

**Spouse Selection Criteria through the Perspective of Satisfied
Individuals with Marriage during their Engagement Period: A
Qualitative Study**

Hanieh Bijari

PhD Candidate in Psychology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Zohreh Sepehri Shamloo¹

*Associate Professor of Psychology Department, Faculty of Education and Psychology,
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran*

Behrouz Mahram

*Associate Professor of Curriculum Planning Department, Faculty of Education and
Psychology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran*

Mansoureh Sadat Sadeghi

*Associate Professor of Family Health, Family Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti
University, Tehran, Iran*

Received: 22 January 2019

Accepted: 19 May 2019

Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

Marriage is the first step towards the formation of a family and one of the most important choices of individuals throughout their lifetime; a satisfying, lasting marriage can guarantee the health and stability of a society (Sommer & Justino, 2015). Various studies have asserted the role of making informed choices in marriage satisfaction. Nevertheless, a variety of factors including personal and interpersonal problems have transformed rapid social, economic, and cultural developments in families where making proper choices has become difficult (Alawi et al., 2014).

Studies show that the majority of divorces take place during the first 3-5 years of marriage and 50% of such cases occur during the engagement period (Daneshpour et al., 2011). Divorce is considered as the second stressful lifetime event that brings about reduced occupational productivity (Blekesaune & Barrett, 2005), physical problems (Robles, & Kiecolt-Glaser, 2003), and psychological distress (Comerford, 2006).

Given the aforementioned challenges and to examine this notion of culture at the first stage of family formation, i.e. the engagement period, it has been attempted to

1. Corresponding Author, z.s.shamloo@gmail.com

take a closer look at preventive measures and purposes behind the criteria for selecting a spouse from the perspective of individuals who have recently passed the selection stage and are satisfied by it.

2. Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework

Many majors including evolutionary biology, sociology, and psychology have paid attention to studying various areas related to spouse selection criteria. According to the biologic theory, humans instinctively strive for maximizing their gene reproduction likelihood. Consequently, when choosing a spouse, men are mostly attracted to physical traits including age and attractiveness which are signs that ensure women's fertility. Meanwhile, women mostly pay attention to the resources and position of their future spouse (Gustavsson, 2008). According to the homogamy theory (Boss, 1986) and selection based on complementarity (Winch, 1958), individuals are inclined to selecting mates similar to or different from themselves (Strickland, 2006). In the socialization theory, parental effects (esp. opposite sex parent) on choosing a spouse are emphasized (Bolhuis & Horn, 1992; quoted from Barzaki, 2004). Similar views are expressed in the theory of unconscious choice. Based on this theory, one does not choose another for marriage exclusively due to their physical attractiveness, capabilities or similarity with an individual; while the selected mates might represent important people from one's childhood (Hendrix, 2005).

Spouse selection criteria involve different meanings in different cultures and periods. Therefore, a culture-dependent process is involved in selecting a life partner (Kaufman, 2012; Alawi et al., 2014). However, the majority of studies in this area are conducted using quantitative methods with single individuals as the target population. Yet on the other hand, qualitative studies are better options for examining the phenomena influenced by culture and ever-changing aspects. Moreover, the experiences gained by those who have recently and successfully passed through this stage can offer individuals who are about to get married more accurate information on selection criteria and examining their possible transformations under such experiences.

3. Method

The present study was conducted using the qualitative method and thematic analysis. Participants were selected among individuals living in Mashhad and spending the engagement period using purposive sampling and selection was continued until theoretical saturation. Semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with 20 individuals (12 women and 8 men who were content with marriage based on their own reports). Data were collected during a 1-year period and analyzed based on Braun and Clark's (2006) reciprocating process including

six stages of implementation, repeated review and immersion in data, creating initial codes, searching the themes, defining and naming, and ultimately, report writing.

4. Results and Discussion

Out of the 650 initial codes, the following 3 main categories and 14 secondary categories were extracted:

1. Personal characteristics (320 codes) with 5 subcategories of characteristic features (209 codes), demographic features (39 codes), appearance features (37 codes), belief features (30 codes), and physical-mental health (8 codes);
2. Relationship characteristics (156 codes) with 4 subcategories including similarities and differences (79 codes), recognition (45 codes), interest (18 codes) and acceptance of conditions and agreements (14 codes);
3. Family characteristics (99 codes) with 6 subcategories of congruence and similarities (35 codes), intimate relationships (25 codes), prominent features (13 codes), family's agreement (10 codes), healthy role models (9 codes), and demographic features (7 codes).

