

Spring 2019

The Effect of Religion on Trait Priority in Potential Partners in Short and Long Term Relationships

Sara K. Glass

Bucknell University, skg008@bucknell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses

Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Glass, Sara K., "The Effect of Religion on Trait Priority in Potential Partners in Short and Long Term Relationships" (2019). *Honors Theses*. 494.

https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses/494

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

The Effect of Religion on Trait Priority in Potential Partners in
Short and Long Term Relationships

By

Sara Glass

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council for Honors in Psychology

Monday, April 1, 2019

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joel Wade". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Advisor: Joel Wade, PH.D.

A second handwritten signature in cursive script, identical to the one above, reading "Joel Wade". It is also written in black ink and positioned above a horizontal line.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Hypotheses.....	5
Methods.....	6
Results.....	9
Discussion.....	17
Limitations and Future Directions.....	27
References.....	29
Appendices	
A. Informed Consent.....	49
B. Survey Part 1: Demographics and CRS-5.....	52
C. Survey Part 2: Short Term Relationships.....	54
D. Survey Part 2: Long Term Relationships.....	56
E. Debriefing Statements.....	58

Abstract

This study builds upon previous research that demonstrates how various demographic characteristics, as well as relationship type, affects trait preferences for potential mate partners. This study also explores the potential effects of religious affiliation and religiosity on trait preferences, as no previous research explicitly tests how individuals' religious affiliation or strength of religiosity influences their rank ordering of potential partner traits. Seven hypotheses were proposed, as well as four points of exploration regarding sexuality, relationship status, religious affiliation, and race were proposed. Hypotheses 1, which predicted that women will rank financial stability higher than men and that men will rank physical attractiveness higher than women; Hypothesis 2, which predicted that gay people will rank religiously-oriented traits and the desire for the same number of children lower than their straight counterparts; Hypothesis 3, which predicted that gay men will rank financial stability higher than straight men and that lesbians will rank intelligence higher than straight women; and Hypothesis 4, which predicted that older people will rank religiously-oriented traits and political and moral similarity higher than younger people, who will rank humor higher, were supported. However, Hypothesis 5, which predicted that religious people will rank religiously-oriented traits higher than non-religious people, was not supported, with results suggesting an effect opposite to the effect predicted. Hypothesis 6, which predicted that more group differences will be present for long term relationships than short term relationships was mostly supported. Hypothesis 7, which predicted that results will remain consistent across nationalities, was unable to be tested because of inconsistencies in the data. Effects of the proposed exploratory demographics were identified. Possible explanations for unpredicted and exploratory results, as well as limitations and future directions, including remaining gaps in research, are discussed.

List of Tables

1) Participant Characteristics.....	33
2) Overall Average Rank Position of Traits by Relationship Type.....	35
3) Summary of Significant Results for Sex.....	37
4) Summary of Significant Results for Age Group.....	38
5) Summary of Significant Results for Race.....	40
6) Summary of Significant Results for Sexual Orientation.....	42
7) Summary of Significant Results for Relationship Status.....	44
8) Summary of Significant Results for Religious Affiliation.....	45
9) Summary of Significant Results for Religiosity.....	47

Introduction

The formation and maintenance of relationships is of central importance to most people (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). We place such an emphasis on our relationships that management of them may be the focal point of our social cognition (Reis & Downey, 1999). Given the value many individuals place on building stable and satisfactory romantic relationships, it is important that we understand what exactly makes a person desirable.

Research has shown that mate preferences have changed within the last half-century (Buss et al., 2001), so there is also a need to continuously update the body of research so that a current understanding of partner selection is consistently available. We have long known that when individuals are presented with a list of traits for potential partners, some traits carry more weight than others (Asch, 1946). For example, similarity of a potential partner in regards to issues which individuals find particularly important carries more weight than similarity in less important issues, and potential partners with similar attitudes on important issues are regarded as more intelligent and well-adjusted (Byrne, 1961). Asch described those traits which carried the most weight as central traits, and those which carried less weight as peripheral traits (1946), and a great body of research has since been collected to further understand which traits are the most central to our perception of potential partners, and under what circumstances the order of importance of some traits may change.

Research suggests that for all individuals, regardless of sex, sexual identity, or nationality, and for both short and long term relationships, trustworthiness and dependability is considered one of the most important traits in partner desirability (Buss et al., 2001; Lippa, 2007; Stewart et al., 2000). Intelligence also has been shown to be a central trait regardless of sex, sexual orientation, or nationality (Buss et al., 2001; Lippa, 2007). Buss et al. found that, when presented

with a list of 18 traits, college students of both sexes around the country consistently ranked emotional stability and maturity, dependability, and intelligence in the top five most important traits, whereas possessing similar religious beliefs and political values consistently ranked in the five least important traits (2001). However, this research required participants to rate the importance of each trait on a four-point scale, rather than order them, which would have better exemplified the tradeoffs individuals are forced to make in real-life partner selections. While Buss et al. found that similarity in political values was relatively unimportant, Lippa's research suggests otherwise, (2007). He found that regardless of sex or sexual orientation, individuals ranked intelligence, dependability, humor, physical attractiveness, and similarity in political values as most important, (2007). Therefore, while research consistently suggests traits such as dependability and intelligence are central, it may be that the importance of other traits is dependent upon other variables.

The differences that arise in trait importance rankings due to sex are heavily studied, and research shows that the two sexes have been converging in their preferences in recent decades (Buss, 1989). Yet, there is much evidence to show that men and women value different traits in their potential mates. Research has consistently shown, for example, that men place a greater importance on physical attractiveness than women (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss, 1989; Buss et al., 2001; Lippa, 2007, Stewart et al., 2000). Conversely, women also consistently place more weight on the financial stability of potential partners than men, (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss et al., 2001; Stewart et al., 2000). Researchers have also suggested that while both sexes prefer partners of similar age, men prefer women that are a few years younger while women prefer partners that are a few years older, (Buss, 1989; Conroy-Beam & Buss, 2018).

Stewart et al. have also done research on the different priorities that men and women have for short versus long term relationships, (2000). They found that while differences do exist for the sexes given relationship type, both men and women became more selective when considering a partner for a long term relationship versus for a short term relationship, (Stewart et al., 2000). They found that women ranked trustworthiness, dependability, and humorousness, as the most important traits and desire for children as one of the least important traits for short term partners. However the desire for children and financial stability increased significantly in importance for long term relationship partners. They similarly found that men rated trustworthiness and humorousness as very important in short term relationships, and desire for children also increased in importance for long term relationships. However, men also rated attractiveness as one of the most important traits, and financial stability as one of the least important traits in short term relationships (Stewart et al., 2000). It has also been shown that, while men value physical attractiveness more than women across relationship types, this difference became more dramatic when men evaluated partner traits for long term relationships (Lee et al., 2014).

Some research has also been conducted on the effect of sexual orientation on trait preferences. Lippa found that while differences across sexual orientation do occur, they are less prominent than sex differences, with general trends for men and women remaining largely the same for both gay and straight individuals (2007). Lippa (2007) did however find that gay individuals placed less importance on the desire for children and religious similarity than their straight counterparts, and that lesbian women rank intelligence as more important than straight women, while gay men rank financial stability and physical attractiveness as more important than straight men.

Research suggests that while perception of relationships varies across cultures (Seepersad et al., 2008), trait preferences remain largely the same. Seepersad et al. suggest that some cultures put more of an emphasis on being in a romantic relationship than others, with Western cultures generally desiring romantic relationships more than East Asian cultures. They found that this difference in cultural desire for relationships led to an increase in romantic loneliness among members of Western cultures compared to those in East Asian cultures (2008). However, in an international study of trait preferences, Lippa found that rankings were relatively similar internationally, with attractiveness having the same importance internationally and character trait differences arising somewhat as a reflection of cultural values (Lippa, 2007). Buss has also demonstrated consistency across cultures in regards to trait preferences, with women valuing financial earnings more than men across countries (1989). This suggests that while there may be differences in perceptions of relationships and motivation to develop them, there is consistency in what traits are valued in potential partners.

Perceivers' age and relationship status are also noteworthy variables with regards to trait preferences. While it has been suggested that sex differences in trait preferences persist across age and marital status (Buss & Barnes, 1986), there is evidence that other traits may change in importance across these two demographics. Data from the European Social Survey suggests that our values change as we age, with tradition and conformity increasing and self-seeking habits such as stimulation and hedonism decreasing with age (Robinson, 2012). Similarly, parents with young adult children have been found to place more emphasis on similarity in background in their children's partners than their children do (Buunk & Solano, 2010).

While religion has been a trait listed in some studies that measure the importance rankings of traits, there seems to be a gap in the research in regards to addressing how religion, both its

affiliations and strength of religiosity, may affect trait preferences. Buunk and Solano's research on the differences in partner preferences between parents and their children suggest that religious similarity is regarded as more important to parents than to their children (2010), and Lippa has demonstrated that gay individuals place less importance on religious similarity than their straight counterparts, (2007). It has also been shown that people with similar beliefs and attitudes, both political and religious, are viewed as more desirable and likeable (Sachs, 1975). However, previous studies on trait preferences have identified religiosity as the most variable trait (Buss & Barnes, 1986). Religion has also been shown to influence one's values, with both strength of religiosity and religious affiliation being reliable predictors of a change in values in China (Chan et al., 2018).

