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Abstract

Evolutionary and sociocultural models of mate preferences suggest that education might be an important consideration for men and women, but this research is characterized by several limitations warranting more research. In this experiment (N = 1306), we focused on the impact of relative levels of education on the desirability of potential long-term and short-term mates, while holding physical attractiveness constant, and also examining the potential moderating influence of interpersonal warmth. Both sexes preferred mates of equal education (compared to less or more), for both relationship durations, but particularly for long-term mates. Men found less educated and interpersonally cold targets more appealing in the short-term context. Overall, men found targets more appealing than women did across both mating contexts. Our results replicate and extend research on the role of partner's education in people's mate preferences.

1. Introduction

Considerable evidence suggests people value relationship partners who are intelligent or educated. Sapiosexuality has been identified as a trait predicting mate preferences for educated partners (Gignac, Darbyshire, & Ooi, 2018) and higher IQ or education leads to more desirability in self-report (Prokosch, Coss, Scheib, & Blozis, 2009), speed dating (Kurzban & Weeden, 2005), personal ads (Pawlowski & Koziol, 2002), and online dating studies (Lin & Lundquist, 2013). People may value education in their partners because it may reflect genetic quality (Miller, 2000) and competence in daily life (Lam & Kirby, 2002). In addition, when female partners have less education and the male partners have more education, they report greater relationship stability (Bereczkei & Csakny, 1996). However, some doubt has been cast on the importance of education in mate choice because it may reflect genetic quality (Miller, 2000) and competence in daily life (Lam & Kirby, 2002). In addition, when female partners have less education and the male partners have more education, they report greater relationship stability (Bereczkei & Csakny, 1996). However, some doubt has been cast on the importance of education in mate choice because it may reflect genetic quality (Miller, 2000) and competence in daily life (Lam & Kirby, 2002). When making mating decisions, people consider their ideals (Campbell, Simpson, Kashy, & Fletcher, 2001; Fletcher & Simpson, 2000; Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas, & Giles, 1999) and their dealbreakers (Jonason et al., 2015; Watson et al., 2004). People may engage (implicitly or explicitly) in a balancing of benefits and costs when evaluating with whom to date and have sex. It is likely the costs of dating someone less educated outweigh any benefits, leading to a generally limited desirability of such targets. Those who are more educated may possess a desirable quality but may pose ego threats and may have many other suitors, leading to little more appeal than a similarly educated partner (i.e., law of diminishing returns; Samuelson & Nordhaus, 2001). Partners who are similarly educated may represent an optimum balance of positives and negatives, making this partner the most

“intelligence” which has lay and scientific uses (Jonason et al., 2019), and may have limited ecological validity by focusing on IQ scores (Prokosch et al., 2009) and absolute as opposed to relative education (Townsend & Levy, 1996; Townsend & Roberts, 1993). In this study, we use the person-perception method to replicate, extend, and (hopefully) address these limitations to better reveal the importance of education in mate choice.

When making mating decisions, people consider their ideals (Campbell, Simpson, Kashy, & Fletcher, 2001; Fletcher & Simpson, 2000; Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas, & Giles, 1999) and their dealbreakers (Jonason et al., 2015; Watson et al., 2004). People may engage (implicitly or explicitly) in a balancing of benefits and costs when evaluating with whom to date and have sex. It is likely the costs of dating someone less educated outweigh any benefits, leading to a generally limited desirability of such targets. Those who are more educated may possess a desirable quality but may pose ego threats and may have many other suitors, leading to little more appeal than a similarly educated partner (i.e., law of diminishing returns; Samuelson & Nordhaus, 2001). Partners who are similarly educated may represent an optimum balance of positives and negatives, making this partner the most
desirable (Jonason et al., 2019; Lin & Lundquist, 2013) and explaining why homogamy leads to greater relationship stability (Buss, 1985). However, this pattern may depend on other key considerations.

