

A Cross-Cultural Mate Selection Study of Chinese and U.S. Men and Women

Ruoxi Chen

Fred P. Piercy

John K. Miller

INTRODUCTION

Mate selection is a pivotal human experience. It is an individual adventure and a familial, societal, and cultural event. Although the importance of mate selection to human experience is evident, scholars are less clear regarding how the process works. Moreover, mate selection studies have not typically involved cross-cultural comparisons or provided clear implications for relationship education or therapy. Additionally, most mate selection studies adopt one theory or another, and are often limited to a particular aspect of the mate selection process, such as mate selection criteria (e.g., Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, and Larsen, 2001), or influences from social network members (e.g., Zhang and Kline, 2009). In this study, we examined the mate selection process cross-culturally and contextually. We simultaneously considered multiple key variables in the mate selection process—i.e., culture, gender, age, external influences, self-appraisals, mate selection perceptions, and mate selection criteria—informed by social exchange theory, social context frameworks, sexual strategies theory, and search theory.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Social exchange theory—based on the premise that social interaction is an exchange of activity, specifically, its rewards and costs (Homans, 1961)—offers a pathway to examine mate selection as an interactive process. Applied to human mate selection, social exchange models propose that individuals with greater assets tend to demand more desirable mates with similar levels of assets, and that individuals' position in the heterosexual marketplace influences the reactions they receive from members of the other sex that in turn influence the individuals' mate selection criteria (e.g., Hatfield, Utne, and Traupmann, 1979; Kenrick,

Groth, Trost, and Sadalla, 1993; Sadalla, Kenrick, and Vershure, 1987). Furthermore, cultural norms affect the value of different mate selection assets in different contexts. For instance, marriage gradient often renders women with high mate selection assets and men with low mate selection assets in a disadvantaged mate selection position given the hypergamy norm of women marrying up (i.e., marrying a man of higher status) and men marrying down (i.e., marrying a woman of lower status) (e.g., Bernard, 1972). The hypergamy norm might explain the decline in marriage rates among highly educated Japanese women (Raymo and Iwasawa, 2005) and discriminatory treatment and rejection by romantic prospects that highly educated Chinese career women suffer from (To, 2013). In contrast, no evidence of inverse effects of dominance on U.S. women's desirability to men was found (Sadalla et al., 1987).

Analogous to social exchange theory, sexual strategies theory, grounded in Darwin's theory of evolution and extending the work of Trivers (1972) on parental investment, assumes that individuals attempt to maximize their personal gain of resources through mate selection. Such personal gains, based upon our evolved mechanisms, center on maximizing the likelihood of raising viable offspring (e.g., Kenrick et al., 1993). Sexual strategies theory suggests that females invest more generously (e.g., time and physical resources) in their offspring, and consequently, their mate selection criteria are more stringent than those of males (Trivers, 1972). Sexual strategies theory also proposes that men particularly value women's physical capacity to produce viable offspring (indicated by youth and beauty) and women particularly value men's ability to raise their offspring (indicated by status and wealth). At the same time, researchers also noted the convergence between the two sexes in their mating values and most notably, the increasing value conferred on good financial prospects by their U.S. sample during a time span of 50 years, which has increased more among men than among women (Buss et al., 2001). An analysis of U.S. census data from 1940 to 2003 suggested that spouses' increasing resemblance in their education attainment might have resulted partly from women's increasing earnings and from men's competition for women with strong financial prospects and high education attainment (Schwartz and Mare, 2005). Sexual strategies theory is supported by empirical validation across many

cultures (e.g., Buss, 1989; Li, Valentine, and Patel, 2011). The pursuit to maximize mate selection gains also seemed particularly useful for explaining American individuals' mate selection pressures, which were more focused on the qualities of their possible mates than were the mate selection pressures of Chinese individuals, who in contrast seemed primarily pressured about their own mate selection adequacies (Chen, Piercy, Miller, and Austin, in press).

Whereas sexual strategies theory suggests that men and women are valued for different traits, social context frameworks propose that the contrasting priorities between the genders are also contingent and contextual (e.g., Gagnon and Simon, 1973). External influences—most notably from the media, parents, and peers—convey to individuals how they might be perceived and received by possible mates and thus influence them to adjust their mate selection criteria accordingly. Researchers have consistently found parental influence and peer influence to be key factors in mate selection. For instance, romantic involvement and perceived support from family and friends were positively correlated (Park, Stan, and Eggert, 1983). Likewise, individuals' receptivity to media influence is an important contributing factor to their relationship experiences. For instance, consumption of objectifying media has a negative effect on relationship satisfaction, mediated by partner objectification (Zurbriggen, Ramsey, and Jaworski, 2011).

