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ABSTRACT

How does power affect the characteristics sought in a long term mate? Similarities and differences in men's and women's mate preferences have been extensively studied. Men have been found to desire physical attractiveness and youth in mates whereas women desire mates with resources and good earning capacity. Individual characteristics such as one's own physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status affect one's mate preferences. Yet little research has explored the ways in which an individual's social power may influence mate preferences. Based on social learning theory, social power and gender were expected to influence an individual's mate preferences. An experiment was conducted to test whether priming heterosexual participants towards a power orientation would influence mate preferences. Results provided partial support for hypotheses. Although power had no effect on mate preferences, gender accounted for a small percentage of variance in preferences for physical attractiveness and potential earning capacity in a long term mate.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

One of the core human drives is the desire to secure a mate. Consequently, many social scientists have explored factors that shape mate preferences. As early as 1945, Hill found that women valued characteristics such as ambition and good financial prospects more than men (Hill, 1945). More recent studies have continued to find gender differences in the characteristics desired in a mate. For instance, men prefer physical attractiveness and youth in mates whereas women prefer mates who possess resources and status (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Feingold, 1992; Johanessen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002; Li, Bailey, Kenrick & Linsenmeier, 2002; Sprecher, Sullivan & Hatfield, 1994; Townsend, 1989; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992). Yet, some psychologists contend that as societies modernize, gender differences are becoming smaller and that gender differences account for only a small percentage of variance in preferences today (Oliver & Hyde, 1993).

Theoretical Background

Evolutionary theory. Mate preferences have been primarily studied by theorists adopting either a social learning or evolutionary framework. Evolutionary theory argues that men and women have specialized psychological mechanisms that have evolved as a result of the differing adaptive problems that men and women faced while pursuing their own reproductive success during ancestral times (Trivers, 1992). According to this view, these psychological mechanisms are different in men and women and consequently account for gender differences in mate preferences. From the very beginning of sexual reproduction, men and women devote unequal resources to reproduction (Trivers, 1972). Sperm, when compared to nutrient rich eggs, are relatively inexpensive for the body to
produce. With regards to parental investment, men may contribute to the production of many offspring in a one-year period (Buss, 1992) whereas women generally are able to only produce one offspring during the same period. In addition, women make direct investments to offspring by contributing body nutrients to support pregnancy, providing nutrients in the form of breast milk to offspring (Chagnon, 1992), and providing care for several years for each offspring (Boyd & Silk, 1997), whereas men only contribute indirect investments (e.g., ability to provide food or protection). As a consequence of these investment differences, men and women have evolved specialized psychological mechanisms for different strategies for reproductive success (Trivers, 1972). Men enjoy higher reproductive success by copulating with as many fertile females as possible (Trivers, 1972). Thus, men who were able to detect cues of women’s fertility would enjoy more reproductive success than men who were not able to detect fertility cues (Symons, 1979). Because a woman’s fertility is highly correlated with age and health, men have evolved preferences for physical cues of good health such as youth and attractiveness in potential mates as these are related to a woman’s reproductive capacity (Buss, 1989; Symons, 1979).

On the other hand, women have less to gain and more to lose from the strategy of copulating with many males (Symons, 1979). Because women face heavy parental investment, women’s reproductive success is enhanced by choosing a mate who will devote all his resources to her and their mutual offspring. Several studies have found that women consider a potential mate’s resources or social status during mate selection (e.g., Buss, 1989; Townsend & Levy, 1990, Kenrick, Sadalla, Groth & Trost, 1990). Unlike
women, men’s window of fertility is much larger; thus, physical cues such as physical attractiveness and youth are not associated with men’s reproductive capacity. Consequently, women have evolved preferences for prowess and the ability of a mate to provide resources as these characteristics are related to women’s reproductive success (Buss, 1994). A potential mate’s prowess influences the amount of resources he can acquire. Cues for a mate’s intention to provide resources could be a demonstration of emotional attributes such as kindness and commitment. Women’s reproductive success is contingent on choosing a partner who is willing to invest his resources in her and their mutual offspring.

In addition to physical attractiveness and resources, ancestral men and women also sought mates with the emotional attributes of kindness and understanding (Symons, 1979). Evolutionary theorists believe that sexual selection and parental investment are the most determinant factors of mate selection (e.g., Buss, 1994; Kenrick et al., 1990; Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972). Thus, cultural and social changes should have little influence on gender differences in mate preferences.

Social learning theory. In contrast, social learning theorists posit that mate preferences result from the influence of social and cultural factors such as learning (Mischel, 1966), socialization and positive reinforcement of gender role consistent behavior (e.g., Eagly & Wood, 1999; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1995; Sprecher et al., 1994). One notable social learning theory, social role theory (Eagly, 1987) states that sex differences are a consequence of the differing positions men and women occupy in society and the sexual division of labor (Wood & Eagly, 2002). In addition, Eagly (1983)
maintains that gender differences may be due to early socialization. As children develop, they tend to imitate same gender adults and receive positive reinforcement for gender-consistent role behavior. Thus, as children become adults, they will continue to endorse traditional social roles. Men are more likely to enter occupations associated with high status and income whereas women are more likely to enter occupations of lower-status and income (Eagly, 1983). In cultures where men are responsible for acquiring financial resources and women are responsible for domestic (e.g., housekeeping) and reproductive (e.g., childrearing) duties, preferences for characteristics related to performing these duties well will be highly valued. Another social learning theory, the structural powerlessness theory, posits that sex differences in mate preferences exist largely due to women’s relative lack of social status and financial status (Buss & Barnes, 1986). According to this theory, sex differences in mate preferences may dissolve as women gain financial independence. In general, social learning theories assert that mate preferences are variable. Thus, research findings may reflect changes in societal and cultural factors; men’s and women’s preferences in mates might be expected to change too. In particular, social theorists would expect women’s increasing financial independence and access to many convenient forms of birth control may affect mating strategies and preferences.

