

**PREFERRED OCCUPATIONS IN MATE SELECTION: A STUDY OF STUDENTS
IN TWO SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES**

By

GUGU ZONDI

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Bachelor of Social Sciences Psychology (Masters) Degree
in the Discipline of Psychology, School of Applied Human Sciences,
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus.**

January 2016

Supervisor: Professor Augustine Nwoye

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work. All citations and references used through the study have been acknowledged accordingly.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Gugu Zondi

I confirm that the work reported in this project was carried out by the above named candidate under my supervision.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the Lord Jesus Christ for giving me strength and courage and never failing me in my life, and for guiding me in every stage until the completion of the current study.

I would like to appreciate the following people for their contribution in this current study:

Firstly my supervisor, Professor Augustine Nwoye, for providing me with necessary guidance and constructive feedback regarding my thesis.

My mother and family members for their support, comfort and encouragement.

All people that participated in the current study by taking their time out of their busy schedules.

Abstract

Marriage is one of the most significant aspirations in life. It is believed that marriage continues to be highly valued and most young people aspire to be married (Sussman et al., 2013). In fact a study by Beguy (2011) stated that marriage has become important for most young people. This is not unique to Africa and is found in Europe and Asia (Nugent, 2006).

Studies have shown various reasons that influence people to get married. When making a decision in a potential marriage partner, people have several factors put into consideration such as; complementing each other, attraction to one another and occupational preference (Kendall, 2015). Occupational preference is a factor that individuals consider in spouse selection which has been studied (Malik, 2009). Although, research has been conducted in this area, the researcher found no study which looked at the students' perspective. The current study was conducted to explore the occupational preferences of South African students from the University of KwaZulu-Natal and Durban University of Technology students in mate selection. The current study aimed to identify the most preferred occupations in mate selection among students and therefore by default, the least preferred or rejected occupations among the university students.

To guide the study, a number of research questions were formulated. A total of 200 university students, including undergraduate and postgraduate students (100 students from UKZN and 100 students from DUT) participated in the study. A self-developed occupational preference questionnaire was used to collect data. Descriptive statistics (including frequency calculations and rank ordering of the data) were used in analysing the data collected. The results show that a total of five occupations were the Most Preferred (MP) among the participants. These were in the following order: engineer, bank accountant, chartered accountant, medical doctor and bank manager. Most of the occupations were under the category of Can Consider (CC) and some of these were marketing manager, farmer, lawyer and gynaecologist. The results also revealed that four occupations were rejected by the students. These occupations were taxi driver, gardener, cleaner and security guard. Therefore, this could mean that students will not prefer mates in such occupations. Also indicated in the results were the gender differences between male and female, with regards to their occupational preferences. The

implications of the findings of the present study were reviewed and some of the limitations of the study were highlighted, as well as recommendations for furthering other studies.

Table of Contents

TITLE	i
Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Purpose of the Study	2
1.4 Objectives of the Study	3
1.5 Research Questions	3
1.6 Significance of the Study	4
1.7 Assumptions/Prospective Hypotheses of the Study	4
1.8 Scope and Delimitations of the Study.....	4
1.9 Operational Definition of Terms	5
1.10 Summary and Overview of the Study	6
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Theoretical Review of the Literature	7
2.2.1 The homogamy theory.....	7
2.2.2 The heterogamy theory.....	8
2.2.3 The complementary needs theory.....	9
2.2.4 The exchange theory.....	9
2.2.5 Social learning theory.....	10

2.2.6 Social role theory	10
2.2.7 Evolutionary theory	11
2.3 Review of Foreign Empirical Literature	12
2.3.1 Preferred occupations in mate selection.	12
2.3.2 Mate selection and level of education	13
2.3.3 Sex differences.	13
2.4 Reasons Influencing Students' Preferences	17
2.4.1 Socio-economic status.	17
2.5 Summary and Synthesis of the Review	19
2.6 Research/Operational Hypotheses.....	19
2.7 Conceptual Framework	20
2.8 Summary	21
CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	22
3.1 Introduction	22
3.2 Design of the Study	22
3.2.1 Research design.	22
3.2.2 Focus groups.....	22
3.3 Location of Study.....	23
3.4 Study Population	23
3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size	23
3.5.1 Recruitment.	24
3.6 Research Instruments: Occupational Preference Inventory (OPI)	24
3.6.1 Reliability and validity	26
3.7 Data Analysis	27
3.8 Ethical Considerations.....	28
3.8.1 Permission from relevant authorities.....	28

