature a leading man who is noticeably older than his love interest (sometimes by a few decades). Sean Connery,

---

[1] As an interesting side note, a Google search for 'films featuring mixed couples' yielded page after page of pornography. Comparing the short list that I was able to think of to this veritable flood of sexually explicit material leads one to believe that homogamy loses its importance in the case of strictly sexual relationships (a point I'll return to shortly).

Harrison Ford, Michael Douglass, Clint Eastwood, and Richard Gere have all played opposite twenty-something, up and coming actresses.[2] In many cases, these actors have married youthful rising stars in real life. Most Americans barely raise an eyebrow over this type of heterogeny. Therefore, our culture's norms of endogamy are differentially valued. Certain lines are more permissible to cross than others. Since all of us belong to a multitude of groups, only our membership in certain of those groups will have a bearing on public approval of a non-homogamous relationship.

One assumption is that people will always mate assortatively, regardless of whether they are choosing dating, sex, or marriage partners. However, due to the effects of endogamous norms, dating and marriage partner preferences should be more homogamous (i.e. endogamous) than casual sex partner preferences. I argue that this is because of the difference between biological and cultural drives behind mate selection.

The pursuit of a casual sex partner involves biological interests, and the act itself usually occurs in private. Marriage, on the other hand, is a cultural behavior and as such invokes social norms and public rules. It involves many people, such as family, friends, and coworkers, and is subject to public scrutiny. Unlike a sexual partnership, which can be secretive and clandestine, marriage is often announced to a community via the newspaper, and traditionally involves a third party's consent. Although many people might be interested in reading it, I have yet to see a newspaper with a section announcing sexual intimacies; and intercourse only requires the consent of the people directly involved in the act. The point is this: norms of endogamy exert a much greater force on our selection of dating or marriage partners than on our selection of casual sex partners. This is because sex involves internal and personal needs and drives, while marriage is a public declaration and involves social concerns.

Methods

A three-part survey was used to collect data for this study (see appendix A). The survey included basic information about all respondents – age, gender, race, religion, education, income, marital status, and sexual orientation. The survey asked a series of likert-type scaled questions about the subject's dating partner preferences, and in subsequent sections asked identical questions about sexual, and marriage partner preferences. The survey was distributed in all the Anthropology classes that were offered in the summer 2003 academic session at PSU, as well as some other disciplines, such as Biology, and Administration of Justice. Additional surveys were obtained from graduate students, members of Penn State's Department of Educational Equity, and undergraduates participating in PSU's summer research programs. A total of 317 surveys were distributed, and 248 completed surveys were collected. The data from these surveys were entered into an Excel file, and analyzed using Excel and SPSS.

Data

The sample obtained was almost evenly divided by gender (47.6% male, 52.4% female), with a mean age of 22 years (90% of the sample was 26 years of age or younger). The vast majority of subjects (93%) had earned a Bachelor's degree or less, and 80% of respondents earned less than $10, 000 annually. Of those responding, 96% reported

---

[2] Rarely is the alternative—an older woman with a younger man—seen. Some exceptions are Harold and Maude, and The Graduate.

being heterosexual, only 7% were married, and 95% of the subjects had no children. In terms of religion, 70.4% identified as being Christian, with Catholic (27.8%), Non-Denominational Christian (17.7%), and Protestant (16.5%) being the most frequent responses. Given the respondent pool, it isn't surprising that the sample was homogeneous. The exception was in terms of racial identification. While a majority of respondents (71%) identified as Caucasian or White, 29.5% identified as a racial minority (percentages do not total 100 because some respondents left the racial identity question blank). I found that 8% of subjects identified as Asian, 14% as Black or African-American, 7% as Hispanic, and .5% as Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. This is more than double the typical percentage of the racial minority population of the entire Penn State- University Park campus. The most recent data available (2002) place Penn State-University Park's minority enrollment at 12% (Source: Office of Enrollment Management and Administration, Pennsylvania State University).