The effects of external influences on the mate selection process vary across societal and cultural contexts. For example, conforming to society and others' opinions of one's marriage is of paramount importance in Chinese society, whereas romantic love is a top priority for mate selection in North American culture (e.g., Higgins, Zheng, Liu, and Sun, 2002; Myers, Madathil, and Tingle, 2005). The relative individualism-collectivism balance is a reliable indicator of the level of parental influence on mate selection in a given culture, with parents exerting a higher level of influence in more collectivistic cultures (Buunk, Park, and Duncan, 2010). Furthermore, the conditions of mate selection markets differ in different countries. For instance, in 2001, 118 boys were born in China for every 100 girls, and because of the imbalanced sex ratio at birth, millions of Chinese men may not be able to find

Chinese brides; by comparison, 105 boys were born in America for every 100 girls (Poston and Glover, 2005). Although cultural differences in mate selection have frequently been the subject of scholarly inquiry, most studies have focused on cultural differences regarding specific mate selection criteria, but rarely the contextual processes (e.g., Buss, 1989; Toro-Morn and Sprecher, 2003).

Additionally, search theory assumes that “people seek partners from a distribution of possible mates about which they possess imperfect information” (Lewis and Oppenheimer, 2000, p. 31). Lewis and Oppenheimer also proposed that age reduces educational sorting opportunities in four ways: one’s marriage market capital decreases as fertility and physical attractiveness decrease; education becomes less salient as individuals filter more directly based on possible mates’ demonstrated performance (e.g., financial prospects); possible mates marry and thus exit the marriage market; and individuals join workplaces, which tend to have less educationally matched singles than schools do. The pressure to be married by a certain age also establishes a perceived deadline that amplifies selection pressure (Chen et al., in press).

CURRENT STUDY

 Insert Figure 1 about Here

In our hypothesized model (Figure 1), *self-perceived relative mate selection position*—abbreviated as *relative position*—is determined as individuals’ self-appraisal minus their perception of possible mates’ minimum mate selection criteria. A positive score on relative position indicates that individuals thought they exceeded their possible mates’ minimum criteria; a negative score indicates that they thought they did not fulfill their possible mates’ minimum criteria. Similarly, *relative mate selection demand*—abbreviated as *relative demand*—is determined as individuals’ minimum mate selection criteria minus their

self-appraisal. A positive score on relative demand indicates that participants expected their possible mates to possess higher qualities than they did (i.e., they expected to “marry up”), whereas a negative score indicates that they were willing to accept possible mates possessing lower qualities than their own (i.e., they were willing to “marry down”).

Our overall goal was to examine whether the hypothesized model adequately depicts the relationships among receptivity to external influences, relative position, relative demand, age, and gender for both Chinese and U.S. participants. More specifically, we were interested in the direction of the relationship between relative position and relative demand. On the one hand, based on social exchange theory, one might expect that relative position and relative demand are positively correlated because individuals tend to mate with those possessing a similar level of assets. On the other hand, relative position and relative demand may be negatively correlated because if individuals perceive a lack of possible mates with equal or higher mate selection qualities then they may be more inclined to lower their comparative mate selection demands to maximize their chance of successful mating.

We also had multiple secondary goals. We hypothesized that as individuals’ receptivity to external influences that involve mate selection pressure increases, their relative mate selection demands will decrease. Furthermore, because sexual strategies theory suggests that women hold more stringent mate selection criteria than men do, we hypothesized that women will have higher relative demands than men. Given that search theory suggests that age increases mate selection pressure, we hypothesized that older individuals will have lower relative demands compared with younger individuals. Finally, we were interested in specific cultural differences in mate selection between Chinese participants and U.S. participants.