Current Research on Mate Preferences

Evolutionary and social learning research on mate preferences have revealed both similarities and differences in what men and women desire in potential long-term mates (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Feingold, 1992; Hill, 1945; Howard,
Blumstein & Schwartz, 1987). Both men and women overwhelmingly prefer mates with positive emotional attributes such as being kind and understanding, dependable, considerate, and socially exciting (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Hill, 1945; Regan & Berscheid, 1997). Yet, there are marked differences in preference for physical attractiveness and resources (for a review, see Feingold, 1992). Men desire physical attractiveness and youth in a potential mate more than do women (Buss, 1989; Hatfield & Sprecher 1995; Sprecher, Sullivan & Hatfield, 1994; Kenrick, Groth, Trost & Sadalla, 1993; Li, Bailey, Kenrick & Linsenmeier, 2002; Townsend, 1989). In contrast, women rate financial resources and good earning capacity in a potential mate as more important than do their male counterparts. Unlike most studies, Regan (1998) found that both men and women considered physical appeal (e.g., physical attractiveness, being sexy) closely followed by emotional attributes as the most important traits desired in an ideal long term mate. In sum, both sexes value physical attractiveness and resources, but to varying degrees.

Both social learning theory and evolutionary theory concur that gender differences for resources and physical attractiveness exist; however, the two theories differ in their explanations as to the origins of these sex differences and in their predictions concerning stability of mate preferences over time. Social learning theorists believe that these sex differences in preferences arise from the differing social roles of men and women and the sexual division of labor (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Men play the traditional role of breadwinner while women are homemakers. Social learning theorists predict that as social norms and conditions change, mate preferences may also change. Mate preferences are socially constructed to reflect the current social and cultural norms.
of a society. Therefore, cultures which are more egalitarian in division of labor and access to status would have little or no sex differences in mate preferences.

Cross-cultural research. Cross-cultural research on mate preferences have found mixed results. Evolutionary theorists, who attribute sex differences in mate preferences to the differing adaptive problems faced by our hunter-gatherer ancestors, predict that sex differences will remain robust over time. Consistent with this prediction, Buss (1989) found no significant variations in men’s preference for physical attractiveness and women’s preference for resources, despite varying levels of division of labor among 37 countries. Yet, Kasser & Sharma (1999) found women’s preferences for mates with good earning potential was positively associated with the extent to which cultures limit women’s access to educational attainment and reproductive freedom. Kenrick and Keefe (1992) found that men’s preference for younger wives was universal in the Philippines, but was shared only by men over 30 years of age in the United States. Wood and Eagly (2002) believed that Buss’s results might be attributed to methodological flaws such as overrepresentation of participants who were well-educated and of a higher socioeconomic status. Other cultural differences have been found in the preference of practical traits such as good housekeeping and demographic similarity. For instance, collectivist cultures such as India and China tend to prefer long term mates that possess practical traits such as good housekeeping, money-mindedness, similar background more than do people from individualist cultures (Buss, Abbott et al., 1990; Sprecher & Chandak, 1992). In reanalyzing Buss’s 1994 data, Wallen (1989) was interested in knowing whether culture or gender would account for more variance in preferences and found that gender
accounted for 40-45% of variance in preference for good looks and financial prospect whereas culture only accounted for 8-17% of variance. However, culture accounted for 38-59% of variance in preference for chastity, preferred age of mate, and ambition while gender accounted for only 5-16% of variance. Thus, Wallen concluded that culture and gender both play a role in prediction of mate preferences.

Limitations of mate preference research. Social scientists have been concerned with the methodology of ranking (e.g., Hill, 1945; Regan & Berscheid, 1997) and rating (e.g., Buss & Barnes, 1986; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992) mate preferences, contesting that the rating and ranking of mate preferences does not accurately reflect mate choice decisions and actual mate choice. A person’s own mate value may influence what traits are sought in a mate. For instance, Wiederman and Allgeier’s (1992) study found that sample population influenced the extent to which women valued good earning capacity. College women’s expected income was found to be positive related to a potential mate’s good financial prospect; however, when they sampled women from the community, they found community women’s expected income was unrelated to the importance of a potential mate’s good earning prospect. Townsend (1989) found that female medical students preferred potential mates whose expected income would be equal or higher to their expected incomes.

Furthermore, a person’s social context may determine what traits are more important than others. Less important traits may be traded off. For instance, women have been shown to value both physical attractiveness as well as resources in a potential long term mate (Waynforth, 2001). However, although women value physical attractiveness in
a potential mate; they are willing to trade off physical attractiveness for resources. Similarly, women prefer potential mates who are kind, understanding, and intelligent over potential mates who lacked these characteristics, but had earning capacity (Buss, 1989). Women also prefer potential mates with whom they may develop emotionally satisfying and intimate relationships (Buss, 1994) and choose less attractive men with good character over more attractive men with less desirable character (Scheib, 2001).