The tables show average scores and range between 1 and 5 – a 1 indicates strong disagreement, while a 5 indicates strong agreement. Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the racial preferences of respondents with respect to a potential dating, sex, or marriage partner. The tables illustrate that most respondents preferred members of their own race. Scores were typically higher—indicating agreement – for members of their own race on questions asking about who they were most likely to date, have sex with, and marry. Subjects were more selective about marriage partners than sex or dating partners, especially Asian respondents. This is revealed in the greater variability of average scores for marriage preferences, whereas average scores for sex partner preferences are less variable. For example, Table 2 shows that Asian respondents ranked potential sex partners from a high score of 4.17 to a low score of 3.00. These scores cover a smaller span than the Asian rankings for potential marriage partners on table 3, which range from a high of 4.37 to a low of 2.68. In other words, respondents are flexible about who they are willing to have sex with, but are particular about who they will and will not marry. One can see that 'Arab' is an unpopular category, particularly when it comes to marriage; which is quite telling since this runs congruent with the current American sentiment following September 11, 2001 and the war on Iraq.

Table 4 displays educational preferences, and is divided into male and female respondents. A preference for mates with higher education levels corresponds to higher scores. Both genders indicate that they are least particular about the education level of a sex partner, slightly choosier about a dating partner, and most selective about a marriage partner. For instance, the average scores for a potential mate with a G.E.D. show a high of 3.22 (female) for a sex partner, and reach a low of 2.28 (male) for a marriage partner. The four lowest education levels (did not finish High School, G.E.D., High School graduate, and attended college but did not graduate) all display the same pattern – highest scores for sex partners, slightly lower scores for dating partners, and lowest scores for marriage partners. This illustrates that subjects are more willing to have sex with someone who lacked a higher education than they are to marry someone from one of those categories. The scores for Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees remain relatively constant across sex, dating, and marriage choices, indicating a willingness to engage in any of these activities with someone who held a degree.

Table 5 shows a similar pattern concerning the income of a potential mate. Again, people are least concerned about the income of a sex partner (as indicated by higher

scores in the lower income categories), more concerned about a dating partner's income, and most selective about the income of a marriage partner. This is especially true in the case of incomes lower than $40, 000 a year. For example, scores for potential sex partners range from a low of 3.33 for a person earning less than $10,000 a year, to a high of 4.31 for a person earning more than $200,000 a year. Contrast this narrow range of scores with that of potential marriage partners, which range from a low of 2.30 to a high of 4.43. In other words, subjects are willing to have sex with someone from any income level, but are selective about the incomes of potential spouses.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 show the religious preferences for potential mates. Once again, it is clear that subjects prefer members of their own religion as dating, sex, or marriage partners (this is indicated by the highlighted scores). The pattern concerning the type of mate also reappears. The highest scores for mates outside of the respondents' religion are for sex partners (see table 7). These scores become lower when respondents are asked about marriage partners (see table 8). This indicates that subjects are more willing to have sex with someone from a different religion than they are willing to marry someone from a different religion.

Discussion

There was a strong association between a person's background and the preferences that he or she expressed. If you consider that 71% of subjects were White, 74.8% Judeo-Christian, and 93% had either completed or were enrolled in a Bachelor degree program, it is not a surprise that, when taken as a group, respondents were most likely to choose a White, Judeo-Christian, college-educated partner. The highest ratings from the group as a whole reflect the composition of the sample, which indicates a preference for Assortative Mating. In some cases, informants adamantly expressed this preference. For example, a line was provided on some questions that was labeled 'other', in order to allow subjects to include certain groups that may not have been specifically listed on the survey question. Ten respondents identified themselves as Baptists, and disagreed with marrying, dating, or having sex with anyone from any of the groups listed. Five wrote in the name 'Baptist' on the line marked 'other' and indicated that they would strongly agree with selecting a member of this group as a marriage partner. This shows that some people are very particular indeed about marrying, dating, or having sex with someone like themselves.

The premise of Assortative Mating states that people are particular about the demographic characteristics of their prospective spouses; but the idea of Assortative Mating does not address the choices people make regarding dating or sex partners. This study, however, did consider dating or sex partners. The results indicate that subjects are most particular about who they would marry, less particular about who they would date, and least concerned with the characteristics of a potential sex partner. This difference in the level of concern people have about the characteristics of different types of mates is an important one, and one that previous research on Assortative Mating has overlooked.