Findings offer evidence in confirming both theories of homogamy and selection based on complementarity. In line with many studies including Botuin et al. (2006), Maliki (2009), Husseinkhanzadeh et al. (2015), participants expected similarity in many of the areas as a criterion for selecting their spouses; yet in certain features, difference appeared to be desirable as it would complete them.

Women also emphasized having a proper job and sufficient income as an important criterion which is in line with the evolutionary theory. One of the different findings of the study involved women's priority in finding physical beauty as a significant criterion equal to that of men. This distinguished result requires more sociological and psychological examinations and denote changes in individuals' perspective toward marriage criteria. In addition, the majority of women participating in this study expected their future spouse to be distanced from traditional and prejudicial beliefs, refuse to limit the women from social activities and be more involved with house chores. Bourne (2006) believes that gender-related ideologies are transformed towards equality in general, while men have been slower in showing their changes in perspective towards women (Rajabi et al., 2011).

5. Conclusion

Today, the developments resulted from modernity has transformed social homogeneity of the past into social distinction. Therefore, contrary to the past, not only the members of various strata of the society, but also the individuals in a kinship network or a family do not have similar beliefs. This has been clearly

manifested in spouse selection in the form of differences in insights and criteria among various generations (Abdulmaleki et al., 2015). Another part of changes in the currently shifting Iranian society is due to the collapse of traditional collectivist structures and realization of individualism which has introduced profound developments in individuals' traits (Kermani et al, 2018). The results of this study are in line with the above-mentioned research as well as the study by Nikparvar et al (1390) which demonstrates that the transfiguration of family from a an extensive entity into a core collective has diminished the common patterns of the past based upon the dominance of families over marriage whilst highlighting the role of the individual in decision-making.

Conflict of expectations in the gender-related ideology's shift towards equality can be explained using views related to "power" and "structure". Malek Asgar et al. (2014) concluded that the women from the second and third generations of the society possess more imperatives with respect to fair distribution of power in the family. The traditional marriage placed men in a superior position over women where change would be accompanied by withdrawal behaviors from men. The formation of this "demand-withdrawal" cycle was the result of gender-based power and is related to the relations and extent of power balance between the man and the woman (Shahmoradi et al., 2014).

These findings can offer those involved in the area of marriage a more extensive horizon where they would be able to update their interventions according to the ever-changing conditions of the society; they can also contribute to building healthier relationships by asserting the important factors in spouse selection which considerably predicts satisfaction following marriage.

Keywords: Marriage Criteria, Engagement Period, Thematic Analysis, Qualitative Method

References (In Persian)

1. Aliakbari Dehkordi, M. (2007). بررسی مقایسه‌ای ملاک‌های همسرگزینی در دختران جوان. شهر اهواز [A comparative study of mate selection criteria of Ahwazi young girls]. *Daneshvar Raftar*, 14(25), 75-84.
2. Alvani, S. M., Khanbashi, M., & Boudlaie, H. (2014). تبیین مفهوم ایپوخه در پژوهش‌ها. [Explaining epoché in phenomenological researches and its application in the field of entrepreneurship]. *Rahbord*, 23(71), 214-241.
3. Azadarmaleki, T. (2010). جامعه‌شناسی خانواده ایرانی [Sociology of Iranian families]. Tehran, Iran: SAMT.