Similarly, there is a gap in the research on how race may influence trait preferences. Racial identity is an important component in how we understand ourselves, with a strong sense of personal identity being linked to protection against discrimination, which has implications for our mental health and wellbeing (Yip, 2018). Identities that have such a strong effect on one's values and one's health may also be important in one's evaluation of potential partners. Therefore, it then becomes crucial that we understand what role, if any, these previously unexplored factors play in our trait preferences for partners. The present research seeks to determine how these aforementioned factors affect trait preferences for one's short and long term partners.

Hypotheses

Based on previous research, it is predicted that (1) women will rank financial stability higher than men and men will rank physical attractiveness higher than women, (2) gay people

will rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, as well as the desire for the same number of children, lower than their straight counterparts, (3) gay men will rank financial stability higher than straight men and lesbians will rank intelligence higher than straight women, (4) older people will rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, as well as political and moral similarity higher than younger people, who will rank humor higher, (5) religious people will rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, higher than non-religious people, (6) more group differences will be present for long term relationships than short term relationships, (7) and that results will remain consistent across nationalities. There are also four points of interest that, because of a lack of prior research, are being examined in an exploratory fashion without specific predictions. These are (8) whether bisexual and pansexual people are more similar in their trait rankings to straight or gay people, and if this changes across sex, (9) if across married, divorced, dating, and single people, married and divorced people are similar while dating and single people are similar, or if married and dating people are similar while divorced and single people are similar, (10) if there are any differences in trait preferences across religious affiliation, (11) and if there are any racial differences in trait preferences.

Methods

Procedure

An online survey was distributed through social media platforms and by snowball sampling, in which participants who accessed the survey were encouraged to invite others to take it as well, for the purpose of maximizing diversity and sample size. Participants were told that

they would be answering questions about their demographics, affiliations, and beliefs, as well as ranking the importance of specific traits for potential romantic partners. The survey consisted of two parts. The first part asked participants to fill out a short questionnaire identifying their age, sex, sexual orientation, relationship status, race, nationality, and religious affiliation, and contained the CRS-5, a five item measure of religiosity, which had been adapted to accommodate greater religious diversity (Huber and Huber, 2012). A final score of religiosity was also calculated from the CRS-5 as suggested by Huber and Huber (2012). Cronbach's Alpha was performed to test the internal consistency of the CRS-5 subscale. The scale was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha=.889$).

Part two asked participants to rank a list of traits in order of importance, from most to least important to them, for a potential partner in a short term relationship, and a potential partner in a long term relationship. The order of the two parts, as well as the order of relationship type in part two, were randomized to avoid priming effects.

Participants

Participants were 258 individuals, ranging in age from 18 to 67, $M = 24.17$, $SD = 10.472$. Age was aggregated into groups of five years from ages 20-49, as well as one group for those under 20 and one group for those 50 or above. New categories were also created for race and religious affiliation. The new groups created were "Biracial or Multiracial" and "None or No Affiliation" respectively and were established due to the higher number of responses where these identities and affiliations were given.

Descriptive statistics were computed for sex, age, race, sexual orientation, relationship status, religious affiliation, and religiosity, and are shown in Table 1. For age, 18-19 year old's

made up 53.9% of the sample population (n=139), followed by 20-24 year old's, 25-29 year old's, 30-34 year old's, 50+ year old's, 35-39 year old's, 45-49 year old's, and 40-44 year old's at 18.2% (n=47), 9.7% (n=25), 7.0% (n=18), 5.8% (n=15), 2.3% (n=6), 1.6% (n=4), and 1.2% (n=3) respectively. One respondent failed to report their age.

For sex, women accounted for 69.4% of the population (n=179), with men accounting for the remaining 30.6% (n=79). Also, Whites made up the majority of the sample population at 71.3% (n=184), followed by Asians, Blacks and African Americans, Hispanics, Biracial and Multiracial individuals, and others at 10.1% (n=26), 7.4% (n=19), 5.4% (n=14), 3.9% (n=10), and 1.9% (n=5) respectively. Heterosexuals made up 81.8% of the sample population (n=211), with bisexuals and pansexuals making up 10.5% (n=27), homosexuals making up 5.4% (n=14), and others making up 2.3% of the sample population (n=6). The sample population was composed of predominantly singles at 60.1% (n=155), with people who were unmarried but in a relationship following at 26.4% (n=68), married individuals at 11.6% (n=30), and divorced individuals at 1.9% (n=5). No single religious affiliation accounted for the majority of responses, with Catholics, Agnostics and Atheists, Protestants, Other Christians, Others, Pagans, Jews, people who were unaffiliated, Muslims, Buddhists, and Hindus making up 27.5% (n=71), 22.5% (n=58), 17.8% (n=46), 12.8% (n=33), 5.8% (n=15), 3.5% (n=9), 3.1% (n=8), 3.1% (n=8), 1.9% (n=9), 1.2% (n=3), and 0.8% (n=2) of the sample population respectively. For religious affiliation, others consisted of predominantly spiritual but not religious individuals, syncretic individuals, and Satanists. Religious individuals made up 49.2% of the sample population (n=127) followed by very religious individuals at 30.6% (n=79) and non-religious individuals at 20.2% (n=52).

Results

To determine how the mate preference traits were ranked, the overall average position ranking of each trait for both short and long term relationships was calculated, with lower numbers indicating higher rank, or greater importance to participants, as shown in Table 2. Kruskal-Wallis tests were then performed to determine which traits yielded significant differences between categories of sex, age group, race, sexual orientation, relationship status, religious affiliation, and religiosity. Once a significant interaction was found, each category's average ranking of the significantly differing trait was recorded, and Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests were conducted on each pair of categories to determine which pairs were responsible for the interaction. Because of inconsistencies in responses, nationality data was omitted from analysis.

Sex

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that women ranked dependability and humor higher than men for short term relationships ($p=.042$, $p=.000$), and ranked dependability and financial stability higher than men for long term relationships ($p=.000$, $p=.000$), while men ranked physical attractiveness, same religious affiliation, and same frequency of religious observances higher than women for long term relationships ($p=.025$, $p=.006$, $p=.016$). Mann-Whitney tests revealed identical results, and are shown in Table 3.

Age Group

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that 18-19 year old's ranked similarity in age higher than 25-29 year old's, 30-34 year old's, and 50+ year old's for short term relationships ($p=.024$,

$p=.001$, $p=.003$) and long term relationships ($p = .001$, $p = .009$, $p = .002$). 20-24 year old's also ranked similarity in age higher than 30-34 year old's and 50+ year old's for short term relationships ($p=.004$, $p=.008$) and higher than 25-29 year old's, 30-34 year old's, and 50+ year old's for long term relationships ($p=.008$, $p = .041$, $p=.008$). 18-19 year old's ranked humor higher than 20-24 year old's for both short and long term relationships ($p=.017$, $p=.008$), higher than 50+ year old's for short term relationships ($p=.002$), and higher than 35-39 year old's for long term relationships ($p=.013$). Humor was also ranked higher by 30-34 year old's and 40-44 year old's than by 50+ year old's for short term relationships ($p=.040$, $p=.036$). 18-19 year old's ranked similarity in interests and hobbies higher than 20-24 year old's, 35-39 year old's, and 50+ year old's for short term relationships ($p=.003$, $p=.025$, $p=.021$). Dependability was ranked higher by 18-19 year old's and 30-34 year old's than 20-24 year old's for long term relationships ($p=.000$, $p=.037$). Emotional stability and maturity was ranked higher by 18-19 year old's than 20-24 year old's and 35-39 year old's for long term relationships ($p=.003$, $p=.027$). Similarity in sexual views and behaviors was ranked higher by 20-24 year old's than 18-19 year old's for long term relationships ($p=.001$). Strength of religiosity was ranked higher by 20-24 year old's, 25-29 year old's, and 50+ year old's than by 18-19 year old's for both short term ($p=.018$, $p=.002$, $p=.035$) and long term relationships ($p=.005$, $p=.032$, $p=.038$), by 30-34 year old's for short term relationships ($p=.032$), and by 45-49 year old's for long term relationships ($p=.024$). For long term relationships, same frequency of religious observances was ranked higher by 20-24 year old's and 50+ year old's than by 18-19 year old's ($p=.000$, $p=.034$), and same kind of religious practices was ranked higher by 20-24 year old's, 25-29 year old's, and 45-49 year old's than by 18-19 year old's ($p=.049$, $p=.003$, $p=.043$). Similarly, it was ranked higher by 25-29 year old's, higher than 30-34 year old's ($p=.004$), and ranked higher by 25-29 year old's and 45-49 year

old's than 40-44 year old's ($p=.031$, $p=.048$). The Mann-Whitney tests that were also performed for trait ranking across age group showed some different results. These differences in p -values are shown in Table 4. Only the interaction between 40-44 year old's and 45-49 year old's for same kind of religious practices for long term relationships was not found to be significant for both tests.