METHOD

Sample

The current study recruited never-married heterosexual adults who were both citizens and residents of either the People’s Republic of China or of the United States, and were between 18 and 39 years of age. This age range was selected in consideration of the minimum legal age to marry in both countries and the age-specific distribution of never-married individuals based on census data (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2012; United States Census Bureau, 2010). Because we hypothesized that the experience of a divorce may alter one’s perception of and criteria for mate selection, individuals who had been divorced were excluded. We recruited the participants using online survey panels (<http://www.qualtrics.com>, to recruit U.S. participants, and <http://www.sojump.com>, to recruit Chinese participants). Qualtrics panel partners randomly selected potential respondents who were highly likely to qualify for the survey based upon the inclusion criteria. Exclusion criteria such as respondents’ participation frequency were also considered in selecting potential survey respondents from the panel base. Each sample from the panel base was proportioned to the general population and then randomized before the deployment of the survey, though online sample and respondents of the panel base are not perfectly representative of the general population (Qualtrics, 2014). The Sojump survey panel employed similar procedures to maximize the representativeness of the generated sample. Using our inclusion criteria, we recruited 333 Chinese participants and 339 U.S. participants. Table 1 summarizes participants’ demographic information.

Insert Table 1 about Here

Translation Protocol

To ensure that both the Chinese and English versions of the survey instrument were semantically equivalent, we followed the following protocol adapted from Herrera, DelCampo, and Arnes (1993). Two native Chinese speakers, fluent in English, produced independent translations of the survey. The first author (one of the two translators) reviewed

the two Chinese versions, discussed challenging concepts with native Chinese speakers, and finalized the wording so that it will be conceptually consistent in meaning to the English version. Similarly, we asked a native Chinese speaker to share her thinking process while completing the preliminary Chinese version of the survey. Her reflections helped us to identify and rectify any additional wording that was not conceptually equivalent to that of the English version. Finally, an independent native Chinese speaker fluent in English back-translated the survey to confirm that both versions conveyed the correct and intended meaning.

Measures

Based upon the existing literature, we selected 21 items from well-referenced studies on mate selection criteria (i.e., Buss and Barnes, 1986; Kenrick et al., 1993; Toro-Morn and Sprecher, 2003) to assess participants' self-appraisal, their perceptions of possible mates' minimum mate selection criteria, and their minimum mate selection criteria. In phrasing the questions, we tried to motivate participants to consider the importance of different traits as well as the trade-offs among mate selection traits (Li, Bailey, Kenrick, and Linsenmeier, 2002). For instance, we solicited participants' ratings of least acceptable mate selection criteria instead of their ideal mate selection criteria. Questions were worded to match participants' gender. For instance, male participants answered the question "What is your perception of the minimum mate selection criteria of women with comparable mate selection assets to yours?", whereas female participants answered the question "What is your perception of the minimum mate selection criteria of men with comparable mate selection assets to yours?". Furthermore, to control for rater bias and avoid any ordering effect, we randomized both the order in which the mate selection criteria were presented as well as the three different scenarios—evaluating oneself, interpreting possible mates' minimum mate selection criteria, and establishing one's minimum mate selection criteria—that solicited participants' ratings.

Participants rated the 21 items on a scale from 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the highest self-appraisals, the highest perceived minimum criteria, or the highest minimum criteria held, respectively. Relative position and relative demand scores were then computed for all items. These items formed six indicators—status, attractiveness, family orientation, agreeableness, extraversion, and intellect—based upon how they measured the respective indicators in previous research, which utilized factor analysis to group items and verified the alpha reliabilities of the composites as generally acceptable (e.g., Buss and Barne, 1986; Kenrick et al., 1993). The item “religious” was omitted from the indicator of family orientation, due to significant historical, political, and cultural differences between U.S. and China in this respect (e.g., 31.3% of U.S. participants and 67.3% of Chinese participants reported no religious affiliation). Similarly, emotional stability was initially considered a separate indicator but later omitted due to its possible lack of cross-cultural transferability (Chen, Austin, Miller, and Piercy, 2015). We also checked the alpha reliabilities of the items for the indicators in the current study. The item “popular,” initially used to measure extraversion, was omitted due to its having a low reliability with “exciting” and “has a sense of humor.” Table 2 summarizes the 18 final items that formed the six indicators and the internal consistency scores (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha) for these indicators.

Additionally, we devised a series of statements measuring participants’ receptivity to external influences (Table 2). Participants rated the extent to which they felt these statements applied to them (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *completely*). Their ratings in turn formed four indicators (i.e., receptivity to parental influence, peer influence, media influence, and felt pressure on mate selection), and the means of the item scores accordingly became the indicator scores.