Both men and women preferred potential mates who possess a combination of physical attractiveness and pleasing disposition over 1) mates who possessed physical attractiveness and wealth, and 2) mates who possessed pleasing disposition and wealth (Cunningham, Druen & Barbee, 1997). Li and his colleagues (2002) further explored mate preferences in terms of viewing certain traits in potential mates as “necessities” versus “luxuries” and found that women considered a potential marriage partner’s resources as a necessity while other characteristics (e.g., physical attractiveness, creativity and emotional connection) were considered luxuries. These studies clearly indicate that mate preferences are complex and influenced by more than just what individuals desire in potential mates. Mate preferences often result from compromise and are influenced by social factors such as a person’s own characteristics or mate value.

Despite the numerous studies done from both the evolutionary and social perspective, few have studied the influence of an individual’s power on his or her preferences in a potential romantic mate. Some studies have looked at power by using the individual’s level of income or socioeconomic status (e.g., Li et al., 2002; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992) whereas other studies have employed special populations (e.g., law or
medical students) to predict mate preferences (Townsend, 1989; Townsend & Roberts, 1993). However, resources and social status are not the only forms of social power. Social power can also be conceived of as a psychological property of the individual and experiences with holding power may influence attitudes and behavior.

*Power.* Most commonly, social power has been defined as the ability of person A to influence person B (French & Raven 1959; Weis, 1998) and has been used to explain different aspects of interpersonal influence. By this definition, power is only the ability and potential to influence, not necessarily individual characteristics of the powerful such as dominance. For instance, person A is perceived to be able to reward person B, thus person A is able to get influence person B to do what person A wants. French and Raven (1959) first identified five bases of social power: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, expert. French (1965) later added informational as a sixth basis of social power.

Social power has been most commonly studied in the context of interpersonal influence in which individuals or groups change the attitudes and behaviors of others. One classic example of social power is Milgram’s (1974) obedience studies. Milgram found that participants could be influenced to change their behavior by verbal prompting by the experimenter. This type of social power results in behavioral or attitudinal changes in the person being influenced.

Theories of power in romantic relationships have been put forth using this construct of social power. Waller (1931) proposed the principle of least interest which states that the person with the least amount of interest and investment in the relationship will be the one that has power. Blood and Wolfe (1960) proposed a resource based theory
of power, where the person who contributes the most resources to the relationship is the one with power. Gender differences have been found in the balance of power. Men tend to be perceived as the more powerful partner in relationships (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Peplau, 1979). In romantic relationships, the powerful are able to get what they want without having to compromise too much (e.g., Browning, Kessler, Hatfield & Choo, 1999; Howard, Blumstein, and Schwartz, 1986). If social power can influence what individuals get from their relationships and how they behave in their relationships, social power may influence what characteristics individuals would desire in a long term mate.

The present study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of power and gender on relative importance of physical attractiveness, potential for acquiring resources, and kindness in a potential long-term mate. Evolutionary theorists predict that women will choose potential mates primarily on their potential for status and resources whereas men will choose potential mates based on physical attractiveness (Buss, 1989). Women’s mate preferences for resources or earning capacity is part of embedded psychological mechanisms and would not be influenced by women’s own power during ancestral times; therefore, their neural processing systems would have evolved with consideration only to detection of a mate’s resources or potential resource capacity, but not mediated by their own power or earning capacity.

In contrast, social learning theorists believe that in the course of evolution, people came to be wired to confront the social and environmental conditions they face; what they stress is not the rigidity of humankind but their flexibility. Social learning theories
stress the importance of socialization and social experiences in shaping social behavior. Thus, social role theory (e.g., Eagly & Wood, 1999; Wood & Eagly, 2002) would predict that since, in America, women’s social power is rapidly improving—perhaps due to changing social roles, increasing financial independence and educational attainment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004), and the invention of the birth control pill, social preferences for certain mate characteristics may change as well. Specifically, socially powerful women might exhibit mate preferences more similar to men than to those of traditional women. In contrast, women who have little access to social power will maintain mate preferences that are more consistent with past research conducted in societies where women have little access to social power (e.g., Wood & Eagly, 2002). Socially powerful women would also be more discriminating and less willing to trade off preferences for physical attractiveness for resources than less powerful women. Because men traditionally possessed a great deal of power, and since men’s social roles have changed little in recent years, social power (or lack thereof) is expected to have less impact on their desires in a mate.

Thus, the present study examined whether: 1) an individual’s social power would influence the importance of physical attractiveness, kindness, and earning capacity in a potential long-term mate and 2) if individuals with social power would prioritize what characteristics are desired in a potential mate differently than individuals with no power. If evolutionary theory’s predictions hold, power would have no influence on relative importance of mate preferences. Social role theory predicts that the power of an individual will influence the relative importance of potential mate characteristics (e.g.,
physical attractiveness, resources, and emotional attributes). Thus, individuals with power are predicted to demand more from potential mates as compared to low power individuals and be less willing to “settle.” With social learning theory in mind, two hypotheses were presented.

_Hypotheses_

1) Powerful people will have higher minimum standards of physical attractiveness, potential earning capacity, and kindness for potential mates than will their less powerful peers.