3.8.2 Informed consent.....	28
3.8.3 Anonymity and confidentiality.....	28
3.8.4 Privacy.....	29
3.8.5 Protection of participants from harm.....	29
3.8.6 Deception.....	29
3.8.7 Storage and dissemination.....	29
3.8.8 Incentives.....	29
3.9 Summary.....	30
CHAPTER 4: Results of the Study.....	31
4.1 Introduction.....	31
4.2 Research Question One.....	31
Table 1: Students' occupational preferences in mate selection.....	32
Table 2: Ranking of the various occupations in the mate selection preferences of University of KwaZulu-Natal students.....	43
4.3 Research Question Two.....	45
Table 3: Rank order of occupations in the mate selection preferences of male university students.....	46
Table 4: Rank order of occupations in the mate selection preferences of female university students.....	48
Table 5: Top 10 positively rated occupations in mate selection by the students studied.....	51
Table 6: Top ten highly rejected occupations in the mate selection considerations of the students studied.....	51
4.4 Qualitative Analysis of Data.....	52
4.4.1 Females prefer marital spouses in occupations that are of a high financial status.....	52
4.4.2 High earning occupations chosen by males.....	53
4.5 The Occupations Students Will Consider in their Choice of a Mate.....	54
4.5.1 Occupations females will consider.....	54

4.5.2 Occupations males will consider	54
4.6 Occupations Students Least Prefer in their Choice of a Mate.....	55
4.6.1 Occupations female students least prefer.	55
4.6.2 Occupations male students least prefer.	56
4.7 The Occupations Students Will Reject in their Choice of a Spouse	57
4.7.1 Occupations females will reject.....	57
4.7.2 Females interest in intelligent males	57
4.7.3 Occupations males will reject.....	58
4.7.4 Males view of low income occupations.	58
4.7.5 Males view of females in low status jobs.....	58
4.8 Reasons for Occupational Preferences in Mate Selection.....	58
4.8.1 Importance of financial status in a partner	59
4.8.2 Females prefer men who can be providers for their family.....	59
4.8.3 An educated spouse means high earning potential	59
4.8.4 Men preferred a spouse with an occupation requiring flexible working hours	60
4.8.5 Men love to be with partners who can assist.....	60
4.8.6 Financial stability is important for both partners.....	60
Table 7: Summary of male and female reasons of occupational preferences in mate selection.....	61
4.9 Conclusion.....	61
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion	63
5.1 Introduction	63
5.2 Discussion of Results	63
5.2.1 Research question one.	63
5.2.2 Research question two.	65
5.2.3. Research question three.	67

5.2.4 Research question four.	71
5.3 Summary and Implications of the Study	75
5.4 Limitations of the Study	76
5.5 Recommendations for Further Research	76
REFERENCES	78
Appendices.....	90
Appendix 1 Informed consent	90
Appendix 2 Audio consent	92
Appendix 3 Directions	93
Appendix 4 Focus group questionnaire.....	97
Appendix 5 Letter to authorities.....	98
Appendix 6 Ethical clearance letter.....	93
Appendix 7 Gatekeeper Approval letter.....	94
Appendix 8 Gatekeeper Approval letter.....	95

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In all human societies, across the centuries, behavioural differences based on a person's gender have emerged as the norm. In non-Western societies, in particular, a settled pattern of roles for males and females have persisted (Arnesen, 2006). In this way, although some variations can be observed, the general tendency in most African societies is that boys are socialised to direct their attention to the outer sphere characterised by career aspirations and political interests (Ferguson & Iturbide, 2013). On the other hand, the socialisation of girls in these societies has focused on the inner space of existence where family, domestic matters and child-care concerns are ranked most highly (Richardson & Simpson, 1983). In recent years the content and context of the socialisation of the African child have drastically changed in many ethnic communities in Africa such as Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and here in South Africa. According to Sandhya (2013) females of our species are devoted to providing for their children since they can only reproduce once in nine months. Males, however, they can have children with many different partners quicker, therefore reducing their natural instinct toward high parental care compared with women (Hancock, in Sandhya, 2002). Women often choose their mates based on the ability to provide a high level of parental investment; and what the male will be able to provide for the offspring when the child is born (George & Hancock, 2002). Hancock argued that a study done by David Buss showed that in every culture, females placed more importance than males on financial prospects (George & Hancock, 2002).