 Insert Table 2 about Here

Analytic Approach

We used structural equation modeling to test the hypothesized model, and maximum likelihood estimation to deal with the missing data. All analyses were conducted in Mplus 7.1 (Muthén and Muthén, 1998-2012). We checked the comparative fit index (CFI), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) to evaluate overall model fit: a CFI value close to .95 indicates a good fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999); a SRMR value less than .08 indicates a good fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999); RMSEA values of .01, .05, and .08 indicate excellent, good, and mediocre fit, respectively (MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara, 1996). Although a model's chi-square value is sensitive to the sample size and is considered a poor indicator of models with large sample sizes (Marsh, Balla, and McDonald, 1988), we also reported this value to follow field conventions. Because identical instruments measured relative position and relative demand only in different scenarios, it is conceivable that some method or instrument variance is shared across scenarios on the same measurement instruments. Thus, we allowed for correlations between the same indicators on relative position and relative demand.

RESULTS

Overall Model Fit

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations between observed variables for Chinese and U.S. participants, separately. We first tested the fit of the measurement model. Model fit statistics suggested that the measurement model fit the data well: $\chi^2(86, N = 672) = 245.51, p < .001$; CFI = .97; SRMR = .04; RMSEA = .053, 90% confidence interval (CI) = .045–.060. The factor loadings for the measurement model were presented in Table 4, which showed that parameter tests for all factor loadings were statistically significant at $p < .001$. We then tested the fit of the hypothesized model: $\chi^2(234, N = 672) = 592.40, p < .001$; CFI = .94; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .068, 90% CI = .061–.074, suggesting that the model fit the data well overall.

 Insert Table 3 about Here

 Insert Table 4 about Here

Between-Group Invariance

To evaluate between-group invariance, we tested the invariance of factor loadings between the two groups by freely estimating the factor loadings and then constraining them to be invariant between the two groups. The chi-square difference statistics suggested that the model fit statistically worsened, $\Delta \chi^2(13, N = 672) = 26.50, p = .01$; the CFI value also declined slightly to .93. These results suggested that the latent variables might have somewhat different meanings for Chinese and U.S. participants, which potential discrepancy warranted caution in drawing comparisons of effects between the two groups. The constraints were subsequently removed and paths were estimated freely. The model explained 53.2% of relative demand for Chinese participants and 41.1% for that of U.S. participants. The model also explained 4.1% of relative position for Chinese participants and .7% for that of U.S. participants.

Direct and Indirect Effects

 Insert Figure 2 about Here

Next, we examined the relationships between key variables in the model (Figure 2). Relative position was negatively correlated with relative demand: $b = -.68, SE = .06, p < .001$,

$\beta = -.70$ for Chinese participants and $b = -.62$, $SE = .07$, $p < .001$, $\beta = -.64$ for U.S. participants. Chinese women had a higher relative demand in mate selection than did Chinese men, $b = -.43$, $SE = .09$, $p < .001$, $\beta = -.21$ ($0 = female$, $1 = male$), but there was no statistical relationship between relative demand and gender for U.S. participants. Additionally, receptivity to external influences and relative position were positively correlated for the Chinese participants, $b = .43$, $SE = .17$, $p = .01$, $\beta = .18$, but not for U.S. participants. Age presented a poor correlation with relative position: $b = -.02$, $SE = .02$, $p = .14$, $\beta = -.09$ for Chinese participants, and $b = .01$, $SE = .01$, $p = .33$, $\beta = .06$ for U.S. participants.

The indirect effect of receptivity to external influences on relative demand (tested using bootstrapping) indicated that relative demand declined as Chinese individuals were more receptive to external influences, $b = -.29$, $SE = .12$, $p = .01$, $\beta = -.13$, 95% CI = $-.23$ to $-.03$. For indirect effects, a small effect size is $.01$; medium, $.09$; and large, $.25$ (Kenny, 2013). Following this guideline, the indirect effect of receptivity to external influences on relative demand had a medium to large effect size. There was not a statistical indirect effect of receptivity to external influences on relative demand for U.S. participants, nor was there a statistical effect of age on relative demand for either group.

DISCUSSION

The existing literature on mate selection has focused on establishing the importance of various mate selection criteria in a hierarchical fashion. The present research, in contrast, focused on the comparison between individuals' minimum mate selection criteria and their self-appraisal, (i.e., relative mate selection demand).