Race

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that similarity in age was ranked higher by Whites than by Blacks and African Americans and Asians for short term relationships ($p=.039$, $p=.001$), and by Blacks and African Americans for long term relationships ($p=.004$). Biracial and Multiracial individuals ranked similarity in age higher than Blacks and African Americans, Asians, and others for short term relationships ($p=.011$, $p=.002$, $p=.042$). Hispanics ranked age higher than Blacks and African Americans for long term relationships ($p=.043$). Whites ranked humor higher than Asians for both short and long term relationships ($p=.026$, $p=.001$). Both Blacks and African Americans and Hispanics ranked similarity in morality higher than Whites for short term relationships ($p=.042$, $p=.004$). For long term relationships, similarity in morality was ranked higher by Hispanics than by Blacks and African Americans, Whites, and Asians ($p=.008$, $p=.009$, $p=.014$), and higher by Biracial and Multiracial individuals than by Blacks and African Americans and Asians ($p=.017$, $p=.007$). For short term relationships, same kind of religious practices was ranked higher by Blacks and African Americans than by Whites, Asians, and Biracial and Multiracial individuals ($p=.039$, $p=.011$, $p=.003$), and higher by others than by Biracial and Multiracial individuals ($p=.015$). For short term relationships, similarity in sexual views and behaviors was ranked higher by Blacks and African Americans, Whites, and

Hispanics than by others ($p=.021$, $p=.007$, $p=.016$), higher by Biracial and Multiracial individuals than by Asians, Hispanics, and others ($p=.029$, $p=.007$, $p=.010$), and higher by Whites than by Biracial and Multiracial individuals ($p=.025$). For long term relationships, Hispanics ranked same political affiliations higher than Blacks and African Americans, Whites, Asians, and Biracial and Multiracial individuals ($p=.004$, $p=.016$, $p=.013$, $p=.013$), Whites ranked similarity in interests and hobbies higher than Blacks and African Americans ($p = .012$). Additionally, Blacks and African Americans and Asians ranked similar strength of religiosity higher than Whites ($p=.002$, $p=.015$). Mann-Whitney tests were also performed across race for trait preferences. Differences in p -values are shown in Table 5. All results were similarly significant for both Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests.

Sexual Orientation

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that homosexuals and bisexuals and pansexuals ranked same political affiliations higher than heterosexuals for both short term ($p=.000$, $p=.002$) and long term relationships ($p=.000$, $p=.001$). Additionally, for short term relationships, desire for the same number of children was ranked higher by heterosexuals, bisexuals and pansexuals, and others than by homosexuals ($p=.014$, $p=.005$, $p=.019$), and higher by others than by heterosexuals ($p=.033$). For short term relationships, heterosexuals ranked warmth higher than bisexuals and pansexuals ($p=.002$), and homosexuals ranked similarity in morality higher than heterosexuals ($p=.043$). For long term relationships, heterosexuals ranked humor, same kind of religious practices, and same religious affiliation higher than homosexuals ($p=.011$, $p=.011$, $p=.006$), and same religious affiliation higher than bisexuals and pansexuals ($p=.048$), while bisexuals and pansexuals ranked humor higher than homosexuals ($p=.019$), and ranked similarity

in morality higher than heterosexuals ($p=.006$). Differences in trait preferences across sexual orientation was also analyzed separately for men and women. Same political affiliations was ranked higher by bisexuals and pansexuals than heterosexuals for both men and women for short term relationships ($p=.026$, $p=.032$), and higher by homosexuals than heterosexual for women ($p=.001$), and was ranked higher by homosexuals than heterosexuals for both men and women for long term relationships ($p=.013$, $p=.011$), and higher by bisexuals and pansexuals than by heterosexuals for men ($p=.002$). For men, heterosexuals ranked similar strength of religiosity in short term relationships ($p=.025$), and same kind of religious practices for long term relationships higher than homosexuals ($p=.010$). Homosexual men also ranked financial stability higher than heterosexual and bisexual and pansexual men for long term relationships ($p=.002$, $p=.003$). For short term relationships, homosexual and bisexual and pansexual women ranked similarity in morality higher than heterosexual women ($p=.043$, $p=.035$). For long term relationships, heterosexual women ranked financial stability higher than homosexual and bisexual and pansexual women ($p=.043$, $p=.044$), and heterosexual women ranked same religious affiliation higher than homosexual and other women ($p=.023$, $p=.016$). Bisexual and pansexual women ranked similarity in sexual views and behaviors higher than heterosexual women for long term relationships ($p=.000$). Mann-Whitney tests were also performed across sexual orientation for trait preferences, both together and for men and women separately. Differences in p -values are shown in Table 6. All results were similarly significant for both tests, except for two trait rankings that were not found to be significantly different by Kruskal-Wallis tests. These two results are also shown in Table 6.

Relationship Status

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that individuals who are unmarried but in a relationship ranked similarity in age higher than married and divorced individuals for both short term ($p=.002, p=.011$) and long term relationships ($p=.001, p=.002$). Single individuals also ranked similarity in age higher than married and divorced individuals for both short term ($p=.004, p=.019$) and long term relationships ($p=.002, p=.002$). Also, for short term relationships, married individuals ranked desire for the same number of children higher than individuals who were unmarried but in a relationship and single individuals ($p=.010, p=.017$). For long term relationships, divorced individuals ranked similarity in strength of religiosity higher than individuals who were unmarried but in a relationship and single individuals ($p=.004, p=.013$). Mann-Whitney tests were also performed across relationship status for trait preferences. Differences in p -values are shown in Table 7. All results were similarly significant for both Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests.

Religious Affiliation

Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that similarity in age was ranked higher by Catholics than by other Christians and others for short term relationships ($p=.005, p=.025$), and by Protestants and other Christians for long term relationships ($p=.000, p=.013$), higher by Agnostics and Atheists than by other Christians and others for short term relationships ($p=.011, p=.038$), and by Protestants for long term relationships ($p=.015$), and higher by unaffiliated individuals than by other Christians, Buddhists, Pagans, and others for short term relationships ($p=.014, p=.039, p=.030, p=.026$), and by Protestants for long term relationships ($p=.045$). Hindus ranked similarity in age for long term relationships lower than Catholics, Protestants, other Christians, Muslims, Pagans, Agnostics and Atheists, unaffiliated individuals, and others ($p=.023, p=.032$,

$p=.019$, $p=.049$, $p=.033$, $p=.033$, $p=.039$, $p=.040$). For short term relationships, same political affiliations was ranked higher by Protestants, Jews, Agnostics and Atheists, unaffiliated individuals, and others than by Catholics ($p=.024$, $p=.005$, $p=.000$, $p=.028$, $p=.000$), higher by others than by Protestants ($p=.028$), higher by Agnostics and Atheists and others than by other Christians ($p=.009$, $p=.004$), and higher by Jews, Agnostics and Atheists, and others than by Muslims ($p=.026$, $p=.017$, $p=.004$). For long term relationships, same political affiliations was ranked higher by Pagans, Agnostics and Atheists, and others than by Catholics ($p=.040$, $p=.000$, $p=.042$) and Protestants ($p=.049$, $p=.001$, $p=.046$). Similarity in strength of religiosity was ranked higher for short term relationships by Protestants, other Christians, and others than by Jews ($p=.032$, $p=.010$, $p=.017$), Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.002$, $p=.000$, $p=.011$), and unaffiliated individuals ($p=.041$, $p=.009$, $p=.010$), higher by Protestants and other Christians than by Catholics ($p=.015$, $p=.000$), and higher by other Christians and others than by Pagans ($p=.028$, $p=.045$). The same trait was ranked higher for long term relationships by Protestants than by Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.020$), and higher by other Christians than by Catholics, Jews, Pagans, and Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.004$, $p=.016$, $p=.029$, $p=.001$). For long term relationships, same kind of religious observances was ranked higher by other Christians than by Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.018$), higher by others and Protestants than by Catholics ($p=.039$, $p=.037$) and Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.012$, $p=.010$), and higher by Muslims than by Catholics, Jews, Pagans, and Agnostics and Atheists ($p=.025$, $p=.038$, $p=.026$, $p=.015$). For long term relationships, similarity in morality was ranked higher by Protestants, other Christians, and Agnostics and Atheists, and others than by Catholics ($p=.010$, $p=.013$, $p=.000$, $p=.002$), and higher by Jews than by Catholics, Buddhists, Agnostics and Atheists, and unaffiliated individuals ($p=.000$, $p=.035$, $p=.035$, $p=.048$). Mann-Whitney tests were also performed across religious

affiliation for trait preferences. Differences in p -values are shown in Table 8. All results were similarly significant for both Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests, except for five trait rankings that were not found to be significant by Mann-Whitney tests. These five results are also shown in Table 8.