There are observable sex differences and similarities in mate preferences. Two predominant paradigms have emerged to account for these sex differences, both with evidence to support their claims (see Li & Meltzer, 2015; Zentner & Eagly, 2015). Sociocultural theories suggest that sex differences are artifacts of gender stereotypes, patriarchal power systems, or structural/economic differences (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1999). In contrast, evolutionary theories suggest that sex differences are the result of recurrent selection pressures in the evolutionary past that reflect asymmetries in minimum obligation to offspring for the sexes (Kenrick, Groth, Trost, & Sadalla, 1993; Trivers, 1972). Whoever is right, a useful way to understand sex differences in mate preferences is to understand how the sexes make mating decisions in the short-term and long-term contexts (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). The level of investment people have in relationships should influence their decision-making. When both sexes invest heavily, as is the case for long-term relationships like marriage, both sexes have a vested interest in choosing a partner—who is high in value but also unlikely to abandon the relationship (avoiding sunk costs), therefore, men and women should both desire a long-term partner who has similar education as they do. In contrast, men and women do not invest equally in short-term relationships. Women are exposed to more risk at the social and sexual level (Koeln & Jonason, 2018) than men are which may lead women to be have short-term mate preferences that resemble their long-term preferences. In contrast, men are socially permitted more freedom to engage in casual sex than women are and have a lower minimum obligation to offspring, leading men to have short-term mate preferences that prioritize other traits than their partner's education. Men may be willing to lower their standards in level of education for a short-term mate because what they really care about in this context is physical attractiveness (Li & Kenrick, 2016). Therefore, we expect women's mate preferences for educated mates to be relatively less sensitive to mating context than men's are and that in the short-term context, men will desire a less educated partner as compared to the long-term context.

Mating decisions are not based on a single trait, but, instead, are the result of how several factors interact and are integrated (Jonason, Raulston, & Roto10, 2012; Li, Bailey, Kenrick, & Linsenmeier, 2002). Two important traits that we will consider are physical attractiveness and interpersonal warmth (Campbell et al., 2001; Fletcher et al., 1999). Physical attractiveness is an important quality for both sexes but only in so much as people typically desire to have a partner who is sufficiently appealing to them (Regan, Levin, Sprecher, Christopher, & Gate, 2000; Stewart, Stinnett, & Rosenfeld, 2000) and once that is reached, people begin focusing on other qualities (Jonason et al., 2019; Li & Kenrick, 2006). However, people may make stereotypical judgments of people's attractiveness based on target's level of education (e.g., halo effects) which would then lead to mate preferences based on those stereotypical judgments. Like inferred judgments of target's physical appearance, people may also infer judgments about their personality. In particular, people may make sex-specific inferences about how interpersonally warm someone is based on their education (Eckes, 2002; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Karbowski et al., 2016; Koenig & Eagly, 2014). Therefore, we hold the physical attractiveness of the target constant and manipulate levels of interpersonal warmth to better isolate the role of education in mate choice.

How do individual differences in relative education influence people's mating decisions? In this study we examine how self-referential differences in the education of targets influence the long-term and short-term desirability of mates in men and women. We improve on prior research by holding target's physical attractiveness constant and manipulating interpersonal warmth to better isolate the importance of this variable. We also improve on prior research through the use of experimental (albeit simple) methods in a large sample and add some degree of ecological validity by focusing on relative education over absolute IQ scores.

2 Method

2.1. Participants and procedure

The sample was comprised of 1306 American (52% female), online participants who were paid US$0.25 through Mechanical Turk. The average participant was 37.07 years old (SD = 12.09, Range = 18–87), European/white (74%), heterosexual (85%), in a committed relationship (71%), and had a Bachelor's degree as their highest level of education (41%). The necessary sample size (N* = 648) was determined by an *a priori* power analysis using G-power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), with an expected small effect (f) of 0.10 (e.g., Jonason et al., 2019; Pawlowski & Koziel, 2002), an alpha set at 0.05, and power set at 0.95. However, because of an unknown technical error with the service, we were able to get twice as many participants, leaving us with approximately 100 participants for each of the 12 cells. We include the full sample to maximize power.

Participants were informed of the nature and length (i.e., 5 min) of the study, completed a simple, between-subjects, person-perception study, a demographics survey of the aforementioned details, and, at the end, were thanked and debriefed. All participants (i.e., within-subjects) rated the (order randomized) long-term (e.g., marriage) and short-term term (e.g., a casual sex partner) desirability (1 = *Extremely Undesirable*; 5 = *Extremely Desirable*) for one gender-neutral (to control for sexual orientation effects) target who differed in relative education (i.e., less, equal, more; ≈33% each) and interpersonal warmth (i.e., not warm, warm; ≈50% each), but was “someone whom you find physically attractive.” Participants were instructed to answer the question as if they were interested in having a partner. This study was approved by the ethics committee at Western Sydney University (H10499) and data can be found at the Open Science Foundation (https://osf.io/w6grs).