Why would this difference exist? I believe it is due to the difference between cultural and biological drives behind the choice of a particular kind of mate, coupled with the relative force that Norms of Endogamy exert over culturally versus biologically driven behavior. Marriage is a cultural behavior, and as such follows prescribed rules and norms. Among these norms is the idea that marriage partners should ideally come

from similar demographic backgrounds. Marriages, and marriage partner choices, are subject to a great deal of public scrutiny, and people enter into these unions with a large amount of social pressure weighing on their decisions. Our marriage choices are subject to the approval of our parents and other family members, our friends and associates, and in many cases our clergy members. A great incentive exists for people to follow social norms when choosing a spouse.

The same norms exist concerning the choice of a sex partner, but there are critical differences. Sexual partnerships can be temporary unions, and they can serve quite limited functions in the lives of individuals. Although people frequently become very involved in the lives of their sex partners, this is generally an indication that the relationship has progressed beyond mere sexual pleasure. Strictly sexual relationships can be concealed from public scrutiny. Their private nature makes it very easy for people to behave in opposition to group norms without consequence. When individuals seek mates specifically for purposes of sexual gratification they are pursuing a personal and biological urge. When people are selecting marriage partners, on the other hand, they are obligated, to some degree, to take the values of the group-at-large into consideration. This reality accounts for the fact that respondents were most particular about the characteristics of a spouse, rather than a dating or a sex partner.

Problems

Some problems arose through the course of this project that would need to be addressed if this research was to be continued. Some issues pertained to the questionnaire itself. For instance, one survey question asks if the respondent would have sex with a homosexual. The problem is that the question does not specify a gender for the homosexual person. This ambiguity makes it difficult to interpret the responses. If a male participant responds that he 'strongly agrees' that he would have sex with a homosexual, does he mean a lesbian woman, a gay man, or both? This distinction is an important one. One other problem with the content of the survey was the use of the term 'asexual.' Participants were given 'asexual' as a choice on a list of possible sexual orientation identities. The most frequently asked question while administering the surveys concerned the meaning of the term 'asexual.' The term was intended to define the sexual orientation of an individual who had no intentions of engaging in sexual activity. Based on the fact that none of the 248 participants claimed to be asexual, perhaps its inclusion was not worth the confusion it caused.

The fact that no one identified as asexual brings up another important point. Were people being honest when answering the survey questions? The survey was anonymous so as to encourage honest responses, however most of the surveys were distributed and completed in class. Perhaps the lack of privacy influenced people's answers to questions about sensitive personal information, such as sexual orientation, marital status, and children. The fact that only four percent of the sample identified themselves as being of an alternative sexuality (homosexual or bisexual) may be a result of the public setting in which the surveys were administered.

Some of these problems may or may not have been avoided if interviews had been used instead of surveys. Face to face interviews allow for clarification on questions or answers that are unclear, but they are time-consuming and create problems of their own – not least of which is a lack of anonymity. The use of surveys allowed much more data to

be collected in a shorter period of time, and enabled a bigger sample. The drawback to using a completely anonymous survey is that ambiguities cannot be resolved because participants cannot be contacted after the survey has been completed. Overall, surveys were the most effective method in this particular study.

Conclusion

Rules of exogamy are often viewed as facilitating relationships of exchange between groups (Levi-Strauss 1969). One group (A), forbidden from marrying within the group, must choose its spouses from another group (B). Likewise, exogamous group B must choose its spouses from outside of the group. These groups form an ongoing relationship based on the exchange of spouses; group A gets its mates from group B and vice versa. This process of ongoing exchange is known as reciprocity. Reciprocity implies a continuing relationship between two or more groups, and by the same token, refusing to participate in an exchange signifies a refusal to be involved in the relationship (Mauss 1990).