Religiosity

Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that similarity in age, humor, and similarity in interests and hobbies were ranked higher for short term relationships by religious ($p=.009, p=.000, p=.001$) and very religious individuals ($p=.000, p=.000, p=.004$) and higher for long term relationships by religious ($p=.007, p=.000, p=.001$) and very religious individuals than by non-religious individuals ($p=.001, p=.000, p=.001$). For long term relationships, physical attractiveness, dependability, desire for the same number of children, and same political affiliations were also ranked higher by religious ($p=.001, p=.001, p=.002, p=.001$) and very religious individuals than by non-religious individuals ($p=.007, p=.007, p=.004, p=.001$). Same religious affiliation, similar strength of religiosity, same frequency of religious observances, and same kind of religious practices were ranked higher for short term relationships by non-religious individuals than by religious ($p=.000, p=.000, p=.000, p=.000$) and very religious individuals ($p=.000, p=.000, p=.000, p=.000$) and higher for long term relationships by non-religious individuals than by religious ($p=.000, p=.000, p=.000, p=.000$) and very religious individuals ($p=.000, p=.000, p=.000, p=.000$). Very religious individuals ranked similarity in age higher than religious individuals for short term relationships ($p=.041$), and religious individuals ranked same religious affiliation higher than very religious individuals for long term relationships ($p=.019$). Mann-

Whitney tests were also performed across religiosity for trait preferences and revealed similarly significant trait ranking patterns. Results are shown in Table 9.

Discussion

Sex

Hypothesis 1 predicted that women would rank financial stability higher than men and men would rank physical attractiveness higher than women. For short term relationships, women ranked dependability and humor higher than men. For long term relationships, women ranked dependability and financial stability higher than men, while men ranked same religious affiliation, same frequency of religious observances, and physical attractiveness higher than women. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported, with predicted rank differences only occurring for long term relationships. This partial support could be explained by previous research that suggests that men and women's trait preferences have been converging in recent decades (Buss, 1989; Shackelford, Schmitt, & Buss, 2005). It could also be explained by prior research indicating that people become more selective when considering a long term partner (Stewart et al., 2000) which may lead to stronger polarization in groups with differing values.

Women's higher ranking of dependability for both relationship types, and men's higher ranking of religiously-orientred traits for long term relationships was unexpected. Stewart et al. (2000) found that women ranked dependability as one of the most important traits in potential partners which may account for this finding. However, no previous research has suggests that men rank religiosity higher than women or that men place more of an emphasis on religion in relationships.

Sexual Orientation

Hypothesis 2 predicted that gay people would rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, as well as the desire for the same number of children, lower than their straight counterparts. Straight people ranked desire for the same number of children higher than gay people for short term relationships. Straight people also ranked same religious affiliation and kind of religious practices higher than gay people for long term relationships. So, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported, with each predicted rank difference only occurring in one relationship type. Gay and bisexual and pansexual people also ranked same political affiliations and similar moral views higher than straight people for both long and short term relationships. One possible explanation for this is the connection between political and moral positions and homophobic attitudes (Hicks & Lee, 2006), which may cause gay and bisexual and pansexual people to feel a greater need to ensure that their partner's values align with theirs to ensure safety and support.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that gay men would rank financial stability higher than straight men and lesbians would rank intelligence higher than straight women. Gay men did rank financial stability higher than straight men for long term relationships, but not for short term relationships, and no differences in rank position of intelligence between gay and straight women were found. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported. The difference in gay men's rank positions for financial stability for long term but not short term relationships could be explained by people's increased selectivity when considering long term partners (Stewart et al., 2000).

This research was also interested in determining whether bisexual and pansexual people were more similar in their trait ranking to straight or gay people, and if this changes across sex. Bisexual and pansexual people shared some trait rank rankings with straight people and shared

other trait rankings with gay people. When ranking desire for the same number of children and good sense of humor, bisexual and pansexual people were more similar to straight people than to gay people, with both groups ranking the two traits higher than gay people. The difference between bisexual and pansexual people's average rank positions and straight people's average rank positions for these two traits were not significantly different. When ranking same political affiliations, similar moral views, and traits relating to religiosity, bisexual and pansexual people were more similar to gay people than to straight people, with both groups ranking politics and morality higher, and religion lower, than straight people. The difference between bisexual and pansexual people's average rank positions and gay people's average rank positions for these traits were not significantly different. A possible explanation for these findings is that bisexual and pansexual people are more similar to straight people than gay in their relationship-related goals and preferences. However, because of the connection between political and moral positions and homophobic attitudes (Hicks & Lee, 2006), bisexual and pansexual people, who also feel same-sex attractions, have an increased desire for partners that share one's values to ensure acceptance and support.

When ranking financial stability, bisexual and pansexual men were more similar to straight men than gay men, with both groups ranking the trait lower than gay men. The difference between bisexual and pansexual men's average rank position and straight men's average rank position for financial stability was not significantly different. However, bisexual and pansexual women were more similar to lesbians for this trait, with both groups ranking it lower than straight women. The difference between bisexual and pansexual women's average rank position and lesbians' average rank position for financial stability was not significantly different. It could be speculated that bisexual and pansexual men and women differ more across

sex than bisexual and pansexual people differ across sexual orientation. However, future research is needed to determine potential differences and similarities of individuals across different sexual orientations and sexes.

Age Group

Hypothesis 4 predicted that older people would rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, as well as political and moral similarity higher than younger people, who would rank humor higher. Multiple age groups ranked same strength of religiosity higher than 18-19 year old's for both short and long term relationships. There were significant differences in rank position for same frequency and kind of religious practices for long term relationships, but results indicated no clear trend. There were no significant differences in rank position for same religious affiliation, political affiliations, or moral views for either relationship type. Older age groups ranked humor lower than younger age groups for both short term and long term relationships. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported. Older ranked similarity in age lower than younger people for both short term and long term relationships. For short term relationships, 18-19 year old's ranked similarity in hobbies and interest higher than other age groups. For long term relationships, 18-19 year old's ranked dependability and emotional stability higher than other age groups. This could be explained by the casual nature of teenage relationships and the increase in partygoing and casual sex during college years, leading to an increased desire for partners that are more fun rather than partners that share similar values and life goals. Another possible explanation is that marriage could lead to an increased focus on maintaining similarity in values and life goals. However, this

explanation does not explain why there were no differences across groups for same political affiliations and moral views.

Relationship Status

This research was also interested in determining if across married, divorced, dating, and single people, married and divorced people are similar while dating and single people are similar, or if married and dating people are similar while divorced and single people are similar. There were few differences in trait rank positions across relationship statuses, however similarity in age was found to differ significantly in its rank position across groups for both relationship types. For both relationship types, single and dating people ranked similarity in age higher than married and divorced people. The differences in rank position for this trait were not significant between married and divorced people or between single and dating people. While more evidence is needed on the relationship between these four categories, results suggest that married and divorced people are more similar in their trait rank positions while single and dating people are more similar in theirs. Younger people's increased engagement in more casual dating and hookups could explain these results. Another possible explanation is that because values change throughout life (Gouveia et al., 2015), married and divorced people are more similar and dating and single are more similar because of their greater overlap in age. However, further research would need to be conducted to determine any causal relationships for the correlation between relationship status and age group with regards to rankings of similarity in age.

Religiosity

Hypothesis 5 predicted that religious people would rank similarity in religion, including affiliation, frequency and kind of practices, and strength of religiosity, higher than non-religious people. For both long and short term relationships, non-religious people ranked all four of these traits higher than religious and very religious people. However, religious and very religious people ranked physical attractiveness, dependability, desire for the same number of children, and same political affiliations higher for long term relationships, and similarity in age, humor, and similarity in hobbies and interests higher for both relationship types than non-religious people. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Because people with similar beliefs are seen as more desirable (Sachs, 1975), one possible explanation for these findings is that non-religious people are stronger in their convictions than religious people, thus strongly desiring a partner that shares their lack of religiosity. However, this explanation raises the question as to why very religious people did not rank religiously-oriented traits higher than religious people.

Religious Affiliation

This research was also interested in determining if there are any differences in trait preferences across religious affiliations. For long term relationships, Hindus ranked similarity in age lower than Catholics, Protestants, other Christians, Muslims, Pagans, Agnostics and Atheists, unaffiliated people, and others. However, because of the small number of Hindu participants, these results should be viewed as tentative. More research is needed to determine if these results are due to individual differences, or if there are religious or cultural differences that may correlate with this finding.

For short term relationships, Agnostics and Atheists and others ranked same political affiliations higher than Catholics, other Christians, and Muslims, while for long term

relationships, Pagans, Agnostics and Atheists, and others ranked that trait higher than Catholics and Protestants. For short term relationships, Protestants, other Christians, and others ranked same strength of religiosity higher than Jews, Agnostics and Atheists, and unaffiliated people, while Protestants and other Christians ranked it higher than Catholics, and other Christians and others ranked it higher than Pagans. However, for long term relationships, Protestants only ranked it higher than Agnostics and Atheists, while other Christians still ranked it higher than Catholics, Jews, Pagans, and Agnostics and Atheists.