3. Results

A mixed-model ANOVA with a 2 (participant's sex) × 3 (relative education) × 2 (interpersonal warmth) × 2 (mating context) design was tested. We summarize the lower-order effects and include the descriptive statistics in Table 1 (i.e., short-term relationships) and Table 2 (i.e., long-term relationships). We found no four-way interaction (F[2, 1290] = 1.50, p = .22, η_p^2 < .01) and no three-way interaction between mating context, agreeableness, and sex (F[1, 1290] = 1.27, p = .26, η_p^2 < .01) or mating context, relative education, and sex (F[2, 1290] = 0.59, p = .56, η_p^2 < .01). We did, however, find two other three-way interactions.

The first of these interactions was between mating context, agreeableness, and relative education (F[2, 1290] = 6.51, p < .001, η_p^2 = .01) and reflected two significant two-way interactions and a lack of one between mating context and sex (F[1, 1290] = 0.57, p = .45, η_p^2 < .01). There was a significant two-way interaction between mating context and agreeableness (F[2, 1290] = 134.94, p < .001, η_p^2 = 0.10), such that (see Fig. 1) people found disagreeable mates more appealing in the short-term than the long-term (t [647] = 9.31, p < .001) whereas the agreeable target was more desirable in the long-term than the short-term (t[657] = −6.93, p < .001). There was a significant interaction between mating context and relative education (F[2, 1290] = 15.30, p < .001, η_p^2 = 0.02),

---

1 Four participants who failed to identify as “male” or “female” were excluded from analyses.

2 ANCOVAs revealed that our effects were invariant to the level of education and relationship status of the participants. Therefore, results were reported without taking them into account further.
such that (see Fig. 2) targets who were less educated were more desirable in short-term mating (STM) and long-term mating (LTM) contexts. Error bars represent the standard error of the means.

In addition, there were several additional main effects worth reporting. People found the targets more desirable for a short-term than a long-term relationship (F(1, 1302) = 4.56, p < .04, ηp² = 0.01), probably because targets were described as physically attractive. People found agreeable (M = 3.88, SD = 0.83) targets more desirable than disagreeable targets (M = 3.12, SD = 0.91), regardless of mating context (F(1, 1290) = 256.88, p < .001, ηp² = 0.17). Equal education (M = 3.65, SD = 0.91) was the most desirable, followed by higher relative education (M = 3.52, SD = 0.95), and lower relative (M = 3.34, SD = 0.97) education respectively (F(2, 1290) = 13.87, p < .001, ηp² = 0.02) regardless of mating context. Men (M = 3.61, SD = 0.86) found targets more desirable than women did (M = 3.40, SD = 1.02) across both contexts (F(1, 1290) = 22.78, p < .001, ηp² = 0.02).
We cannot say the online method completely eliminates this problem because men may prioritize physical attractiveness over kindness in short-term mates (Li et al., 2002; Li & Kenrick, 2006), and what we found is replicating this.

4.1. Limitations and conclusions

Despite the methodological strengths of our study, it was limited in several ways. First, while we touched upon three traits, these are a fraction of all the traits people integrate to understand mate choice. However, integrating more than three traits into an experimental paradigm may lead to uninterpretable, higher-order interactions. Second, despite the large sample size, there is a markedly small amount of variance being accounted for by education level, in particular. This suggests that while interesting, it is not all that important—statistically speaking—of a consideration in mate choice.

Third, we suffer, like most relationship research does, from only sampling from a W.E.I.R.D. (i.e., Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) population. Future research will need to test the cross-cultural robustness of our effects because there are surely places where formal education means little to people (e.g., tribal societies).

Fourth, there may be individual differences beyond sex differences that help to elucidate the psychological mechanisms behind our effects like sociosexuality (Schmitt, 2005), mate value (Jonason et al., 2015), and propinquity (Jonason, Noland, & Tyler, 2017). Last, although we tried to improve on the ecological validity of some of the experimental work on this topic, we still had participants make hypothetical judgments. Such judgments have been criticized as potentially not resembling actual mate choice (Eastwick & Finkel, 2008) but other evidence suggests that hypothetical judgments and actual mate choices are similar (Li et al., 2013).

As people spend more and more time getting educated, this trait may become more and more salient in people’s mate choices. While some research exists on this topic, we wanted to address some limitations in that area (e.g., correlational v. experimental methods; absolute v. relative judgments). We revealed that women appear to value education across context more consistently than men do, but both sexes want a similarly educated partner in the long-term whereas men found less educated (physically attractive) partners more desirable as a sex partner.
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