It is important to explore any truth to the assumptions that a woman's goal in marriage is to have a man who will support her financially, and that men are interested in a woman's physical attractiveness, and whether these traditional trends have changed over the years among young females and males. Intrigued by the latter assumptions is the theory stating that gender differences were evident in mate preferences in occupation and social economic status. Relatives in previous males showed desire in socioeconomic status more essential than females (Doosje, Rojahn & Fischer, 1999 in Saunders, Kurko, Barlow & Crane, 2011).

South (1991) argued that in marriage, males were less worried about good earning capacity than females. South (1991, in Malik, 2011) continued to state that females would not compromise their preference of good earning capacity. Therefore females were not likely to marry a male whose income was lower and who had a non-stable job (South, 1991).

The current study aimed to explore issues such as which criteria women use when approached by several men in making a decision on their future mate. This research further sought insight into the possibility that some occupations are more popular than others. This could be another characteristic that females use when selecting a mate.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Generally people have assumptions that one is more likely to secure better chances in the future with a partner as a result of one's occupation. It is often assumed that individuals in high educational courses or high earning occupations are often most favoured in mate selection than those in low earning occupations. For example, the assumptions are that women will often choose to be with men that are in occupations such as medical doctors, business and in management positions to provide financial security for them and their offspring. Likewise, with men it is assumed that in mate selection they will tend to avoid women in occupations such as medical doctors and chartered accountants because these occupations may be seen as time consuming and will not allow the women to perform their duties as wives. These may just be assumptions which need to be explored using real data to prove their existence. However, a study with this focus does not exist in South Africa. Foreign studies have been attempted but there is a gap in this focus locally. Therefore, the main emphasis of the present study is to work at gaining data of preferred occupations in mate selection of students from two South African universities.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The study was aimed at finding out if there are significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection. The essence was to determine the extent to which university students in South Africa (the future leaders of the nation) are embracing social changes, as can be measured from their views in the context of mate selection considerations.

A positive response in this regard, if there are significant gender differences, will lead to conflicting role expectations, and inability to meet partner's expectations in those concerned. In that case premarital counselling in South Africa should focus on how the changing landscape of the professional world, especially the entry of more women into the job market, will affect marital relations of South African young men and women.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The key objectives of the study were:

To determine the leading or most preferred occupations in mate selection among South African university students.

To identify the least preferred or rejected occupations in mate selection by South African university male and female students.

To find out if there are any significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection

To determine students' reasons for their occupational preferences in mate selection.

1.5 Research Questions

1. Which are the leading or most preferred occupations in mate selection among South African university male and female students?

2. Which occupations are least preferred or rejected in mate selection by South African university male and female students?

Are there any significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection?

What reasons do the students give in support of their occupational preferences in mate selection?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The divorce rate is high and has increased to 28% in South Africa (Baker, 2013). This is caused by different factors. One of the factors that could lead to unhappy marriages is wrong mate selection. This phenomenon of wrong mate selection will continue to challenge marriage counsellors. The current study aimed to explore one of the factors that are instrumental in mate selection. Secondly, the current study aimed to provide counsellors with some understanding of mate selection strategies in order to equip them in assisting clients, especially in couple's therapy. It is important to know the perceptions of university students towards choosing partners and understand the criteria they use to select a future spouse. Thirdly, the study should contribute in forecasting the behaviour of the next generation of couples who are still at university. It would help to understand a significant trend among students. This will lead to the provision of public education regarding the criteria for mate selection. The present study is useful as there is a scarcity of studies relating to occupational preferences in mate selection, mainly in South Africa, whereas other characteristics such as education in mate selection have been explored.

1.7 Assumptions/Prospective Hypotheses of the Study

The following assumptions were made in the current study:

People have occupational preferences in their mate selection considerations. If contacted they will be ready to share these preferences.

Occupations do not have equal preference among people. Some have higher preference than others and some are rejected outright.

Male and female students have differences in their occupational preferences.

1.8 Scope and Delimitations of the Study

The present study focused only on occupational preferences in mate selection to explore possible trends in the criteria university students use in this regard. As there are many fields of study, some occupations may be more preferred than others in selecting a mate. The study focused on two universities in South Africa in order to have a comparison. The two universities allow this topic to be explored using a variety of students. The study was specific

in terms of using a sample that excludes married persons due to the nature of the research topic. The aim was to explore how each person makes decisions in mate selection before entering into a potential relationship. The study explored preferred occupations in mate selection among university students if given the choice.

1.9 Operational Definition of Terms

In the current study, the following terms are operationally defined thus:

Mate selection: this is the process of choosing an appropriate partner for reproduction within a population. It is the selection of a mate depending on the desirability of his or her characteristics (Balthazart & Young, 2015).