4. Balali, E., Bakhtiari Safar, Z., Mohammadi, A., & Mohaghegh, H. (2016). عوامل موثر بر تضاد نقش‌های زنان و رابطه آن با تعارضات خانوادگی در شهر همدان [Effective factors of role conflict in women and its effect on family conflicts in Hamadan]. *Applied Sociology*, 27(4), 117-132.
5. Bengtson, V. L. (2010). *دایره‌المعارف خانواده: نظریه‌ها و روشها* [Sourcebook of family theory research] (A. Shekarbeigi & Sh. Mehrgani, Trans.). Tehran, Iran: Jameshenasan.
6. Cheraghi, M., Mazaheri, M. A., Mootabi, M., Panaghi Sadeghi, L., Sadeghi, M. (2015). مقایسه ارتباط با خانواده همسر در زنان و مردان متأهل ایرانی. *Journal of Family Research*, 11(41), 7-32.
7. Cheraghi, M., Mazaheri, M. A., Mootabi, M., Panaghi Sadeghi, L., Soleymani, Kh. (2017). مقیاس سیستمی - مثلثی خانواده: ابزاری برای سنجش روابط همسران و خانواده‌های [Family triad systemic scale: an instrument for assessment of relationships between couple and families of origin]. *Journal of Family Research*, 13(51), 343-360.
8. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. L. (2011). *اصول تحقیق کیفی-شیوه‌ها و رویه‌ها-گراندد تئوری* [Basics of qualitative research : techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory] (N. Dehghan Nayeri, A. Fakhr Movahed, M. Esmaeeli, T. Sadeghi, & Z. Tayebi, Trans.). Tehran, Iran: Andisheh Rafi'.
9. Ghazi, M. (2017). *با هم‌نگری مسائل اجتماعی نهاد خانواده از منظر جامعه‌شناسان (مرور نظام مند* [Investigating social issues of families as a set from sociologists' point of view (Systematic review of researches conducted on family)]. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
10. Gholamaliei, B., Jampour, S., Soury, A., Soheilzadeh, M., Khazaie, S., Nourian, F., & Bagher, M. (2016). معیارهای ازدواج در زوجین شرف ازدواج مراجعه‌کننده [Criteria of marriage in married couples referred to Tuyserkhan marriage counseling Center in 2015]. *Pajouhan*, 14(4), 38-47.
11. Harazi, M. A., Hosseini Motlagh, S. M., Sadrian, M. (2001). *بررسی دیدگاه دانشجویان علوم پزشکی دانشگاه علوم پزشکی شهید صدوقی یزد پیرامون عوامل موثر بر ازدواج* [Exploring views of students of Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences and Health Services on factors affecting marriage]. *Journal of Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences and Health Services*, 9(1), 37-43.

12. Heidari, Jafari, H., Afzali, M. A., Mohammadpour, R. A., & Mahmoudi, Gh. (2008). [Assessing unmarried student's marital criteria in Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences in 2006]. *Iranian Journal of Nursing Research*, 3(10), 54-62.
13. Hendrix, H. (2004). عشق مورد نظر شما [Getting the love you want] (M. Gharchehdaghi, Trans.). Tehran, Iran: Asim.
14. Hossein Khazadeh, A. A., Niyazi, E., Taher, M., Moghtadaei, K., Mehry, S., & Mohammadi, H. (2015). شناسایی و اولویت‌بندی ملاک‌های انتخاب همسر در دانشجویان مجرد گیلان، [Analyzing and prioritizing of criteria of spouse selection in single students of Guilan university]. *Journal of Psychological Sciences*, 14(53), 20-27.
15. Hosseini, M., Mohammadi, M., Yaghmaie, F., & Alimajd, H. (2007). بررسی اولویت معیارهای انتخاب همسر زوجین در شرف ازدواج شهر تهران [Criteria of marrying couples for mate selection in Tehran]. *Pajoohandeh*, 12(6), 505-512.
16. Hومان, S. A. (2010). راهنمای عملی پژوهش کیفی [Applied guide of qualitative research]. Tehran, Iran: SAMT.
17. Jebraeili, H., Zadehmohammadi, A., & Heidari, M. (2013). تفاوت ملاک‌های [Gender differences in mate selection criteria]. *Journal of Family Research*, 9(34), 155-171.
18. Kermani, M., Asgharpour Masouleh, A. R., & Baradaran Kashani, Z. (2018). همسرگزینی دختران جوان: کشاکش فردیت در برابر ارزش‌های سنتی [Mate choosing among young females: A conflict between individuality and traditional values]. *Family Research*, 34(3), 303-326.
19. Labibi, T. (2014). خانواده در قرن بیست و یکم: از نگاه جامعه‌شناسان ایرانی و غربی [Family in 21st century from the Iranian and Western sociologists' perspective]. Tehran, Iran: Elm.
20. Maaref, M., Khalili, Sh., Hejazi, A., Gholamali Lavasani, M. (2014). رابطه سبک‌های هویت و نقش‌های جنسیتی زوجین با رضایتمندی زناشویی [The relationship between identity style, gender role and marital satisfaction in married couples]. *Applied Sociology*, 18(4), 365-380.
21. Malek Asgar, S., Moutabi, F., Mazaheri, M. A. (2014). مقایسه استانداردهای مربوط به زندگی مشترک، اسناد ارتباطی و رضایت زناشویی در افراد ساکن تهران در طول سه نسل اخیر [Comparing relationship standards, attributions and marital satisfaction across three recent generations in Tehran]. *Family Research*, 10(38), 137-157.