For long term relationships, Catholics ranked similarity in morality lower than Protestants, other Christians, Agnostics and Atheists, others, and Jews, with Jews also ranking it higher than Buddhists, Agnostics and Atheists, unaffiliated people. For long term relationships, Muslims ranked same kind of religious practices higher than Catholics, Jews, Pagans, and Agnostics and Atheists. Agnostics and Atheists ranked it lower than Protestants, other Christians, Muslims, and others.

One possible explanation for non-religious people ranking religiously-oriented traits higher than religious and very religious people is that non-religious people are stronger in their convictions than religious people, thus strongly desiring a partner that shares their lack of religiosity. However, Agnostics and Atheists ranked religiously-oriented traits lower than people of other affiliations. One possible explanation between this inconsistency is that the category of non-religious people consists of more than Agnostics and Atheists, since affiliation with a religious tradition did not exclude participants from receiving a non-religious score on the CRS-5. It could be that there are differences in trait rankings between religiously affiliating non-religious people and Agnostics and Atheists that account for these findings. However, more

research is needed. The gap in research surrounding these differences is discussed further in “future directions.”

Race

This research was also interested in ascertaining if there are any racial differences in trait preferences. For both short term and long term relationships, Asians ranked humor lower than Whites. For short term relationships, Whites and Biracial and Multiracial people ranked similarity in age higher than Blacks and African Americans and Asians. However, for short term relationships, only Whites and Hispanics ranked similarity in age higher than Blacks and African Americans. For long term relationships, Hispanics ranked similarity in morality higher than Blacks and African Americans, Whites, and Asians, and Biracial and Multiracial people ranked it higher than Blacks and African Americans and Asians, however for short term relationships, only Blacks and African Americans and Hispanics ranked similarity in morality higher than Whites. One possible explanation is that the discrimination faced by racial minorities leads to an increased desire for partners that share their values to ensure safety. A possible explanation for Hispanics’ higher ranking of the trait is that, because of the discrimination faced by Hispanic immigrants, they have an increased desire for partners that share their values to ensure their safety and comfort.

For short term relationships, Blacks and African Americans ranked similarity in kind of religious practices higher than Whites, Asians, and Biracial and Multiracial people. For short term relationships, similarity in sexual views and practices was ranked higher by Whites than others and Biracial and Multiracial people, who ranked it higher than others, Asians, and Hispanics, with Hispanics and Blacks and African Americans ranking it higher than others. For

long term relationships, same strength of religiosity was ranked higher by Blacks and African Americans and Asians than Whites, and similarity in hobbies and interests was ranked higher by Whites than Blacks and African Americans. Blacks' and African Americans' higher ranking of religiously-oriented traits could be explained by previous research showing that religion is more important for life satisfaction for Blacks than for Whites (Thomas & Holmes, 1992), as well as higher self-reported levels of religious participation by Blacks than Whites (Chatters et al., 2009).

Finally, Hispanics ranked same political affiliations higher than Blacks and African Americans, Whites, Asians, and Biracial and Multiracial people. This final finding could be due to the current political climate surrounding immigration policies, and the increase in discrimination and fear faced by Hispanic immigrants (Dreby, 2012; Pew Hispanic Center, 2010), leading to an increase in desire for partners that share their values to ensure safety and support. However, since the sample population included a wide range of nationalities, it is hard to determine the exact reason for this difference.

Relationship Type

Hypothesis 6 predicted that more group differences would be present for long term relationships than short term relationships. This hypothesis was mostly supported. There were more differences in trait rank positions across groups for long term relationships for sex, age group, sexual orientation, religiosity, and religious affiliation. One possible explanation for the differences between trait rank positions for short term and long term relationships is that people become more selective when considering a long term partner (Stewart et al., 2000). Because of this, groups with differing trait preferences may not exhibit significantly different trait rankings

for short term relationships, when individuals are less selective, and may instead follow larger trends towards ranking such traits as attractiveness, financial stability, and humor higher.

However, when ranking traits for long term relationships, because individuals are more selective, members of groups with differing values may rank traits in accordance to those values, which may cause differences in trait rankings across groups to become significant.

Nationality

Hypothesis 7, which predicted that results would remain consistent across nationalities, could not be tested. The exclusion of nationality data is discussed in the “limitations” section.

Conclusion

Trait rankings varied significantly across groups for all demographics. Sexual and racial groups that often face discrimination consistently ranked value-related traits, such as same political affiliations, moral views, and religiously-oriented traits, higher than majority groups. Across groups, more differences in rank positions were found for long term relationships than short term relationships. Religious affiliation and religiosity affected trait rankings, with Agnostics and Atheists ranking religiously-oriented traits lower than other groups, while non-religious people ranked those traits higher than religious and very religious people, suggesting differences in the makeup of the groups “Agnostic and Atheist” and “not religious” that require further research to determine.

Limitations

Because snowball sampling was used to collect data, results may be skewed towards people of the same values or beliefs. A number of complaints were made by religious individuals regarding the short term relationship question, with individuals expressing that participation in short term dating is in violation of their religious beliefs. This suggests that results may be skewed towards those who are willing to consider both short term and long term relationships. There was also some missing data, with 37 of the 516 trait preferences responses being left incomplete. However, 18 of those missing responses were in the short term relationship condition while 19 were in the long term relationship condition. Thus, it remains possible that any differences caused by the lack of responses in one condition was balanced by the lack of responses in the other. Finally, issues surrounding nationality data arose that rendered the data unusable for analysis. There were a large number of participants that listed every country with which they have a heritage, rather than the country in which they have spent the majority of their developmental years. Because of this inconsistency, nationality data was omitted from analysis.

Future Directions

Future directions consist primarily of filling current gaps in research regarding religious and racial differences in trait preferences, as well as the inclusion of bisexual and pansexual individuals in research regarding sexual orientation and trait preferences. Regarding race, future research should focus on determining possible causes for racial differences in trait preferences. Possibilities include national and cultural differences, as well as socioeconomic disparities, and their possible effects on values which may influence trait preferences in potential mate partners. Regarding religion, future research should focus on determining possible causes for the differences in trait rankings observed in this study, with the goal of determining why certain

religious affiliations differ in their trait rank orders, and why non-religious individuals rank religiously-oriented traits higher, while Agnostics and Atheists rank them lower, than their religious counterparts. While there has been research on sexual orientation and trait preferences, research is often limited to a comparison of homosexuality and heterosexuality. Future research should incorporate a broader range of sexual identities to get a more inclusive and complete view of sexual orientation's influence on trait preferences. Future directions for this research include a additional collection of nationality data to test hypothesis 7, and an analysis of possible interactions between demographics such as sexual orientation and religion.

References

- Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41*(3), 258-290. doi:10.1037/h0055756
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*(01), 1. doi:10.1017/s0140525x00023992
- 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*(2), 491-503. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00491.x
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(3), 559-570. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.3.559
- Buunk, A. P., & Solano, A. C. (2010). Conflicting preferences of parents and offspring over criteria for a mate: A study in Argentina. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*(4), 391-399. doi:10.1037/a0020252
- Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*(3), 713-715.
- Chan, S. W. Y., Lau, W. W. F., Hui, C. H., Lau, E. Y. Y., & Cheung, S. (2018). Causal relationship between religiosity and value priorities: Cross-sectional and longitudinal investigations. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/rel0000175

Chatters, L. M., Taylor, R. J., Bullard, K. M., & Jackson, J. S. (2009). Race and ethnic differences in religious involvement: African americans, caribbean blacks and non-hispanic whites. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *32*(7), 1143-1163.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870802334531>

Conroy-Beam, D., & Buss, D. M. (2018). Why is age so important in human mating? Evolved age preferences and their influences on multiple mating behaviors. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(2), 127-157

Dreby, J. (2012). *How today's immigration enforcement policies impact children, families and communities*. Retrieved from The Center for American Progress website:<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/08/20/27082/how-todays-immigration-enforcement-policies-impact-children-families-and-communities/>

Gouveia, V. V., Vione, K., Milfont, T. L., & Fischer, R. (2015). Patterns of value change during the life span: Some evidence from a functional approach to values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(9), 1276-1290. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167215594189>

Hicks, G. R., & Lee, T. (2006). Public attitudes toward gays and lesbians: Trends and predictors. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *51*(2), 57-77.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n02_04

Huber, S., & Huber, O. W. (2012, August 20). The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/3/3/710/htm>

Lee, A. J., Dubbs, S. L., Von Hippel, W., Brooks, R. C., & Zietsch, B. P. (2014). A multivariate approach to human mate preferences. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *35*(3), 193-203. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.01.003>

Lippa, R. A. (2007). The Preferred Traits of Mates in a Cross-National Study of Heterosexual and Homosexual Men and Women: An Examination of Biological and Cultural Influences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*(2), 193-208. doi:10.1007/s10508-006-9151-2

Pew Hispanic Center. (2010). *Hispanics and Arizona's new immigration law.Fact sheet*. Retrieved from <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1579/arizona-immigration-law-fact-sheet-hispanic-population-opinion-discrimination>

Reis, H. T., & Downey, G. (1999). Social cognition in relationships: Building essential bridges between two literatures. *Social Cognition, 17*(2), 97-117.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.1999.17.2.97>

Robinson, O. C. (2013). Values and adult age: Findings from two cohorts of the european social survey. *European Journal of Ageing, 10*(1), 11-23. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10433-012-0247-3>

Sachs, D. H. (1975). Belief similarity and attitude similarity as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Research in Personality, 9*(1), 57-65.
doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(75\)90033-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(75)90033-1)

Shackelford, T. K., Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2005). Universal dimensions of human mate preferences. *Personality and individual differences, 39*(2), 447-458.