2) When people’s choices are constrained and they have to prioritize what characteristics are most desirable in a potential long term mate, power and gender will influence what characteristics are considered essential.
   a. When choices are constrained, high power women will desire physical attractiveness more than do low power women. In contrast, low power women will desire resources more than do high power women.
   b. In contrast, men’s power will have little to no effect on their mate preferences even when choices are constrained. Regardless of power, men will desire physical attractiveness more than resources in a long-term potential mate.
Participants

Participants (N = 163) were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Participants were given extra credit in exchange for participating in the study. Criteria for inclusion were that participants were at least 18 years of age and reported a primarily heterosexual orientation. Thus, data obtained from four participants reporting a non-heterosexual orientation were excluded from analysis. In addition, data obtained from an additional five participants were not used because participants failed to follow instructions. The study sample consisted of 154 participants (115 women and 39 men), most of whom were junior or senior level undergraduates. Most participants were either single (38.3%, N = 59) or dating (42.2 %, N = 65), although a minority of participants were cohabiting (12.3 %, N = 19) or married (7.1 %, N = 11). The mean age of participants was 22.43 years (SD = 4.41). The ethnicity of the sample was diverse and was comprised of 32.5% Japanese (N = 50), 20.1 % Caucasian (N = 31), 15.6% Mixed ethnicity (N = 24), 7.8 % Chinese (N = 12), 7.8% Filipino (N = 12), 3.9% Korean (N = 6), 3.2% Others (e.g., Thai, Tawainese Islander), 2.6% Hawaiian/part-Hawaiian (N = 4), 2.6% Pacific Islander (N = 4), 1.9 % Hispanic (N = 3), 1.3% Vietnamese (N = 2), and 0.6% African American (N = 1).

Design and Procedure

This experiment tested the effects of situationally induced power and gender on long-term mate preference decisions. This experiment had two components: 1) the random assignment of participants to a high or low power condition and 2) the
administration of a questionnaire on mate preferences. The independent variables were
gender of the participant and power of the participant. There were two sets of dependent
variables. The first set, used for testing the first hypothesis, was: importance assigned to
physical attractiveness, good earning capacity, and kindness in a potential mate. The
second set, used for testing the second hypothesis, was: money spent on physical
attractiveness, money spent on potential earning capacity, and money spent on kindness.

Upon arrival to the study, participants were informed the present study consisted
of two unrelated parts. The first part was writing an essay on an interpersonal experience.
The second part of the study was completing a questionnaire on attitudes towards men
and women.

 Priming. The first part of the study was really a manipulation of social power.
Participants were randomly assigned to either a low power or high power condition.
Participants were primed towards a power orientation using a method developed by
Galinsky, Gruenfeld and Magee (2003) (see Appendix A). Participants wrote an essay
describing either 1) a situation in which they had power over someone else (high power)
or 2) a situation in which someone had power over them. This method is an example of
mindset priming (Bargh & Chartrand, 2004). Mindset priming consists of having
participant actively engage in thinking about a concept in one context and then having the
participant perform some unrelated task. Participants are “primed” towards a concept and
this priming should carry over to participants’ performance in the unrelated tasks. For
instance, Wilson and Capitman (1982) had male college students read a “boy meets girl”
story in the first part of the experiment which primed male students to act much friendlier
when meeting female confederates in the second part of the experiment. In this study, participants’ mindsets were engaged towards a low or high power orientation by writing the essay. Researchers have found that activating a high power orientation causes participants to behave more according to their wants and desires; however, the low power activation seemed to have a less pronounced effect on participants’ behavior (Guinote, Judd, & Brauer, 2002).

After completion of the priming essay, participants completed a questionnaire (see Appendix A) on demographics, self-report of power, traditional gender role orientation (Glick & Fiske, 1996), and mate preferences (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Li et al., 2002). Since some research has found an association between endorsement of the female traditional role and mate preferences (Johanessen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002), participants’ attitudes towards traditional roles were assessed using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). After completion of the questionnaire, participants were thanked for their participation and were given a debriefing form to read that explained the actual purpose of the study.

Materials

Priming essay. Participants were given a written prompt developed by Galinsky et al. (2003) and instructed to write an experiential essay on power.

Rating of mate preferences. Using a scale developed by Buss and Barnes (1986), participants were asked to rate the relative importance of 13 characteristics in a potential long term mate. Each item was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 being, “not at
all important” and 7 being, “very important.” To control for item-order effects, half of participants in each power condition received this scale with reverse-ordered items.

**Designing the Ideal Mate.** Relative importance of mate preferences, when choices are constrained, was assessed by using a modified budget methodology employed by Li and his colleagues (2002). Participants were first asked to rank characteristics from 1, being most important, to 10, being least important. Then, participants were instructed to design their ideal mate using a budget of fifty dollars. Participants could spend up to ten dollars on each specific characteristic in an ideal mate. For example, each “mate” dollar spent on kindness was a means of securing kindness in an ideal mate. Half of participants in each power condition received this scale with reverse-ordered items.

**Identification with traditional gender roles.** Identification with traditional gender roles was assessed using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This scale can be used as a whole to measure endorsement of the traditional female gender role or may be divided into two subscales to measure both “benevolent sexism” and “hostile sexism.” Benevolent sexism measures the extent to which participants approve of women in traditional gender-consistent roles. Hostile sexism measures the extent to which participants disapprove of women in nontraditional roles. For the purposes of this study, the scale was used as a whole. This inventory consisted of twenty-two items, using a seven-point Likert-type scale with 1 being, “strongly disagree” and 7 being, “strongly agree.” Alpha reliability was .80.

**Self-report of power.** Participants were asked to respond to three items concerning power. The first question asked participants to rate how much power they
felt in the essay they wrote, on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 being, “not powerful at all,” and 7 being, “very powerful.” The second item asked participants to rate their agreement with the statement, “Writing the essay made me feel powerful now” on 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 being, “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree.” The third question assessed how confident participants currently feel about getting someone to do what they want. Participants rated their response on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 being “not confident at all” and 7 being “very confident.”