We found that the more advantageous individuals perceived their relative position to be, the lower their relative demands were. In other words, the greater the extent to which individuals thought they exceeded possible mates' mate selection demands, the lower their own mate selection demands were, compared to their self-appraisals. Perhaps as individuals placed themselves on the higher end of the mate selection market, they realized that possible

mates of equal quality were increasingly scarce. The more they perceived themselves as exceeding possible mates' minimum demands, the more heavily affected their selection criteria were by the perceived availability of possible mates with comparable qualities. Following social exchange theory, which proposes that individuals attempt to mate with those at or above their own levels of mate selection assets (e.g., Sloman and Sloman, 1988), if an individual considers him- or herself as far exceeding possible mates' minimum demand, he or she might be at risk of over-qualifying for those whom he or she regards as possible mates. The negative correlation between relative position and relative demand probably reflected individuals' anxiety concerning whether the mate selection market contained a sufficient number of high-quality possible mates. By lowering their relative demands, individuals with strong relative positions may enhance their chances of successful mating, and realistically pursue maximum mate selection gain. Alternatively, negative correlation between participants' relative position and relative demand might be related to rater bias (i.e., participants might rate themselves more positively than they view others), as well as to the fact that participants were asked to rate themselves typically but to provide their minimum criteria for a possible mate.

Furthermore, receptivity to external influences had a positive relationship to relative position and a negative indirect relationship to relative demand for Chinese participants. These relationships were not observed for U.S. participants. The variant relationships between external influences and Chinese and U.S. individuals' mate selection expectations are consistent with the social context frameworks and with existing research on the relative priorities in mate selection for individuals from collectivistic and individualistic cultures, respectively (e.g., Higgins et al., 2002). The messages from the media, parents, and peers may provide Chinese individuals with cues regarding their own value, while also suggesting that compromises are necessary to secure a mate. Consequently, the more receptive Chinese individuals were to external influences, the more willing they were to settle for someone of relatively lower perceived value. Following social exchange theory, Chinese individuals seem particularly conscious of the costs embedded in the mate selection process (e.g., time, missed mate selection opportunities if adopting higher mate selection standards) and tend to

adopt an approach that may lower potential mate selection costs. Future studies might further distill the varying influences from parents, peers, and the media on Chinese individuals' mate selection criteria, especially in relation to their self-appraisal. Additionally, though a significant relationship between receptivity to external influences and U.S. participants' relative mate selection position and demand was not observed in the current study, future studies might nevertheless probe how external influences may intersect with U.S. individuals' demographic characteristics (e.g., race, social status) to influence their mate selection process.

In both groups of participants, age did not have an important effect on relative position or relative demand, which suggests both that younger never-married adults are not exempt from mate selection pressures and that older never-married adults are not necessarily more resilient to external influences on mate selection. Although search theory proponents suggest that mate selection pressure increases as one ages (Lewis and Oppenheimer, 2000), older never-married adults are likely to amass mate selection assets (such as status and wealth), which may offset the theorized effect of age on the relationship between relative position and relative demand. Additionally, most participants were younger than 30 years old, which might partly explain the lack of relationship between age and relative position, especially given the later marriage age in both China and the U.S. (Chen et al., 2015).

Consistent with sexual strategies theory (e.g., Buss, 1989), women had a higher relative demand than did men in both countries. Furthermore, Chinese women had positive mean scores on all relative demands, and U.S. women had positive mean scores on all relative demands except intellect, thereby demonstrating a general goal to marry up. In contrast, Chinese men only had positive scores on attractiveness and family orientation, and U.S. men only had positive scores on attractiveness and agreeableness. Both Chinese men and U.S. men also seemed particularly forgiving of possible mates' status and intellect. In other words, the men would accept possible mates possessing much lower qualities than their own on these two criteria. More broadly, Chinese and U.S. women's expectation of marrying up and men's expectation of marrying down on most mate selection criteria were consistent with the marriage gradient (Bernard, 1972). Previous studies on marriage gradient have

tended to focus on certain forms of hypergamy, such as education, age, and social class (e.g., Kalmijn, 2013; Pyke and Adams, 2010). The current study points additionally to the value of considering different forms of hypergamy in both the Chinese and U.S. cultural contexts, as women's expectation of marrying up seemed to concern not only criteria closely correlated with dominance (e.g., status, education, age), but also personality traits such as extraversion.