22. Mirmohammadsadeghi, M. (2005). ازدواج (آموزش پیش از ازدواج) [Marriage (Premarital education)]. Tehran, Iran: State Welfare Organization of Iran.
23. Mohammadpour, A. (2010). ضد روش: منطق و طرح در روش شناسی کیفی [Anti-method: Logic and design in qualitative methodology]. Tehran, Iran: Jameshenasan.
24. Nikparvar, F., Panaghi, L., & Mazaheri, A. (2011). تغییر ملاک‌های ازدواج در سه نسل: ارائه یک مدل زمینه‌ای مقدماتی [Alteration in marriage criteria in three generations: The presentation of a primary grounded model]. *Family Research*, 7(26), 187-205.
25. Sadeghi, M. (2010). الگوهای تعاملی زناشویی در فرهنگ ایرانی و اثربندی آموزش مهارت‌های [Marital interaction models in Iranian culture and the effectiveness of educations of communication skills based on culture on the increase of incompatible couples]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.
26. Sadoughi, M. (2008). معیارهای ویژه ارزیابی پژوهش کیفی [Special criteria of evaluating qualitative research]. *Journal of Methodology of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 14(56), 55-72.
27. Sadra, A., & Ghanbari, A. (2010). ارزش‌های حاکم بر جامعه ایرانی [Values dominating on Iran]. Tehran, Iran: Komeil.
28. Salar, A. (2010). بررسی ویژگی‌های شبکه اجتماعی همسرگزینی و تاثیر آن بر رضایت از زندگی [Investigating the characteristics of spouse choosing social networks and its effect on marital life satisfaction among married men of Mashhad]. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ferdowsi University Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
29. Shahmoradi, S., Etemadi, A., Bahrami, F., Fatehizadeh, M., Ahmadi, A. (2014). رابطه بین کلیشه‌های جنسیتی، احساس قدرت زوجین و متغیرهای جمعیت‌شناختی با [The relationship between gender stereotypes, sense of power, and demographic variables with the cycle of demand-withdrawal marital communication]. *Applied Sociology*, 25(1), 101-110.
30. Shekarbeygi, A. (2011). مدرن گرایی و سرمایه اجتماعی خانواده (درآمدی بر جامعه شناسی [Modernism and social capital of families (An introduction to sociology of families in Iran)]. Tehran, Iran: Jameshenasan.

31. Soleymani, A., Farahati, M., Mojoudi, M., & Zaheri, M. (2011). تاثیر نوع ازدواج [The effect of traditional and modern marriages on marital satisfaction of couples]. Paper presented at the *2nd National Conference on Psychology*. Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran.
32. Zabihollahzadeh, A., Mazaheri, A., Hatami, J., Panaghi, L., & Ghashang, N. (2018). ملزومات صیانت از حریم زناشویی در ارتباط درمانی بین روان درمانگر و درمانجو: یک مطالعه. [The essentials of marital privacy protection in therapeutic communication between psychotherapist and client: a qualitative study based on couples' perspective in Iranian culture]. *Journal of Family Research, 14(54)*, 160-181.
33. Zahabi, A., Alinejad, M., Farahmand, M. (2016). بررسی رابطه بین جهان-محلی شدن با [Investigating the relationship between localization world and individualism and collectivism (Case study: Students of Yazd University)]. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 11(30)*, 119-147.
34. Zarghami Hajebi, M., Kamalian, T., & Arjmand, S. (2017). مقایسه رضایت زناشویی [Comparing marital satisfaction in traditional and modern marriages among marries students of Tehran]. *Journal of Psychology, Sociology and Education, 1(2)*, 84-94.