Demographics. Information concerning gender, education, age, relationship status, ethnic identity, and the extent of identification with ethnic background was collected from all participants.
Chapter 3
RESULTS

Data Management

To control for order effects, half of the participants in each power condition were randomly assigned to receive questionnaires with reverse-ordered items. The order of items had no discernible effect on participants' responses. Comparisons of the means, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, distributions, and standard deviations of participant responses showed no significant differences when grouped by demographic factors (e.g., age, relationship status, education level).

Manipulation Check

A coder, blind to the conditions and hypotheses of the study, categorized the type of relationship described in each essay (see Table 3 in Appendix B for frequencies of each relationship type) and rated the participant’s power as depicted in the essay on a 7-point scale with 1 being, “not powerful at all” and 7 being, “very powerful.” Essays from the low power condition were rated with a mean of 1.40, $SD = .64$ while essays from the high power condition were rated as 5.87, $SD = 1.56$. A t-test was conducted and differences were found to be significant, $t(152) = -23.59, p < .001$. To check rater reliability, a second coder rated 30 percent of the surveys. In addition, participants self-reported how much power they had in the situation described in their essays. Cohen’s Kappa was .71. Low power participants ($n = 76$) reported their experiential power with a mean of 2.87, $SD = 1.81$ while high power participants ($n = 78$) reported a mean of 4.99, $SD = 1.28$. As expected, a t-test revealed that differences between the self-reported means of low and high power participants were significant, $t(152) = -8.47, p < .001$. 18
A second item ascertained if writing the essay made participants feel powerful. In response to the statement, “Writing the essay made me feel powerful now,” with 1 being, “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree,” high power participants reported feeling more powerful, $M = 4.18$, $SD = 1.63$, than low power participants, $M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.66$. While the $t$-test revealed that differences were significant, $t(152) = 2.82, p < .01$, the magnitude of the differences was not as great as that seen in the ratings of the essay themes.

A third question assessed how confident participants felt about their ability to influence someone. Both low power and high power participants were quite confident; low power participants reported a mean of 4.63, $SD = 1.32$, whereas high power participants reported a mean of 4.65, $SD = 1.38$. These differences were not significant, $t(152) = -.10, ns$.

**Hypotheses Testing**

**Hypothesis One.** The first hypothesis predicted that people with power would consider physical attractiveness, kindness, and potential earning capacity as more important in potential mates than do their less powerful peers. Gender was predicted to influence the relative importance of physical attractiveness, kindness, and potential earning capacity. Specifically, men were predicted to value physical attractiveness more than earning capacity while women were predicted to value earning capacity more than physical attractiveness.

**MANOVA.** A 2 X 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the three dependent variables: rating of physical
attractiveness, rating of kindness, and rating of potential earning capacity. Box’s test of
equality of covariance matrices was conducted (to test the null hypothesis that the
covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups) and was found to
not be significant, \( F(18, 17200.42) = 1.46, \text{ ns.} \) Levene’s test was performed on each
dependent variable to test the equality of error variances across groups by combination of
factors. No significant effects were found indicating the assumption of equality of error
variances was not violated.

Using Wilks’s \( \Lambda \) criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly
affected by gender, \( F(3, 147) = 17.19, p < .001 \) and by the power X gender interaction \( F \)
\( (3, 147) = 2.74, p < .05 \), but not by power, \( F(3, 147) = 2.10, \text{ ns.} \) Hence, the first
hypothesis received partial support.

To examine the impact of the significant main effects on each individual
dependent variable, univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted using
Bonferroni’s alpha correction for multiple comparisons. Since six comparisons were
needed to test our hypotheses (\( \alpha = .05/6 \)), alpha was set at .008.

**Univariate tests.** Gender significantly affected ratings of importance of physical
attractiveness, \( F(1, 149) = 12.65, p < .01 \), with men (\( M = 5.87, SD = 1.36 \)) rating
importance of physical attractiveness higher than women (\( M = 5.06, SD = 1.22 \)) as seen
in Figure 1. As depicted in Figure 2, gender also influenced ratings of importance of good
earning capacity, \( F(1, 149) = 21.87, p < .001 \), with women (\( M = 5.23, SD = 1.37 \)) rating
importance of good earning capacity higher than men (\( M = 3.97, SD = 1.66 \)). Gender did
not significantly affect importance of kindness, \( F(1, 149) = .475, \text{ ns} \) (see Figure 3).
Although the sample size provided adequate power, the effect sizes as calculated as partial Eta squared ($\eta_p^2$) were small (see Table 1). Partial Eta squared values are the proportion of total variability (the effect and the error variance) that can be attributed to gender.

Table 1

*Power and Effect Size of Importance of Physical Attractiveness, Good Earning Capacity, and Kindness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mate Characteristic</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Earning Capacity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Mean importance of physical attractiveness of potential long term mate by power and gender.

Figure 2. Mean importance of the good earning capacity of a potential long term mate by power and gender.
Figure 3. *Mean importance of kindness in a potential long-term mate.*

*Power X Gender Interaction.* The overall MANOVA indicated a significant interaction effect. However, upon further investigation, this appeared to be a statistical artifact. Although men’s mean ratings of importance of kindness was more affected by power than women’s mean ratings of importance of kindness, a two-way ANOVA was conducted and revealed that gender was driving the significance of this interaction.

*Hypothesis Two.* The second hypothesis predicted that power and gender would influence what characteristics were most important when participants’ choices were constrained. In other words, when participants were forced to prioritize qualities of a potential mate, high power people would rank physical attractiveness higher than resources and kindness, with power having a more pronounced effect on women’s ranking of physical attractiveness than men’s ranking.
MANOVA. A 2 X 2 between-subjects MANOVA was performed on three dependent variables: amount spent on physical attractiveness, amount spent on kindness, and amount spent on potential earning capacity. Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices was conducted (to test the null hypothesis that the covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups) and was found to be not significant, $F(18, 16356) = 1.46, ns$. Levene’s test was performed on each dependent variable to test the equality of error variances across groups by combination of factors. No significant effects were found indicating the assumption of equality of error variances was not violated.