The current study has some limitations. First, participants' educational attainment indicates that the sample represented a more educated and therefore, perhaps, more privileged portion of the general population. It would be fruitful to examine whether the findings of the present study also apply to individuals with a lower socioeconomic status. Furthermore, our Chinese sample is markedly more educated than our U.S. sample is, possibly resulting from our reliance on Internet surveys for data collection and consequently, limiting the comparability of the two samples. A few indicators' relatively low reliability (e.g., relative demand for extraversion for Chinese participants, relative demand for intellect for American participants) also warrants further investigation. Finally, the inferences and conclusions of the current study are constrained by their basis on self-reported, cross-sectional data. Future studies may consider recruiting participants more representative of the general population, and adopting longitudinal designs that can better track the effects of external influences on individuals' adjusted mate selection demands. Despite these opportunities for improvement, this study proposes a model that highlights the value and added insight of incorporating multiple mate selection theories to understand the mate selection process. Different theories often focus on specific aspects of the process, and may thus be best utilized jointly in guiding relevant investigations.

REFERENCES

- Bernard, J. (1972). *The future of marriage*. New York: Bantam.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypothesis tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1-49.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 559-570.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Larsen, R. J. (2001). A half century of mate preferences: The cultural evolution of values. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 491-503.
- Buunk, A. P., Park, J. H., & Duncan, L. A. (2010). Cultural variation in parental influence on mate choice. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *44*, 23-40.
- Chen, R., Austin, J. P., Miller, J. K., & Piercy, F. P. (2015). Chinese and American participants' mate selection criteria: Updates, modifications, and extensions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *46*, 101-118.
- Chen, R., Piercy, F. P., Miller, J. K., & Austin, J. P. (in press). Chinese and American individuals' mate selection pressures: Self-focused vs. mated focused. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*.
- Cobb, N. P., Larson, J. H., & Watson, W. L. (2003). Development of the attitudes about romance and mate selection scale. *Family Relations*, *52*, 222-231.
- Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., & Traupmann, J. (1979). Equity theory and intimate relationship. In R. L. Burgess, & T. L. Huston (Eds.). *Social exchange in developing relationships* (pp. 99-133). New York: Academic Press.
- Herrera, R., DelCampo, R., & Ames, M. (1993). A serial approach for translating family science instrumentation. *Family Relations*, *42*, 357-360.
- Higgins, L. T., Zheng, M., Liu, Y., & Sun, C. H. (2002). Attitudes to marriage and sexual behaviors: A survey of gender and culture differences in China and United Kingdom. *Sex Roles*, *46*, 75-89.
- Homans, G. (1961). *Social behavior*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.

Kalmijn, M. (2013). The educational gradient in marriage: A comparison of 25 European countries. *Demography*, 50, 1499-1520.

Kenny, D. A. (2013, May 1). Mediation. Retrieved from <http://davidakenny.net/cm/mediate.htm#IE>

Kenrick, D. T., Groth, G. E., Trost, M. R., & Sadalla, E. K. (1993). Integrating evolutionary and social exchange perspectives on relationships: Effects of gender, self-appraisal, and involvement level on mate selection criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 951-969.

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.

Lewis, S. K., & Oppenheimer, V. K. (2000). Educational assortative mating across marriage markets: Non-Hispanic whites in the United States. *Demography*, 37, 29-40.

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

Li, N. P., Valentine, K. A., & Patel, L. (2011). Mate preferences in the US and Singapore: A cross-cultural test of the mate preference priority model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 291-294.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130-149.

Markman, H. J., Stanley, S. M., & Blumberg, S. L. (1994). *Fighting for your marriage: Positive steps for preventing divorce and preserving a lasting love*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 391-411.

McGoldrick, M., Gerson, R., & Shellenberger, S. (1999). *Genograms: Assessment and intervention* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2012). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.

Myers, J. E., Madathil, J., & Tingle, L. R. (2005). Marriage satisfaction and wellness in India and the United States: A preliminary comparison of arranged marriages and marriages of choice. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*, 183-190.

National Bureau of Statistics of China. (2012). *China statistical yearbook 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2012/indexch.htm>

Parks, M. R., Stan, C. M., & Eggert, L. L. (1983). Romantic involvement and social network involvement. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46*, 116-131.

Poston, D. L., & Glover, K. S. (2005). Too many males: marriage market implication of gender imbalances in China. *Genus, 61*, 119-140.

Pyke, K., & Adams, M. (2010). What's age got to do with it? A case study analysis of power and gender in husband-older marriages. *Journal of Family Issues, 31*, 748-777.