References (In English)

1. Abdullah, H. S., Li, L. P., & David, A. P. V. (2011). Gender differences in mate selection criteria among Malaysian undergraduate students. *Sarjana, 26(2)*, 33-50.
2. Alavi, M., Alahdad, R., & Shafeq, S. M. (2014). Mate selection criteria among postgraduate students in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 5075-5080.
3. Bereczkei, T., Gyuris, P., & Weisfeld, G. E. (2004). Sexual imprinting in human mate choice. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 271*, 1129-1134.
4. Blekesaune, M., & Barrett, A. E. (2005). Marital dissolution and work disability: A longitudinal study of administrative data. *European Sociological Review, 21(3)*, 259-271.
5. Botwin, M. D., Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (2006). Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of personality, 65(1)*, 107-136.

6. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
7. Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 12(1), 1-14.
8. Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 12(1), 1-14.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Daneshpour, M., Asoodeh, M. H., Khalili, S., Lavasani, M. G., & Dadras, I. (2011). *Self-described happy couples and factors of successful marriage in Iran*. *Journal of Systematic Therapies*, 30(2), 43-64.
11. Edalati, A., & Redzuan, M. (2010). *Perception of women towards family values and their marital satisfaction*. *Journal of American Science*, 6(4), 132-137.
12. Francisca Sommer, C. J. (2015). Impact of culturally sensitive, competence-based marital education program on marital satisfaction, commitment and relationship competence in the Dutch Caribbean. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Montemorelos, Mexico.
13. Golareshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-607.
14. Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
15. Gustavsson, L. (2008). *Mixed Support for Sexual Selection Theories of Mate Preferences in the*
16. Gustavsson, L., Johnsson, J. I., & Uller, T. (2008). Mixed support for sexual selection theories of mate preferences in the Swedish population. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6(4), 575-585.
17. Gustavsson, L., Johnsson, J. I., & Uller, T. (2008). Mixed support for sexual selection theories of mate preferences in the Swedish population. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6(4), 575-585.
18. Hahlweg, K., Grawe-Gerber, M., & Baucom, D. H. (Eds.). (2010). *Enhancing couples: The shape of couple therapy to come*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe.
19. Khallad, Y. (2005). Mate selection in Jordan: Effects of sex, socio-economic status, and culture. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(2), 155-168.
20. Klohnen, E. C., & Mendelsohn, G. A. (1998). Partner selection for personality characteristics: A couple-centered approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(3), 268-278.
21. Maliki, A. E. (2009). Determinants of mate selection choice among University students in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, 2(2), 165-174.

22. Mo, W. (2007). The divorce culture and picture books for young children. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 39(2), 23-46.
23. Neustadter, S. (2011). *Transpersonal mate selection: An investigation of spiritual and extraordinary factors that influence the decision to marry one's partner*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, California, US.
24. Nickol, K., (2006). *The relationship between irrational beliefs and marital satisfaction*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Arizona University, US.
25. Onu, F. O., & Armstrong, M. P. (2013). The ideal man: An investigation into qualities that influences mate selection among female undergraduate students. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 3(1), 80-84.
26. Panda, U. K. (2011). Role conflict, stress and dual-career couples: An empirical study. *The Journal of Family Welfare*, 57(2), 63-82.
27. Robles, T. F., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (2003). The physiology of marriage: Pathways to health. *Physiology and behavior*, 79(3), 409-416.
28. Samani, S. (2007). Important criteria for spouse selection in a sample of Iranian youth. *Psychological Reports*, 100(1), 59-65.
29. Samani, S., & Ryan, B. A. (2008). Spouse selection: Important criteria and age preferences of an Iranian sample. *Psychological Reports*, 103(2), 535-544.
30. Shackelford, T. K., Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2005). Universal dimensions of human mate preferences. *Personality and individual differences*, 39(2), 447-458.
31. Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1992). Gender differences in mate selection criteria: Sociobiological or socioeconomic explanation?. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 13(2), 115-124.
32. Winch, R. F. (1967). Another look at the theory of complementary needs in mate-selection. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 29(4), 756-762.
33. Wyngarden, N. (2010). *Discrepancies between self-report and behavior in college woman: Is there truth to the "nice guy paradox?"*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Illinois University, Illinois, US.