Exogamy as a means to facilitate relationships with other groups has typically been observed in so-called 'simple' societies. These groups are normally foraging or horticulturalist populations. Characteristically, these populations are homogeneous – they share a common language and culture. Complex societies, such as our own, are comprised of many different groups. "[Where] not only social classes but ethnic groups or castes may be pieced together into larger systems . . . the component 'pieces' are usually endogamous" (Keesing 1975:53-4). Considering all of this information, one can deduce that the component parts of complex societies are refusing to carry on significant relationships with each other by refusing to exchange marriage partners. In other words, groups that hold rigid norms of endogamy are exclusive and isolated, and do not associate or form alliances with outside groups. Rules of endogamy serve to divide complex societies.

Rigid norms of endogamy often indicate where important social divisions lie. For example, in America, people are not expected to choose a mate from within their state. Someone from New Jersey can marry someone from Ohio without social consequence. We do not hold norms of home-state endogamy. However, we do hold norms of racial, religious, and social class endogamy. This indicates that in America, racial, religious, and, social class boundaries are more socially cogent than geographic boundaries. "So with all of the other variables – the more significant to a society are the differences between two categories of people, the less they intermarry" (Udry 1971:183).

It is clear that important social boundaries are revealed through mate choices. Mate choice behavior (that is who, in practice, do we marry) obviously reveals social boundaries, but mate choice *preferences* go further to reveal psychological boundaries. If people behave in accordance with social norms, but do not harbor strong preferences in accordance with those norms, this may indicate an imminent shift in the norms themselves. Although people are behaving as they are expected to, their lack of strong preferences for this behavior indicates a weakening of these values. Over time, these people will place less pressure on subsequent generations to choose mates according to norms of endogamy. On the other hand, if preferences are in accordance with norms then people accept and approve of the current distinctions and boundaries, and are likely to

pass these values on to younger generations. The result is that the categories and boundaries will remain stable.

What can be concluded then about social realities as revealed through mate choice preferences? It is clear that norms are quite powerful. The second half of the twentieth century was an era of great social change. Segregation was ended and Affirmative Action served to diversify the workplace. Overall, America made strides toward social and economic equality. Our workplaces, clubs, neighborhoods, and social scenes have all become more diverse – but not our families. Is marriage the final frontier? Segregation in a legal sense is long gone, but on the home front we remain <u>separate</u>, but (arguably) equal.

		Responses to the question, who would you most likely date?						
		White	Black	Am. Ind.	Asian	Hawaiian	Hispanic	Arab
Racial Identity of Respondents	White	4.69	3.62	3.71	3.40	3.80	3.81	3.14
	Black	3.84	4.88	4.28	3.48	4.12	4.48	3.00
	Asian	3.33	3.00	3.14	4.17	3.14	3.14	3.00
	Hispanic	4.46	4.31	4.38	4.00	4.23	4.77	3.77

Table 1: Average Scores for Dating Preferences of Four Main Groups

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

		Responses to the question, who would you have sex with?						
		White	Black	Am. Ind.	Asian	Hawaiian	Hispanic	Arab
Racial Identity of Respondents	White	4.64	3.79	3.76	3.56	3.93	3.91	3.20
	Black	4.00	4.80	4.12	3.52	4.00	4.32	3.12
	Asian	3.50	3.33	3.17	4.17	3.17	3.00	3.00
	Hispanic	4.54	4.38	4.31	3.92	4.31	4.77	3.69

Table 2: Average Scores for Sex Preferences of Four Main Groups

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

		Responses to the question, who would you most likely marry?						
		White	**Black**	**Am. Ind.**	**Asian**	**Hawaiian**	**Hispanic**	**Arab**
Racial Identity of Respondents	**White**	4.62	3.30	3.41	3.25	3.66	3.56	2.90
	Black	3.48	4.79	3.88	2.94	3.67	4.24	2.70
	Asian	3.47	2.68	2.84	4.37	2.84	2.74	2.68
	Hispanic	4.44	4.06	3.94	3.44	3.61	4.72	3.28

Table 3: Average Scores for Marriage Preferences of Four Main Groups

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

	No H.S.	GED	H.S. grad	Attended college	Assoc. degree	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D.
Dating								
Male	2.14	2.81	3.42	3.72	4.13	4.57	4.59	4.54
Female	2.32	2.96	3.61	3.89	4.23	4.56	4.51	4.34
Sex								
Male	2.74	3.16	3.63	3.94	4.24	4.41	4.41	4.41
Female	2.76	3.22	3.77	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.53	4.47
Marriage								
Male	1.82	2.28	3.19	3.21	3.87	4.47	4.56	4.53
Female	1.94	2.35	2.95	3.25	3.82	4.22	4.27	4.25