Occupational preference in mate selection: this refers to the occupations that are most likely to be favoured in the choice of a future spouse.

South African university students: this refers to university students that are originally from South Africa. These are students currently occupying universities in South Africa.

Homogamy: this concept refers to a marriage between individuals who are similar to each other. The similarity between these individuals could be based on factors such as ethnicity, religion or socio-economic status (Sterbova, 2012). Homogamy usually refers to marriage between partners of the same social group (Birkelund & Hildel, 2003).

Monogamy: is defined as the practice of marrying or state of being married to one person at a time (Northrup, 2006). In agreement with this, monogamy is also stated to be a form of relationship in which an individual only has one partner or spouse at once in their lifetime (Hooper, 2008).

1.10 Summary and Overview of the Study

In this chapter, the background and point of departure for the study have been highlighted, followed by the statement problem of the study and the purpose of the study. Chapter two deals with the review of literature related to the topic of the present study, covering a number of important mate selection theories as well as empirical studies conducted by previous investigators on the subject of mate selection preferences. The third chapter is concerned with the study's methodology, instrumentation and techniques of data analyses. Chapter four presents the results of the study while chapter five presents the discussion and interpretation of the findings of the study, together with implications, conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This section explores previous literature in mate selection and reviews mate selection theories, empirical literature (foreign and local studies) on preferred occupations in mate selection among university students.

2.2 Theoretical Review of the Literature

2.2.1 The homogamy theory

Homogamy theory of mate selection states that in the context of mate selection, people tend to be attracted to and become involved with those who are similar to them in age, race, religion, and social class characteristics (Hattori, 2013). This theory implies that the more couples have in common, the higher the chances for them to prefer to select one another in mate selection. Other researchers state that homogamy theory is the tendency for mates and spouses to pair with someone of similar attraction, background, interest and even needs (Gyuris, Jarai & Bereczkei, 2010). Homogamy can also be seen as being in favour of long-term relationships due to the likelihood of causing less disagreements and discord in the everyday life of couples.

The concept of homogamy applies to age, educational background, physical attractiveness, intelligence and demographic factors such as religion, ethnicity and social class (Fu & Heaton, 2008). In addition, most individuals tend to choose a partner that is similar in age, religion, socio-economic status and even intelligence (Knox, 2015). Furthermore, the reason people choose a similar partner is because they are more likely to have complementary ideas. The social circles of people are mainly influenced by their religion, class, and ethnic group which make them more likely to meet and fall in love with people who are similar to themselves (Hattori, 2013).

In addition, homogamy is a concept of marriage between individuals, who are, in some culturally significant way, alike to one another (Blackwell & Litcher, 2004). The similarity of

the mates may be based on their ethnicity, religion or socio-economic status or in the context of the present study, their occupations. Homogamy in mate selection further explains that people have a tendency to marry mates or to desire potential mates within their social group (Blackwell & Litcher, 2004).

2.2.2 The heterogamy theory

Heterogamy refers to partnership or marriage between mates with principal traits that differ from that of the other mate or spouse (Merryman, 2006). Other views state that heterogamy in mate selection is the practice of dating and marrying dissimilar others (Blackwell & Litcher, 2004). Heterogamy is more prominent among people living in a multicultural society since they are more likely to marry outside their religion and race (Suhaimi et al., 2007). When someone leaves home or his country, this increases the likelihood of marrying a person from a different religion, race or other demographic group. Furthermore, moving away usually broadens the choice of potential partners, while the number of within-group choices are relatively small (Suhaimi et al., 2007). Heterogamy also refers to a person's conscious or unconscious tendency to select a mate with personal characteristics that differ from their own (Onu & Armstrong, 2013).

In most societies, there is an unspoken rule which defines potential mates as socially acceptable or unacceptable (Bergad & Klein, 2010). There exist two differentiated norms termed endogamy and exogamy. Endogamy specifies the groups within which a spouse must be found and prohibits marriage with others. For instance, many people are expected to marry within their own racial, ethnic, or religious group and are prohibited from marrying anyone outside the group (Bergad & Klein, 2010). This practice is common in most societies in Nigeria. The Igbos prohibit marriage between a free born and an Osu (outcast).