With the use of Wilks’s $\Lambda$ criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected only by gender, $F(3, 148) = 13.74, p < .001$, but not by power, $F(3, 148) = .69, ns$, nor by the power X gender interaction $F(3, 148) = 1.25, ns$. Thus, our second hypothesis was partially supported.

Univariate tests. To further examine the effect of gender on each dependent variable, univariate ANOVAs were performed using Bonferroni’s alpha correction. Gender significantly accounted for differences in the mean amount spent on physical attractiveness, $F(1, 150) = 18.28, p < .001$, amount spent on potential earning capacity, $F(1, 150) = 13.34, p < .001$, and amount spent of kindness, $F(1, 150) = 7.59, p < .01$. However, upon further examination, power was quite low and effect sizes associated with each dependent variable was very small (see Table 2). For a complete list of mean for all characteristics tested, see Table 5 in Appendix B.
Table 2

Power and Effect Sizes of Amount Spent on Physical Attractiveness, Potential Earning Capacity, and Kindness by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mate Characteristic</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Earning Capacity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 4, men spent an average of $6.90 (SD = 2.70) on physical attractiveness whereas women only spent an average of $5.00 (SD = 2.35). For potential earning capacity, as reflected in Figure 5, women spent $3.37 (SD = 2.50) while men spent $1.71 (SD = 2.04). For kindness, as seen in Figure 6, women spent $7.95 (SD = 2.25) whereas men spent $6.81 (SD = 2.33). For a complete list of mean amounts spent on all characteristics, please see Table 6 in Appendix B.
Figure 4. Mean amount spent in dollars to secure physical attractiveness in a potential long-term mate by power and gender.

Figure 5. Mean amount spent in dollars to secure potential earning capacity in a potential long-term mate by power and gender.
Figure 6. Mean amount spent in dollars to secure kindness in a potential long term mate by power and gender.

Supplemental Analyses. Participants' endorsement of the traditional female role was examined to see if there was a relationship between endorsement of gender role and importance of specific mate characteristics. Men's mean endorsement of the traditional female gender role was 4.19, SD = .52, whereas women's mean endorsement of the traditional female gender role was 3.90, SD = .72. An ANOVA revealed that the mean differences of men's and women's endorsement of the traditional female gender role were significant, $F(1, 152) = 5.59, p < .05$. Eta ($\eta$) was .19, indicating that 19% of the variance in the mean scores of endorsement of traditional female gender role was accounted for by gender. Bivariate correlations of mean endorsement of traditional female gender role and the dependent measures were conducted separately for men and women. For men, endorsement of traditional female gender role was significantly
associated with the free-rating items, importance of good earning capacity, \( r \) (39) = .34, \( p < .05 \), and importance of physical attractiveness, \( r \) (39) = .31, \( p < .05 \). For women, endorsement of traditional female gender role was significantly associated only with the free-rating item, importance of good earning capacity, \( r \) (115) = .20, \( p < .05 \).
Past research on mate selection and preferences has been conducted to test the predictions from two major theories. Social learning theories (e.g., social role, structural powerlessness, sociocultural theories) assert that preferences are largely influenced by culture and societal roles and, therefore, may change over time to reflect societal changes. Thus, they predict that gender differences in mate preferences may cease to exist as men’s and women’s roles change. In contrast, evolutionary theories of mate selection contend that mate preferences are the expression of psychological mechanisms present in the information pathways in the brain that have evolved over the past few millions of years and, thus, are largely unaffected by societal changes (Tooby & Cosmides, 1989). Gender differences in mate preferences are predicted to remain robust over a wide spectrum of social changes.

Few studies have considered how mate preferences for a potential long-term mate may be influenced by personal attributes such as social power. Past studies have used other measures of power such as potential job status (e.g., Townsend & Roberts, 1993) or socioeconomic status (Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992). This study attempted to empirically test the predictions of social learning theory by examining if situationally induced power and/or gender would account for differences in preferences for physical attractiveness, earning capacity, and kindness.

The first hypothesis predicted that people with power would have higher minimum standards of kindness, physical attractiveness, and good earning capacity in a potential mate than their less powerful peers. Analysis provided partial support of the first
hypothesis. Contradictory to what was predicted, power did not account for a significant amount of variance in ratings of importance of physical attractiveness, resources, and kindness. However, gender accounted for 12% of the variance in ratings of importance of good earning capacity and 7% of the variance in ratings of importance of physical attractiveness.

The second hypothesis predicted that when people are constrained to spend a specific amount on designing the ideal mate, powerful people will spend more money on physical attractiveness than on kindness or resources. Gender was also predicted to influence spending. The second hypothesis also received partial support. When participants were forced to prioritize mate characteristics, men and women prioritized differently. When given a budget of fifty dollars with a maximum of ten dollars to be allotted to any one characteristic, men spent an average of two dollars more on securing physical attractiveness in a potential long term mate than women. Although both men and women spent less money on securing potential earning capacity than on securing physical attractiveness, women spent an average of one dollar more than men on the potential earning capacity of an ideal mate. Not surprisingly, both men and women spent the most money on kindness.