Table 4: Average Scores for Education Preferences by Gender

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

	Under 10K	10-20K	20-30K	30-40K	40-50K	50-75K	75-100K	100-200K	Over 200K
Dating									
Male	3.07	3.43	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.10
Female	3.06	3.44	3.81	4.08	4.29	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.29
Sex									
Male	3.33	3.62	3.96	4.12	4.19	4.26	4.28	4.29	4.28
Female	3.33	3.53	3.83	4.06	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.31
Marriage									
Male	2.30	2.56	3.27	3.76	4.16	4.32	4.39	4.38	4.38
Female	2.48	2.80	3.31	3.79	4.07	4.28	4.43	4.42	4.42

Table 5: Average Scores for Income Preferences by Gender

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

		Average Scores for Responses to the question, who would you most likely date?							
		Muslim	Catholic	Protestant	Non-Den Ch	Jewish	Buddhist	Hindu	Atheist
Religious Identity of Respondents	Atheist	2.91	3.00	3.27	3.27	3.18	3.09	3.09	4.09
	Baptist	2.44	3.33	3.22	4.00	2.67	2.44	2.33	1.44
	Catholic	2.64	**4.56**	4.15	4.00	3.54	2.95	2.72	2.59
	Hindu	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	4.00
	Jewish	3.20	3.80	3.80	3.80	**4.20**	3.60	3.60	**4.20**
	Non-Den Ch	2.35	3.58	3.78	**4.15**	3.15	2.44	2.41	2.26
	None	**3.67**	3.67	3.67	3.56	3.67	**3.67**	**3.67**	3.78
	Protestant	2.72	3.72	**4.34**	4.00	3.38	2.76	2.66	2.41

Table 6: Dating Preferences by Religion

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

		Average Scores for Responses to the question, who would you have sex with?							
		Muslim	Catholic	Protestant	Non-Den Ch	Jewish	Buddhist	Hindu	Atheist
Religious Identity of Respondents	Atheist	3.00	3.27	3.45	3.45	3.36	3.55	3.55	3.82
	Baptist	2.25	3.38	3.43	4.00	2.75	2.50	2.25	1.50
	Catholic	2.87	**4.41**	4.08	3.95	3.67	3.10	2.92	2.92
	Hindu	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Jewish	3.80	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.80	4.00
	Non-Den Ch	3.00	4.00	4.21	**4.44**	3.68	3.00	3.00	3.08
	None	**4.20**	4.20	4.20	4.20	**4.20**	**4.20**	**4.20**	**4.30**
	Protestant	2.83	3.79	**4.31**	4.00	3.41	2.76	2.76	2.66

Table 7: Sex Partner Preferences by Religion

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

		Average Scores for Responses to the question, who would you most likely marry?							
		Muslim	Catholic	Protestant	Non-Den Ch	Jewish	Buddhist	Hindu	Atheist
Religious Identity of Respondents	Atheist	2.56	2.94	3.00	3.06	2.94	2.88	2.75	**3.56**
	Baptist	1.82	2.91	3.18	4.09	2.72	1.91	1.60	1.36
	Catholic	2.35	**4.62**	3.93	3.64	3.13	2.48	2.39	2.30
	Hindu	2.57	2.86	2.86	3.00	2.71	**3.71**	**4.43**	3.43
	Jewish	3.09	3.00	3.09	3.09	**4.18**	2.91	2.91	3.00
	Non-Den Ch	2.34	3.59	3.75	**4.34**	3.02	2.50	2.50	2.44
	None	**3.59**	3.53	3.59	3.71	3.59	**3.71**	3.59	3.53
	Protestant	2.09	3.68	**4.57**	4.18	3.02	2.20	2.16	2.23

Table 8: Marriage Preferences by Religion

5 = Perfect Agreement   1 = No Agreement

What is your:

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: _____

Race/ Ethnicity: (you may mark more than one)
☐ White
☐ Black or African American
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
☐ Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, or Caribbean
☐ Middle Eastern or Arab
☐ Other, please specify _____

Religion:
☐ Muslim
☐ Catholic
☐ Protestant
☐ Non-denominational Christian
☐ Jewish
☐ Buddhist
☐ Hindu
☐ Atheist
☐ Other, please specify _____

Approximate Yearly Income:
☐ Under $10,000
☐ $10,000 - $20,000
☐ $20,000 - $30,000
☐ $30,000 - $40,000
☐ $40,000 - $50,000
☐ $50,000 - $75,000
☐ $75,000 - $100,000
☐ $100, 000 - $200,000
☐ Over $200, 000

Highest Education Level:
(if you are a student mark the degree you are currently working toward)
☐ did not complete High School
☐ G.E.D.
☐ high school graduate
☐ attended college, did not graduate
☐ associate's degree
☐ bachelor's degree
☐ master's degree
☐ PhD

Sexual Orientation:
☐ Heterosexual
☐ Homosexual
☐ Bisexual
☐ Transgendered
☐ Asexual

Marital Status:
☐ Single- currently dating
☐ Single- in a steady relationship
☐ Single- not dating, not in a steady relationship
☐ Married (please state number of years _____)
☐ Separated
☐ Divorced

Do you have children? ☐ Yes   or ☐ No

In the following section, please rank the listed characteristics according to the likelihood that you would DATE someone who fit that characteristic. For example, if you would be very likely to date someone in that category, mark *strongly agree*. If it is a possibility, mark *agree*. If you are indifferent to the characteristic, mark *neutral*. If it is an unlikely possibility, mark *disagree*. If you would be very unlikely to date someone from that category, mark *strongly disagree*.

(1)Age: Would you date someone in the age-range of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(1a) 16-18	□	□	□	□	□
(1b) 18-21	□	□	□	□	□
(1c) 21-25	□	□	□	□	□
(1d) 25-30	□	□	□	□	□
(1e) 30-35	□	□	□	□	□
(1f) 35-40	□	□	□	□	□
(1g) 40-50	□	□	□	□	□
(1h) 50-60	□	□	□	□	□
(1i) 60-70	□	□	□	□	□
(1j) 70-80	□	□	□	□	□
(1k) 80-90	□	□	□	□	□

(2) Nationality: Would you date someone with a nationality that was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(2a) the same as yours	□	□	□	□	□
(2b) different from yours	□	□	□	□	□

(3) Education Level: Would you date someone with the education level of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(3a) Did not complete High School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3b) G.E.D.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3c) High School graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3d) Attended college, did not graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3e) Associate's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3f) Bachelor's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3g) Master's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3h) PhD	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(4) Religion: Would you date someone whose religion was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(4a) Muslim	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4b) Catholic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4c) Protestant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4d) Non-denominational Christian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4e) Jewish	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4f) Buddhist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4g) Hindu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4h) Atheist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4i) Other, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

(5) <u>Race/ Ethnicity</u>: Would you date someone with the race or ethnicity of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(5a) White	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5b) Black or African American	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5c) American Indian or Alaska Native	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5d) Asian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5e) Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5f) Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, or Caribbean	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5g) Middle Eastern or Arab	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5h) Other, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

(6) <u>Income (per year)</u>: Would you date someone whose yearly income was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(6a) under $10,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6b) $10,000 - $20,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6c) $20,000 - $30,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6d) $30,000 - $40,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6e) $40,000 - $50,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6f) $50,000 - $75,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6g) $75,000 - $100,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6h) $100, 000 - $200,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(6i) over $200, 000   ☐-------------☐-------------☐-------------☐-------------☐

(7) <u>Sexual Orientation:</u> Would you date someone whose sexual orientation was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(7a) heterosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(7b) homosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(7c) bisexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(7d) transgendered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(7e) asexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(8) <u>Marital Status:</u> Would you date someone with the marital status of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(8a) never been married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8b) separated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8c) married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8d) divorced once	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8e) divorced twice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8f) divorced more than two times	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(9) <u>Children:</u> Would you date a person that:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(9a) has no children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(9b) has children out of wedlock	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(9c) has children with an ex-spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(9d) has children with a current spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