Seepersad, S., Choi, M., & Shin, N. (2008). How does culture influence the degree of romantic loneliness and closeness? *The Journal of Psychology, 142*(2), 209-16.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.142.2.209-220>

Stewart, S., Stinnett, H., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (2000). Sex Differences in Desired Characteristics of Short-Term and Long-Term Relationship Partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*(6), 843-853. doi:10.1177/0265407500176008

Thomas, M. E., & Holmes, B. J. (1992). Determinants of satisfaction for blacks and whites. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33(3), 459-472. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1992.tb00385.x>

Yip, T. (2018). Ethnic/racial identity—A double-edged sword? associations with discrimination and psychological outcomes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 170-175. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721417739348>

Table 1.
Participant Characteristics

Variable	Percent of Sample Population	N
Sex		
Male	30.6%	79
Female	69.4%	179
Age Group		
18-19	53.9%	139
20-24	18.2%	47
25-29	9.7%	25
30-34	7.0%	18
35-39	2.3%	6
40-44	1.2%	3
45-49	1.6%	4
50+	5.8%	15
Race		
Black or African American	7.4%	19
White	71.3%	184
Asian	10.1%	26
Hispanic	5.4%	14
Biracial or Multiracial	3.9%	10
Other	1.9%	5
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	81.8%	211
Homosexual	5.4%	14
Bisexual or Pansexual	10.5%	27
Other	2.3%	6
Relationship Status		
Married	11.6%	30
Divorced	1.9%	5
Unmarried, but in a Relationship	26.4%	68
Single	60.1%	155
Religious Affiliation		
Christian, Catholic	27.5%	71
Christian, Protestant	17.8%	46
Christian, Other	12.8%	33
Jewish	3.1%	8
Muslim	1.9%	5
Buddhist	1.2%	3
Hindu	0.8%	2
Pagan	3.5%	9
Agnostic or Atheist	22.5%	58
None or Unaffiliated	3.1%	8
Other	5.8%	15
Religiosity		

Not Religious	20.2%	52
Religious	49.2%	127
Very Religious	30.6%	79

Table 2.
Overall average rank position of traits by relationship type

Short Term		Long Term	
Trait (Abv. Name)	Average Rank	Trait (Abv. Name)	Average Rank
Good sense of humor (Humor)	4.72	Emotionally stable and mature (Emotion)	4.01
Emotionally stable and mature (Emotion)	5.35	Intelligent (Intelligent)	4.93
Physically attractive (Attractive)	5.52	Dependable (Dependable)	5.06
Intelligent (Intelligent)	5.81	Good sense of humor (Humor)	5.46
Dependable (Dependable)	5.93	Warm (Warm)	6.64
Warm (Warm)	6.17	Physically attractive (Attractive)	7.38
Similar interests and hobbies as you (Hobbies)	7.45	Similar interests and hobbies as you (Hobbies)	7.58
Same sexual behaviors and views on sex as you (SexViews)	7.89	Financially stable (Finances)	8.13
Being a similar age to you (Age)	8.83	Same sexual behaviors and views on sex as you (SexViews)	9.18
Same views on morality as you (Morality)	9.49	Same views on morality as you (Morality)	9.32
Financially stable (Finances)	9.57	Being a similar age to you (Age)	10.09
Same political affiliations as you (Politics)	11.88	Desire for the same number of children as you (Children)	11.54
Same strength of religiosity as you (ReliStrength)	12.25	Same religious affiliation as you (ReliAff)	12.13
Same religious affiliation as you (ReliAff)	12.36	Same political affiliations as you (Politics)	12.34
Same frequency of religious observances as you (ReliFreq)	13.08	Same strength of religiosity as you (ReliStrength)	12.37
Desire for the same number of children as you (Children)	13.25	Same kind of religious observances as you (ReliKind)	13.30

Same kind of religious
observances as you
(ReliKind) 13.47

Same frequency of
religious observances
as you (ReliFreq) 13.53

Table 3.

Summary of significant results for sex

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Sex			
Short Term			
Dependable		.042	.042
Male/Female	6.52/5.66	.042	.042
Humor		.000	.000
Male/Female	5.74/4.27	.000	.000
Long Term			
Attractive		.025	.025
Female/Male	7.71/6.70	.025	.025
Dependable		.000	.000
Male/Female	6.32/4.47	.000	.000
Finances		.000	.000
Male/Female	9.63/7.44	.000	.000
ReliAff		.006	.006
Female/Male	12.73/10.84	.006	.006
ReliFreq		.016	.016
Female/Male	13.99/12.55	.016	.016

Table 4.
Summary of significant results for age group

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Age Group			
Short Term			
Age		.002	
25-29/18-19	10.32/8.08	.024	.024
30-34/18-19	11.69/8.08	.001	.001
50+/18-19	11.93/8.08	.003	.003
30-34/20-24	11.69/8.18	.004	.004
50+/20-24	11.93/8.18	.008	.008
Humor		.034	
20-24/18-19	6.23/4.15	.017	.017
50+/18-19	6.07/4.15	.002	.002
50+/30-34	6.07/4.13	.040	.043
50+/40-44	6.07/3.00	.036	.032
Hobbies		.028	
20-24/18-19	8.69/6.74	.003	.003
35-39/18-19	10.40/6.74	.025	.025
50+/18-19	9.14/6.74	.021	.021
ReliStrength		.012	
18-19/20-24	13.39/10.90	.018	.018
18-19/25-29	13.39/9.95	.002	.002
18-19/30-34	13.39/10.94	.032	.032
18-19/50+	13.39/10.50	.035	.035
Long Term			
Age		.000	
25-29/18-19	12.55/9.22	.001	.001
30-24/18-19	11.94/9.22	.009	.009
50+/18-19	13.17/9.22	.002	.002
25-29/20-24	12.55/9.62	.008	.008
30-34/20-24	11.94/9.62	.041	.041
50+/20-24	13.17/9.62	.008	.008
Dependable		.005	
20-24/18-19	7.43/4.25	.000	.000
20-24/30-34	7.43/4.50	.037	.037
Emotion		.040	
20-24/18-19	5.15/3.51	.003	.003
35-39/18-19	7.60/3.51	.027	.027
Humor		.039	
20-24/18-19	6.80/4.82	.008	.008
35-39/18-19	9.20/4.82	.013	.013
ReliStrength		.008	
18-19/20-24	13.56/10.55	.005	.005

18-19/25-29	13.56/10.23	.032	.032
18-19/45-49	13.56/8.50	.024	.024
18-19/50+	13.56/11.25	.038	.038
ReliFreq		.013	
18-19/20-24	14.34/11.50	.000	.000
18-19/50+	14.34/12.25	.034	.034
ReliKind		.012	
18-19/20-24	14.06/12.05	.049	.049
18-19/25-29	14.06/11.55	.003	.003
18-19/45-49	14.06/9.75	.043	.043
30-34/25-29	14.00/11.55	.004	.004
40-44/25-29	15.67/11.55	.031	.027
40-44/45-49	15.67/9.75	.048	>.05
SexViews		.024	
18-19/20-24	9.60/7.45	.001	.001

Table 5.
Summary of significant results for race

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Race			
Short Term			
Age		.001	
Black/White	10.84/8.27	.039	.039
Black/Biracial and Multiracial	10.84/6.10	.011	.011
Asian/White	11.15/8.27	.001	.001
Asian/Biracial and Multiracial	11.15/6.10	.002	.001
Other/Biracial and Multiracial	12.33/6.10	.042	.049
Humor		.041	
Asian/White	5.85/4.30	.026	.026
ReliKind		.008	
White/Black	13.72/11.05	.039	.039
Asian/Black	13.42/11.05	.011	.011
Biracial and Multiracial/Black	15.10/11.05	.003	.002
Biracial and Multiracial/Other	15.10/1.00	.015	.014
SexViews		.007	
Other/Black	15.00/7.00	.021	.014
White/Biracial and Multiracial	7.82/4.90	.025	.025
Other/White	15.00/7.82	.007	.007
Asian/Biracial and Multiracial	8.65/4.90	.029	.028
Hispanic/Biracial and Multiracial	9.33/4.90	.007	.006
Other/Hispanic	15.00/9.33	.016	.009
Other/Biracial and Multiracial	15.00/4.90	.010	.007
Morality		.004	
White/Black	10.08/8.32	.042	.042
White/Hispanic	10.08/6.75	.004	.004
Long Term			
Age		.019	
Black/White	12.42/9.63	.004	.004
Black/Hispanic	12.42/9.83	.043	.043
Humor		.006	
Asian/White	7.54/4.92	.001	.001
Politics		.039	
Black /Hispanic	13.58/9.17	.004	.003
White/Hispanic	12.25/9.17	.016	.016
Asian/Hispanic	12.88/9.17	.013	.012
Biracial and Multiracial/Hispanic	13.70/9.17	.013	.011
Hobbies		.035	
Black/White	9.58/7.10	.012	.012
ReliStrength		.006	
White/Black	13.04/9.37	.002	.002