There are several explanations for the overall mixed results of the present study. Analyses revealed no main effect for power. First, it is very possible that the priming method was unsuccessful considering that most participants reported being "neutral" or "slightly disagreeing" when asked whether writing the essay subsequently made them feel powerful during the rest of the study. Perhaps the priming was not powerful enough
to carry over to the second task of completing the questionnaire. Past studies (e.g., Galinsky et al., 2002) that have used mindset priming did not mention the duration of mindset priming and have looked more at how priming for power affects behavior, not attitudes or preferences such as in the present study. In addition, Strack & Hannover (1996) suggested that it is possible for participants to somehow pick up on the priming and intentionally try to counteract the influence. It is also possible that treating power as a “state” variable instead of a “trait” variable is not the best predictor of differences in mate preferences.

Given that the priming for power might have been unsuccessful, the results of the present study fail to provide clear support for either social learning theory or evolutionary theory. Taking an evolutionary perspective, statistically significant gender differences were found. Regardless of whether participants’ choices were constrained or unconstrained, men rated and ranked physical attractiveness higher than women and women rated and ranked good earning capacity higher than men. However, the variance that gender accounted for in differences in mate preferences was small which supports the social learning theorists’ assertions that gender differences in mate preferences may be getting smaller over time (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). With consideration to social learning theory, it could be argued that women’s increasing social power in the United States has not yet reached a level that would produce measurable changes in mate preferences. With gender accounting for smaller amounts of variance in mate preferences over the past decades (Oliver & Hyde, 1993), Brehm (1992) suggests that women’s changing roles will play a salient role in mate preferences and, subsequently,
romantic relationships in the future. As education level is an indicator of income, the National Center for Education Statistics (2003) found an increase in the numbers of women earning degrees and projects that women will earn more than half of the total number of degrees granted in the United States over the next ten years. In the past 30 years, earnings by female college graduates have increased by 30% while men’s earnings have only increased 20%, controlling for inflation (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004), although as of 2002, college-educated men’s median annual salary ($56,628) was still higher than the median salary ($42,078) of their female counterparts. An increasing number of women are entering the workforce and reducing domestic labor; on the other hand, men are not increasing their domestic labor or decreasing their paid labor (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer & Robinson, 2000).

Supplemental analyses revealed an association between the endorsement of traditional female gender role and importance of physical attractiveness for men. Endorsement of the traditional female gender role was associated with the importance of potential earning capacity for women and, surprisingly, for men. These findings were similar to Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly’s (2002) findings, except for the association of endorsement of traditional female gender role and importance of potential earning capacity for men. The association of endorsement of the traditional female gender role accounted for a 40% of variance in women’s mean scores of importance of good earning capacity whereas endorsement of traditional female gender role accounted for 65% of variance in men’s mean scores of importance of a potential mate’s good earning capacity.
and 62% of variance in men’s scores of importance of a potential mate’s physical attractiveness.

Limitations of the Study

The present study had a number of methodological limitations that may affect the validity and generalizability of its results. First, the population used for the study was a homogenous sample of college students with a restricted range of age, income, and relationship experience which dramatically limits external validity of the results. Although the sample size provided adequate power for the first hypothesis, analysis for testing the second hypothesis had negligible effect sizes and inadequate power which implies that the methodology for the “designing the ideal mate” measure may be flawed. Because participants were instructed to spend a maximum amount of ten dollars on each characteristic, ceiling effects might have occurred. Second, the dependent measures were based on single items. Multiple items measuring each dependent variable would have increased construct validity. Third, the present study relied on self-report measures which are susceptible to socially desirable responding. For instance, participants’ may have overrated the importance of kindness in a mate and underrated the importance of physical attractiveness in a potential mate.

Strengths of the Study

Past studies have examined social power as a structural trait (e.g., socioeconomic status). Other factors such as social dominance orientation or personality may be associated with possession of structural power and may contribute to its effect (Kenrick et al., 1993). One of the major methodological strengths of this study is that it was an
experiment to test the effect of power on mate preferences. Participants were randomly assigned to a power orientation which helped control the effects of factors that may be associated with structural power. Also, Galinsky et al. (2003) found that having participants recall an experience of power instead of directly putting them in positions of power may decrease the effects of cognitive loading and role-prescribed behavior, thus participants' responses are less influenced by social desirability or role-consistent behavior.

Implications for Future Research in Mate Preferences

Future research should seek to delineate which factors of social power are most salient in determining mate preferences and should include more cross-cultural studies as well as studies which sample widely from the general population. Studies that used samples of college students have found that associations of mate preferences do not hold for samples of participants from the community at large (Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992). Future studies should examine how mate preferences may change across the lifespan. If future studies decide to use the priming method, perhaps measuring behavior (e.g., flirting, initiating contact with a sexy or wealthy-looking confederate) will produce more robust results than measuring mate preferences.

Conclusion

In closing, it is important to note that both social learning theory and evolutionary theory provide important predictions for mate selection. It is not necessary to pit one theory against the other; instead perhaps both perspectives should be taken into account. Social learning theory provides explanation for cross-cultural and historical variations in
preferences while evolutionary theory provides a distal explanation of how mate preferences evolved. Together, they provide an integrated approach to studying mate selection. Also, although the present study focused on differences in mate preferences (e.g., physical attractiveness and good earning capacity), it is important to mention that the most sought after characteristics in potential mates are the same for both men and women. Both men and women overwhelmingly value positive emotional attributes such as kindness and understanding, interesting personality and mutual attraction-love.
Appendix A. Questionnaire

Section 1 (low power prime)
Please recall a particular incident in which someone else had power over you. By power, we mean a situation in which someone else had the ability to influence you to do what they wanted or was in a position to evaluate you. Please describe this situation in which you did not have power---what happened, how you felt, etc. and write about your experience below. Please try to include as many details as you can remember.
Section 1 (high power prime)

Please recall a particular incident in which you had power over another individual or individuals. By power, we mean a situation in which you controlled the ability of another person or persons to get something they wanted or were in a position to evaluate those individuals. Please describe this situation in which you had power—what happened, how you felt, etc. and write about your experience below. Please try to include as many details as you can remember.
Section 2

Part A
1. Which of the following BEST describes your ethnic or racial identity? (Circle only one response.)