In the following section, please rank the listed characteristics according to the likelihood that you would have SEX with someone who fit that characteristic. For example, if you would be very likely to have sex with someone in that category, mark *strongly agree*. If it is a possibility, mark *agree*. If you are indifferent to the characteristic, mark *neutral*. If it is an unlikely possibility, mark *disagree*. If you would be very unlikely to have sex with someone from that category, mark *strongly disagree*.

(10) Age: Would you have sex with someone in the age-range of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(10a) 16-18	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10b) 18-21	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10c) 21-25	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10d) 25-30	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10e) 30-35	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10f) 35-40	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10g) 40-50	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10h) 50-60	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10i) 60-70	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10j) 70-80	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10k) 80-90	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(11) Nationality: Would you have sex with someone whose nationality was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(11a) the same as yours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(11b) different from yours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(12) Education Level: Would you have sex with someone with the education level of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(12a) Did not complete High School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12b) G.E.D.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12c) High School graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12d) Attended college, did not graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12e) Associate's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12f) Bachelor's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12g) Master's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12h) PhD	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(13) Religion: Would you have sex with someone whose religion was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(13a) Muslim	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13b) Catholic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13c) Protestant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13d) Non-denominational Christian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13e) Jewish	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13f) Buddhist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13g) Hindu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13h) Atheist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(13i) Other,	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

please specify _____

(14) <u>Race/ Ethnicity</u>: Would you have sex with someone whose race or ethnicity was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(14a) White	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14b) Black or African American	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14c) American Indian or Alaska Native	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14d) Asian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14e) Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14f) Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, or Caribbean	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14g) Middle Eastern or Arab	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(14h) Other, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

(15) <u>Income (per year)</u>: Would you have sex with someone whose yearly income was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(15a) under $10,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15b) $10,000 - $20,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15c) $20,000 - $30,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15d) $30,000 - $40,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15e) $40,000 - $50,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15f) $50,000 - $75,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15g) $75,000 - $100,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15h) $100, 000 - $200,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(15i) over $200, 000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(16) Sexual Orientation: Would you have sex with someone whose sexual orientation was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(16a) heterosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(16b) homosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(16c) bisexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(16d) transgendered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(16e) asexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(17) Marital Status: Would you have sex with someone with the marital status of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(17a) never been married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(17b) separated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(17c) married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(17d) divorced once	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(17e) divorced twice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(17f) divorced more than two times	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(18) Children: Would you have sex with a person that:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(18a) has no children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(18b) has children out of wedlock	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(18c) has children with an ex-spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(18d) has children with a current spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

In the following section, please rank the listed characteristics according to the likelihood that you would MARRY someone who fit that characteristic. For example, if you would be very likely to marry someone in that category, mark *strongly agree*. If it is a possibility, mark *agree*. If you are indifferent to the characteristic, mark *neutral*. If it is an unlikely possibility, mark *disagree*. If you would be very unlikely to marry someone from that category, mark *strongly disagree*.

(19) Age: Would you marry someone in the age-range of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(19a) 16-18	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19b) 18-21	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19c) 21-25	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19d) 25-30	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19e) 30-35	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19f) 35-40	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19g) 40-50	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19h) 50-60	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19i) 60-70	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19j) 70-80	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(19k) 80-90	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(20) Nationality: Would you marry someone with a nationality that was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(20a) the same as yours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(20b) different from yours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(21) Education Level: Would you marry someone with the education level of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(21a) Did not complete High School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21b) G.E.D.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21c) High School graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21d) Attended college, did not graduate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21e) Associate's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21f) Bachelor's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21g) Master's degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(21h) PhD	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(22) Religion: Would you marry someone whose religion was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(22a) Muslim	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22b) Catholic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22c) Protestant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22d) Non-denominational Christian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22e) Jewish	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22f) Buddhist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22g) Hindu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22h) Atheist	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(22i) Other, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