Qualtrics. (2014). *ESOMAR 28: 28 questions to help research buyers of online samples*. Retrieved from <http://www.qualtrics.com/online-sample/>

Raymo, J. M., & Iwasawa, M. (2005). Marriage market mismatches in Japan: An alternative view of the relationship between women's education and marriage. *American Sociological Review, 70*, 801-822.

Sadalla, E. K., Kenrick, D. T., & Vershure, B. (1987). Dominance and heterosexual attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 730-738.

Schwartz, C. R., & Mare, R. D. (2005). Trends in educational assortative marriage from 1940-2003. *Demography, 42*, 621-646.

Sloman, S., & Sloman, L. (1988). Mate selection in the service of human evolution. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures, 11*, 457-468.

To, S. (2013). Understanding sheng nu ("leftover women"): The phenomenon of late marriage among Chinese professional women. *Symbolic Interaction, 36*, 1-20.

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

Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 1871-1971). Chicago: Aldine.

United States Census Bureau. (2010). *America's families and living arrangements: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2010.html>

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: Norton.

Zhang, S., & Kline, S. L. (2009). Can I make my own decision? A cross-cultural study of perceived social network influence in mate selection. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*, 3-23.

Zurbriggen, E. L., Ramsey, L. R., & Jaworski, B. K. (2011). Self-and partner-objectification in romantic relationships: Associations with media consumption and relationship satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, *64*, 449-462.

Table 1

Participants' Demographics

Demographic Characteristics	China (<i>n</i> = 333)	U.S. (<i>n</i> = 339)
Mean age (<i>SD</i>)	26.5 (4.1)	25.9 (5.6)
Gender		
Male	159	170
Female	174	169
Ethnicity of Chinese participants		
Han	94.9%	n/a
Ethnic minorities	5.1%	n/a
Race/ethnicity of U.S. participants		
Non-Hispanic White	n/a	54.0%
White Hispanic	n/a	21.2%
Black or African American	n/a	19.2%
Asian	n/a	7.1%
Other	n/a	2.4%
Relationship status		
Single and not involved in a relationship	41.4%	60.8%
Dating but not serious	11.1%	10.3%
In a serious relationship	44.1%	24.5%
Engaged	3.3%	4.4%
Highest education level		
Did not graduate from high school	0.6%	2.9%
Graduated from high school	3.3%	21.8%
Had some college education	2.1%	39.5%
Had an associate degree	19.2%	10.6%
Had a bachelor's degree	58.6%	16.8%
Had some graduate education	7.2%	3.8%
Had a master's degree or higher	9.0%	4.4%

Table 2

Reliability of Indicators (Cronbach's Alpha Values) by Country

Indicators and the Items that Formed Them	Chinese <i>n</i> = 333	American <i>n</i> = 339
Status		
-“High social status;”		
-“Wealthy;”		
-“Highly educated;”	Relative Position: .85	Relative Position: .81
-“High earning capacity and/or potential;”	Relative Demand: .84	Relative Demand: .79
-“Good family background and heredity;”		
-“Powerful.”		
Family Orientation		
-“Healthy;”		
-“Wants children;”	Relative Position: .67	Relative Position: .58
-“Good housekeeper;”	Relative Demand: .64	Relative Demand: .65
-“Honest and trustworthy.”		
Agreeableness		
-“Easygoing;”	Relative Position: .80	Relative Position: .74
-“Friendly;”	Relative Demand: .77	Relative Demand: .77
-“Kind and understanding.”		
Extraversion		
-“Exciting;”	Relative Position: .60	Relative Position: .64
-“Has a sense of humor.”	Relative Demand: .47	Relative Demand: .71
Intellect		
-“Creative;”	Relative Position: .61	Relative Position: .56
-“Intelligent.”	Relative Demand: .68	Relative Demand: .54
Attractiveness		
-“Physically attractive.”	-	-
Parental influence		
-“My parents are an important source of information on mate selection to me;”	.74	.87
-“In terms of mate selection, my parents' opinions are very important to me.”		
Peer influence		
-“In terms of mate selection, my peers' opinions are very important to me;”	.79	.90
-“Peers are an important source of information on mate selection to me.”		
Media influence		
-“The media are an important source of information on mate selection to me;”	.72	.79
-“I believe the media's depiction of mate selection accurately reflects social reality.”		
Felt pressure on mate selection		
-“I feel pressured by my parents to get married;”		
-“It is important to my parents that I get married;”	.59	.74
-“I feel pressured by my peers to get married;”		
-“It is important to me that I get married.”		