- African American
- Caucasian
- Chinese
- Filipino
- Hawaiian or part Hawaiian
- Hispanic
- Japanese
- Korean
- Pacific Islander
- Vietnamese
- Mixed
- Other (specify)

2. To what extent do you identify with your ethnic or racial background? (Circle only one response.)

very little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much

3. Please indicate your: Age: ______

4. Please indicate your gender:  _ Female
   ___ Male

5. Which of the following best describes your current level of education?
   __ Freshman (college)
   __ Sophomore (college)
   __ Junior (college)
   __ Senior (college)
   ___ Other (specify)

6. Please check the status that best describes your current relationship.
   ___ Single
   ___ Dating (seeing your current partner monogamously, but not living together)
   ___ Cohabiting (living with your current partner)
   ___ Married

7. What best describes your sexual orientation?
   ___ Straight/Heterosexual
   ___ Bisexual
   ___ Gay/Lesbian
   ___ Other (fill-in)
**Part B**

Imagine what traits you would desire in an ideal long-term mate or marriage partner. What trait is most important to you? What trait is least important to you? Please write the traits in order of their importance to you with 1 being most important and 10 being least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Rewrite traits in order of importance below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physical attractiveness</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexy</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind and understanding</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthy</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting personality</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romantic</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of humor</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential earning capacity</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yearly income</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, imagine that you are given $50 to spend on designing your ideal mate. Each dollar that you spend on a trait reflects the importance of your ideal mate possessing that trait. *You can only spend up to $10 on any one trait, but remember that your total budget is $50.* Please write your dollar amounts that you would spend on each trait in the corresponding blank.

- physical attractiveness $_______
- sexy $_______
- kind and understanding $_______
- intelligence $_______
- healthy $_______
- interesting personality $_______
- sense of humor $_______
- romantic $_______
- potential earning capacity $_______
- yearly income $_______

**Total $_______ (Make sure your total adds up to $50)**
### Part C
Please read the following list of characteristics and rate their importance in someone you might marry using the scale listed next to each item. Please circle the number which most corresponds with your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. kind &amp; understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. exciting personality</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. creative and artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. good housekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. good earning capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. wants children</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. easygoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. good heredity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. college graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. physically attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part D
You were asked to complete an essay on a particular experience in the first part of the study. We would like to ask you a few questions about how you felt after completing the essay.

1. How powerful did you feel in the situation you described in the essay?

   - [ ] 1 Not Powerful at all
   - [ ] 2 Somewhat Powerful
   - [ ] 4 Very Powerful

2. Writing the essay made me feel powerful now.

   - [ ] 1 Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 Neutral
   - [ ] 5 Strongly Agree

3. How confident are you in your ability to influence someone to do what you want?

   - [ ] 1 Not Confident at all
   - [ ] 2 Somewhat Confident
   - [ ] 4 Very Confident
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Part E
The following statements concern women, men, and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by marking the number which best corresponds with your agreement.

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

5. Women are too easily offended.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree

8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

   □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7
   Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

13. Men are complete without women.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree

17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

   □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7
Strongly    Neutral    Strongly
Disagree    Agree
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Thanks for your participation!!! Please turn into the experimenter.
### Table 3

*Types of Relationship as Described in the Power Priming Essays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of relationship described</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager-subordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/admissions/tryouts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club leader-member</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/relatives</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement-citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach/official- athlete</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service-customer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic/dating partners</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-camper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Importance of Mate Characteristics by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mate characteristic</th>
<th>Women $(n = 114)$</th>
<th>Men $(n = 39)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kind/Understanding*</td>
<td>6.60 .68</td>
<td>6.49 .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>3.56 2.17</td>
<td>3.15 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>5.70 1.08</td>
<td>6.10 .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>4.54 1.35</td>
<td>4.62 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Housekeeping</td>
<td>4.57 1.35</td>
<td>4.62 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>5.97 1.07</td>
<td>5.69 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning Capacity*</td>
<td>5.23 1.32</td>
<td>3.97 1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants Children</td>
<td>5.90 1.44</td>
<td>5.41 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td>5.82 1.09</td>
<td>6.08 .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heredity</td>
<td>4.40 1.49</td>
<td>4.31 1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.39 1.42</td>
<td>4.67 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractive*</td>
<td>5.06 1.23</td>
<td>5.87 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>5.90 .99</td>
<td>5.95 .92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Asterisked (*) items were used to test hypothesis one. This table includes complete list of characteristics. Since power had no effect on mate preferences, mean scores are shown only by gender.
Table 5

*Amount spent in dollars on each mate characteristic by gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mate Characteristics</th>
<th>Women (n = 115)</th>
<th>Men (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Personality</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind**</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness**</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning Capacity**</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humor</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Income</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Double-asterisked (**) items were used to test the second hypothesis. This table includes complete list of spending on all characteristics. Because power had no significant effect on preferences, mean amount of spending is reported only by gender.
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