White/Asian	13.04/10.54	.015	.015
Morality		.013	
Black/Hispanic	10.32/5.83	.008	.007
Black /Biracial and Multiracial	10.32/7.00	.017	.016
White/Hispanic	9.50/5.83	.009	.009
Asian/Hispanic	10.33/5.83	.014	.013
Asian/Biracial and Multiracial	10.33/7.00	.007	.005

Table 6.
Summary of significant results for sexual orientation

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Sexual Orientation			
Short Term			
Warm		.009	
Bi. or Pan./Heterosexual	8.33/5.92	.002	.002
Children		.007	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	15.46/13.31	.014	.014
Heterosexual/Other	13.31/7.00	.033	.033
Homosexual/Bi. or Pan.	15.46/12.48	.005	.005
Homosexual/Other	15.46/7.00	.019	.023
Politics		.000	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	12.37/8.77	.000	.000
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	12.37/9.90	.002	.002
Morality		.038	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	9.78/7.92	.043	.043
Long Term			
Humor		.023	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	7.38/5.32	.011	.011
Homosexual/Bi. or Pan.	7.38/4.96	.019	.020
Politics		.000	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	12.89/8.85	.000	.000
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	12.89/10.00	.001	.001
ReliAff		.011	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	14.85/11.78	.011	.011
Bi. or Pan./Heterosexual	13.43/11.78	.048	.048
ReliKind		.037	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	15.77/13.09	.006	.006
Morality		.019	
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	9.68/7.04	.006	.006
Sexual Orientation (Men Only)			
Short Term			
Politics		.020	
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	12.38/9.67	.026	.026
Heterosexual/Other	12.38/2.00	>.05	.035
ReliStrength		.037	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	14.57/10.73	.025	.024
Long Term			
Finances		.008	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	10.30/4.71	.002	.001
Bi. or Pan./Homosexual	9.64/4.71	.003	.004
Politics		.001	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	13.19/8.71	.013	.011

Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	13.19/8.73	.002	.002
ReliKind		.020	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	15.86/11.96	.010	.001
Heterosexual/Other	11.96/1.00	>.05	.034
Sexual Orientation (Women Only)			
Short Term			
Politics		.002	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	12.37/8.33	.001	.001
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	12.37/10.08	.032	.032
Morality		.029	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	10.02/7.33	.043	.043
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	10.02/7.58	.035	.035
Long Term			
Finances		.041	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	10.00/7.15	.043	.043
Bi. or Pan./Heterosexual	9.17/7.15	.044	.044
Politics		.021	
Heterosexual/Homosexual	12.77/9.00	.011	.011
ReliAff		.004	
Homosexual/Heterosexual	15.67/12.37	.023	.023
Other/Heterosexual	16.67/12.37	.016	.016
SexViews		.003	
Heterosexual/Bi. or Pan.	9.63/6.00	.000	.000

Table 7.

Summary of significant results for relationship status

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Relationship Status			
Short Term			
Age		.001	
Married/Relationship	11.32/7.85	.002	.002
Married/Single	11.32/8.67	.004	.004
Divorced/Relationship	12.80/7.85	.011	.008
Divorced/Single	12.80/8.67	.019	.019
Children		.037	
Relationship/Married	13.72/11.04	.010	.010
Single/Married	13.43/11.04	.017	.017
Long Term			
Age		.000	
Married/Relationship	12.77/9.02	.001	.001
Married/Single	12.77/9.97	.002	.002
Divorced/Relationship	15.60/9.02	.002	.001
Divorced/Single	15.60/9.97	.002	.002
ReliStrength		.027	
Relationship/Divorced	13.24/6.80	.004	.002
Single/Divorced	12.29/6.80	.013	.013

Table 8.

Summary of significant results for religious affiliation

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Religious Affiliation			
Short Term			
Age		.040	
Christian O. /Catholic	10.50/7.91	.005	.005
Other/Catholic	10.92/7.91	.025	.025
Christian O./Agnostic and Atheist	10.50/7.83	.011	.011
Christian O./Unaffiliated	10.50/6.29	.014	.012
Buddhist/Unaffiliated	10.50/6.29	.039	>.05
Pagan/Unaffiliated	9.88/6.29	.030	.029
Other/Agnostic and Atheist	10.92/7.83	.038	.038
Other/Unaffiliated	10.92/6.29	.026	.024
Politics		.000	
Catholic/Protestant	13.54/11.83	.024	.024
Catholic/Jewish	13.54/10.38	.005	.005
Catholic/Agnostic and Atheist	13.54/10.40	.000	.000
Catholic/Unaffiliated	13.54/10.43	.028	.028
Catholic/Other	13.54/9.00	.000	.000
Protestant/Other	11.83/9.00	.028	.028
Christian O./Agnostic and Atheist	12.31/10.40	.009	.009
Christian O./Other	12.31/9.00	.004	.004
Muslim/Jewish	14.00/10.38	.026	.030
Muslim/Agnostic and Atheist	14.00/10.40	.017	.015
Muslim/Other	14.00/9.00	.004	.002
ReliStrength		.000	
Catholic/Protestant	13.09/10.78	.015	.015
Catholic/Christian O.	13.09/8.94	.000	.000
Jewish/Protestant	14.00/10.78	.032	.032
Agnostic and Atheist/Protestant	13.83/10.78	.002	.002
Unaffiliated/Protestant	14.43/10.78	.041	.042
Jewish/Christian O.	14.00/8.94	.010	.009
Pagan/Christian O.	13.38/8.94	.028	.027
Agnostic and Atheist/Christian O.	13.83/8.94	.000	.000
Unaffiliated/Christian O.	14.43/8.94	.009	.008
Jewish/Other	14.00/11.15	.017	.020
Pagan/Other	13.38/11.15	.045	.040
Agnostic and Atheist/Other	13.83/11.15	.011	.011
Unaffiliated/Other	14.43/11.15	.010	.011
Long Term			
Age		.006	
Protestant/Catholic	11.71/8.75	.000	.000
Christian O./Catholic	10.79/8.75	.013	.013

Hindu/Catholic	17.00/8.75	.023	.007
Hindu/Protestant	17.00/11.71	.032	.020
Protestant/Agnostic and Atheist	11.71/9.67	.015	.015
Protestant/Unaffiliated	11.71/8.57	.045	.045
Hindu/Christian O.	17.00/10.79	.019	.004
Hindu/Muslim	17.00/10.00	.049	>.05
Hindu/Pagan	17.00/10.88	.033	.044
Hindu/Agnostic and Atheist	17.00/9.67	.033	.020
Hindu/Unaffiliated	17.00/5.57	.039	>.05
Hindu/Other	17.00/10.00	.040	.038
Politics		.010	
Catholic/Pagan	13.41/10.88	.040	.040
Catholic/Agnostic and Atheist	13.41/10.67	.000	.000
Catholic/Other	13.41/11.31	.042	.042
Protestant/Pagan	13.39/10.88	.049	>.05
Protestant/Agnostic and Atheist	13.39/10.67	.001	.001
Protestant/Other	13.39/11.31	.046	.046
ReliStrength		.043	
Catholic/Christian O.	13.12/9.52	.004	.004
Agnostic and Atheist/Protestant	13.71/10.66	.020	.020
Jewish/Christian O.	14.25/9.52	.016	.015
Pagan/Christian O.	13.88/9.52	.029	.029
Agnostic and Atheist/Christian O.	13.71/9.52	.001	.001
ReliKind		.035	
Catholic/Protestant	13.96/11.54	.037	.037
Catholic/Muslim	13.96/9.00	.025	.023
Catholic/Other	13.96/12.00	.039	.039
Agnostic and Atheist/Protestant	14.38/11.54	.010	.010
Agnostic and Atheist/Christian O.	14.38/12.86	.018	.018
Jewish/Muslims	13.88/9.00	.038	.045
Pagan/Muslim	14.38/9.00	.026	.030
Agnostic and Atheist/Muslim	14.38/9.00	.015	.013
Agnostic and Atheist/Other	14.38/12.00	.012	.012
Morality		.003	
Catholic/Protestant	11.28/8.88	.010	.010
Catholic/Christian O.	11.28/8.72	.013	.013
Catholic/Jewish	11.28/5.50	.000	.000
Catholic/Agnostic and Atheist	11.28/8.55	.000	.000
Catholic/Other	11.28/7.46	.002	.002
Buddhist/Jewish	10.00/5.50	.035	.044
Agnostic and Atheist/Jewish	8.55/5.50	.035	.035
Unaffiliated/Jewish	9.43/5.50	.048	>.05