(23) <u>Race/ Ethnicity</u>: Would you marry someone with the race or ethnicity of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(23a) White	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23b) Black or African American	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23c) American Indian or Alaska Native	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23d) Asian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23e) Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23f) Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, or Caribbean	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23g) Middle Eastern or Arab	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(23h) Other, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

(24) <u>Income (per year)</u>: Would you marry someone whose yearly income was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(24a) under $10,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24b) $10,000 - $20,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24c) $20,000 - $30,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24d) $30,000 - $40,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24e) $40,000 - $50,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24f) $50,000 - $75,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24g) $75,000 - $100,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24h) $100, 000 - $200,000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(24i) over $200, 000	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(25) <u>Sexual Orientation:</u> Would you marry someone whose sexual orientation was:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(25a) heterosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(25b) homosexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(25c) bisexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(25d) transgendered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(25e) asexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(26) <u>Marital Status</u>: Would you marry someone with the marital status of:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(26a) never been married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(26b) separated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(26c) married	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(26d) divorced once	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(26e) divorced twice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(26f) divorced more than two times	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(27) <u>Children:</u> Would you marry a person that:

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
(27a) has no children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(27b) has children out of wedlock	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(27c) has children with an ex-spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(27d) has children with a current spouse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Works Cited

Atkinson, Maxine P., and Becky L. Glass
  1985 Marital Age Heterogamy and Homogamy, 1900 to 1980. Journal of Marriage and
        the Family 47:685-691.

Barbara, Augustin
  1989 Marriage Across Frontiers. David E. Kennard, trans. Philadelphia: Multilingual
        Matters Ltd.

Boas, Franz
  1928 Anthropology and Modern Life. New York: W.W. Norton.

Brossard, James
  1932 Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage Selection. American Journal of
        Sociology, September:288-294.

Clarke, Alfred C.
  1952 An Examination of the Operation of Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Mate
        Selection. American Sociological Review, February:17-22.

Davie, Maurice R., and Ruby J. Reeves
  1939 Propinquity of Residence Before Marriage. American Journal of Sociology,
        January:510-517.

Glenn, Norval D.
  1982 Interreligious Marriage in the United States: Patterns and Recent Trends. Journal
        of Marriage and the Family 44:555-566.

Gordon, Albert I.
  1964 Intermarriage. Boston: Beacon Press.

Johnson, Robert A.
  1980 Religious Assortative Marriage in the United States. New York: Academic Press.

Katz, Alvin, and Reuben Hill
  1958 Residential Propinquity and Marital Selection: A Review of Theory, Method, and
        Fact. Marriage and Family Living, February:27-35.

Keesing, Roger M.
  1975 Kin Groups and Social Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kephart, William M.
  1961 The Family, Society, and the Individual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Labov, Teresa, and Jerry A. Jacobs
  1986 Intermarriage in Hawaii, 1950-1983. Journal of Marriage and the Family 48:79-88.

Levi-Strauss, Claude
  1949 [1969] The Elementary Structures of Kinship. James H. Bell and John R. von Sturmer, trans. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mauss, Marcel
  1925 [1990] The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies. W.D. Halls, trans. New York: W.W. Norton.

Rockwell, Richard C.
  1976 Historical Trends and Variations in Educational Homogamy. Journal of Marriage and the Family 38:83-95.

Tucker, M. Belinda, and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan
  1990 New Trends in Black American Interracial Marriage: The Social Structural Context. Journal of Marriage and the Family 52:209-218.

Udry, J. Richard
  1971 The Social Context of Marriage, 2nd edition. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.

Vera, Hernan, Donna H. Berardo, and Felix M. Berardo
  1985 Age Heterogamy in Marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family 47:553-566.

Waddlington, Walter
  1966 The Loving Case: Virginia's Historical Perspective. Virginia Law Review 52(June-Dec.):1189-1223.

Warren, Bruce L.
  1968 A Multiple Variable Approach to the Assortative Mating Phenomenon. Eugenics Quarterly 13:285-290.
  1970 Socioeconomic Achievement and Religion: The American Case. *In* Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970s. Edward O. Laumann, ed. Pp. 130-155. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.