Table 9.
Summary of significant results for religiosity

Variables Sig. diff. variable 1/Sig. diff. variable 2	V1 avg. rank position/V2 avg. rank position	Kruskal-Wallis <i>p</i> value	Mann-Whitney <i>p</i> value
Religiosity			
Short Term			
Age		.000	
Not Religious/Religious	10.75/8.84	.009	.009
Not Religious/Very Religious	10.75/7.49	.000	.000
Religious/Very Religious	8.84/7.49	.041	.041
Humor		.000	
Not Religious/Religious	6.94/4.28	.000	.000
Not Religious/Very Religious	6.94/3.96	.000	.000
Hobbies		.002	
Not Religious/Religious	9.27/6.89	.001	.001
Not Religious/Very Religious	9.27/7.17	.004	.004
ReliAff		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	12.99/9.06	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	13.53/9.06	.000	.000
ReliStrength		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	13.07/8.21	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	13.59/8.21	.000	.000
ReliFreq		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	13.54/10.71	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	13.90/10.71	.000	.000
ReliKind		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	14.16/10.52	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	14.29/10.52	.000	.000
Long Term			
Attractive		.001	
Not Religious/Religious	9.15/6.93	.001	.001
Not Religious/Very Religious	9.15/6.96	.001	.001
Age		.003	
Not Religious/Religious	11.75/9.88	.007	.007
Not Religious/Very Religious	11.75/9.34	.001	.001
Dependable		.003	
Not Religious/Religious	6.67/4.58	.001	.001
Not Religious/Very Religious	6.67/4.77	.007	.007
Children		.004	
Not Religious/Religious	12.79/11.23	.002	.002
Not Religious/Very Religious	12.79/11.21	.004	.004
Humor		.000	
Not Religious/Religious	7.56/5.00	.000	.000
Not Religious/Very Religious	7.56/4.83	.000	.000
Politics		.000	

Not Religious/Religious	13.27/12.91	.001	.001
Not Religious/Very Religious	13.27/10.75	.001	.001
Hobbies		.001	
Not Religious/Religious	9.71/7.19	.001	.001
Not Religious/Very Religious	9.71/6.80	.001	.001
ReliAff		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	12.73/8.19	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	13.79/8.19	.000	.000
Very Religious/Religious	13.79/12.73	.019	.019
ReliStrength		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	13.27/7.81	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	13.92/7.81	.000	.000
ReliFreq		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	14.22/10.58	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	14.37/10.58	.000	.000
ReliKind		.000	
Religious/Not Religious	14.39/9.27	.000	.000
Very Religious/Not Religious	14.17/9.27	.000	.000

Appendix A.

Informed Consent Form Bucknell University**Project Name: “Perception of Potential Partners”**

Purpose of the research: I understand that I will be given a questionnaire and a list of traits which I will have to arrange according to my preferences. I understand that the all of the details of the experiment cannot be explained to me at this time, but that they will be explained fully at the conclusion of the experiment.

General plan of the research: I also understand that I will be asked to answer general questions regarding my demographic information (sex, race, age, etc.), my sexual orientation, current relationship status, religious affiliation, and partner preferences.

Estimated duration of the research: I understand that my participation in this study will take no more than 15 minutes.

Estimated total number of participants: I understand that the research wishes to include at least 200 participants in this study.

Questions or concerns: I understand that if I have any questions or concerns related to this study, I may contact the Principal Investigator, Sara Glass, via email at skg008@bucknell.edu. I may also contact Professor T Joel Wade, Chair, Department of Psychology at Bucknell University, at (570)577-1693 or by email at jwade@bucknell.edu. For general questions regarding human subject research or questions regarding ethical treatment and rights of human

subjects, I may contact Matthew Slater, Chair of the Institutional Review Board at Bucknell University, at (570)577-2767 or by email at matthew.slater@bucknell.edu. Minimal risk or discomfort is possible in this study, but it is not possible to anticipate everything that may occur. All possible measures will be taken by the Principal Investigator to reduce and prevent discomfort.

Subject participation is voluntary: I understand that my participation in this study is completely voluntary. I understand that if I agree to participate I may change my mind at any time. I also understand that I reserve the right to refuse to answer any question(s) and may withdraw from the study at any point without penalty.

No compensation: I understand that my contribution to the current research is voluntary and I will not be compensated for my participation.

Possible risks or discomforts: I understand that I might experience some minor discomfort associated with rating potential romantic partners. For this reason, I understand that my responses will be confidential, known only to the Principal Investigator, and that any reports about responses given will be based on aggregated data.

Possible benefits: I understand that my participation in this study will contribute to the existing knowledge concerning perceptions of traits in romantic partners. It will also add to the research by investigating the role of demographics in ways that have not yet been examined.

Confidentiality: I understand that data acquired through this study will be kept confidential and that I will be offered complete anonymity. I also understand that all data collected will be secured

and only made available to those persons conducting the study, unless I provide written permission to do otherwise. I understand that no reference will be made in any oral or written reports that could possibly link me to the study. All data I provide for the purpose of this study will be retained on computer disk in broad data records.

I have read the above description of the research. Anything I did not understand was explained to me by the Principal Investigator and I had all of my questions answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I will be debriefed upon completion of this study. I agree to participate in this research.

By clicking "I Agree" below, I affirm that I am at least 18 years of age or older.

Appendix B.

Age: ____

Sex: Male Female

Race: Black White Asian Hispanic Other _____

Nationality: _____

Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual Homosexual Bisexual or Pansexual Other _____

Relationship Status: Married Unmarried, In a Relationship Single

Religious Affiliation: Christian, Catholic Christian, Protestant Christian, Other

Jewish Muslim Buddhist Hindu Pagan Agnostic or Atheist

Other _____

1. How often do you think about religious issues?

Very often Often Occasionally Rarely Never

2. To what extent do you believe that God, gods, or something divine exists?

Very much so Quite a bit Moderately Not very much Not at all

3. How often do you take part in religious services or rituals, either alone or with others?

More than once a week Once a week One to three times a month

A few times a year Less often Never

4. How often do you pray, meditate, or participate in other private devotional activities?

Several times a day Once a day More than once a week Once a week

One to three times a month A few times a year Less often Never

5. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feelings of connectedness to God, gods, or something divine or that he/she/it/they intervenes in your life?

Very often Often Occasionally Rarely Never

Appendix C.

Imagine you are seeking a partner for a short term romantic relationship. Please rate the following traits from most important to least important to you in a potential partner in this situation.

Physically attractive

Being a similar age to you

Intelligent

Warm

Dependable

Emotionally stable and mature

Desire for the same number of children as you

Financially Stable

Good sense of humor

Same political affiliations as you

Similar interests and hobbies as you

Same religious affiliation as you

Same strength of religiosity as you (here strength of religiosity is defined as a person's strength of belief in religious ideas and their devotion to the principals and moral teachings of their faith)

Same frequency of religious observances as you

Same kind of religious observances as you (e.g. meditation, prayer, fasting, ritual)

Same sexual behaviors and views on sex as you (e.g. desired frequency of sex, when sex is appropriate in a relationship)

Same views on morality as you (e.g. liberal, conservative)

Appendix D

Imagine you are seeking a partner for a long term romantic relationship. Please rate the following traits from most important to least important to you in a potential partner in this situation.

Physically attractive

Being a similar age to you

Intelligent

Warm

Dependable

Emotionally stable and mature

Desire for the same number of children as you

Financially Stable

Good sense of humor

Same political affiliations as you

Similar interests and hobbies as you

Same religious affiliation as you

Same strength of religiosity as you (here strength of religiosity is defined as a person's strength of belief in religious ideas and their devotion to the principals and moral teachings of their faith)

Same frequency of religious observances as you

Same kind of religious observances as you (e.g. meditation, prayer, fasting, ritual)

Same sexual behaviors and views on sex as you (e.g. desired frequency of sex, when sex is appropriate in a relationship)

Same views on morality as you (e.g. liberal, conservative)

Appendix E.

Debriefing Statement

The experiment you just took part in dealt with the effects of religion on trait preferences in long and short term relationships. You were asked to provide demographic information, religious affiliation, answer questions regarding your religious attitudes, and rate your preferences for potential partner traits in long and short term relationships. The hypothesis of this research was that those who display high religiosity will be rate religion-related traits higher than those who display low religiosity. This research is also looking at the possible effect of religious affiliation on trait preferences. The only individuals who will see the responses are me, and my supervisor, Professor T. Joel Wade. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have either at this time or in the future. I may be contacted via email at skg008@bucknell.edu. Thank you for your participation.