2.2.3 Exogamy theory

Exogamy is the situation where mate selection requirements are outside certain groups, such as from their own family or certain kinfolk (Knox & Schatch, 2014). Virtually all societies prohibit sexual relationships between certain culturally specific relatives (Kornblum, 2011). The taboo means that individuals are advised to marry individuals who are outside the

nuclear family, i.e. not their siblings or even the first cousin and other close relatives. Race, religion and ethnicity are influential factors in mate selection, especially in African countries, and especially in Nigeria (Orisaremi & Alubo, 2012); the multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-linguistic nature of African societies is critical in understanding the dynamics associated with mate selection. With the increase in inter-group (ethno-religious and ethno-political) hostilities and most recently the Boko Haram crisis, mate selection is influenced by these factors of religion, ethnicity and race (Orisaremi & Alubo, 2012). Even the choice of where to live is greatly influenced by these factors. According to the exogamy theory it states that although we may not totally surround ourselves with a “gallery of resemblance” we do seek out and establish relationships with individuals who are similar to us in personality and cultural interests (Onu & Armstrong, 2013).

2.2.4 The complementary needs theory

The complementary needs theory states that individuals tend to select mates whose needs are opposite and complementary to one’s own. Men and women choose a partner based on a complementary exchange to fulfil their needs (Surra & Boetler, 2013). Furthermore, unlike social homogamy theory, which emphasises similarity, the complementary theory states that people choose to marry those who differ from themselves and who they believe will complement their psychological needs (Sterbova & Valentova, 2012). For example, the complementary needs theory would indicate that a shy person is more likely to marry someone who is more sociable.

2.2.5 The exchange theory

The exchange theory is based more on what a person wants in the relationship rather than what is ideal. It also highlights the idea that everyone within a society will find a mate because people are attracted to different people. Therefore, most individuals are not looking for the same ideal mate. One form of exchange theory suggests that men with high status and good financial potential should be involved with women of physical attractiveness (Rosenfeld, 2005). This kind of combination between these individuals is meant to reflect an exchange of a man’s economic resources for the woman’s beauty (Rosenfeld, 2005). In addition, the interest in exchange and matching (assortative mating) in mate selection suggests that gendered exchange occurs where the women trades her looks for a man’s high-

status, without testing if a man possibly uses handsomeness to attract a woman of high-status (American Sociological Review, 2014).

2.2.6 Social learning theory

The social learning theory argues that mate preferences occur as a result of social and cultural factors through learning, socialisation and positive reinforcement of steady role behaviour (Lam Le, 2004). In contrast, the social role theory states that gender differences are mainly due to socialisation processes, in that as children develop they begin to imitate and learn social roles by observing adults of the same gender as themselves and they receive much positive reinforcement from the adult for regular gender behaviour (Lam Le, 2004). As children grow up to become adults they endorse this consistent gender behaviour therefore grooming their own children to imitate the same social roles (Kabeta & Gebremeskel, 2013). This appears to explain the reason why most men tend to end up in high status-income occupations while in the past women did not desire to be in high status-income occupations (Kabeta & Gebremeskel, 2013). For instance, in traditional families where men are held responsible for providing financial resources for their families, women were held responsible for domestic and childrearing responsibilities; an experience that leads to a high preference for these characteristics to do these duties (Casper & Bianchi, 2002).

In line with this hypothesis, it would be expected that male students in the current study would prefer women in non-high income, but service-based occupations, while female students would be expected to go for mates in high income generating occupations in their mate selection considerations. The current study aimed to determine whether these expectations would be corroborated.

2.2.7 Social role theory

Social role theory has been used in order to understand and describe the nature of mate selection (Forde, 2011). Social role theorists state that individuals develop expectations for their own and other's behaviour as a result of their beliefs about what they consider to be appropriate characteristics and actions of each sex (Regan, 2008). These beliefs stem from the idea of men and women adopting or being accustomed to different social roles. For

instance, with men the role involves occupational and economic resources, while for women the role entails being domestic (Regan, 2008). This has existed to the point where people assume others to behave in a manner which concurs with the sex-role stereotypes where for instance, traditionally males are characterised as having high earning occupations, ambition, strength and other traits related to being a man which are significant features that women admire when looking for potential partner (Jenson & Sineau, 2001, in International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family, 2003). On the contrary, females are characterised as being nurturing individuals, conscious of their physical appearance. These may be important characteristics for woman to be admired by males when looking for potential partner ((Jenson & Sineau, 2001, in International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family, 2003). Moss (2008) agreed with this view of social role theory as he also stated that social role theory represents the traditional stereotype regarding labour between women who are expected to carry out domestic duties at home, and men who are expected to focus on duties outside the home.

2.2.8 Evolutionary theory

Geary, Vigil and Byrd-Craven (2004) stated that the evolutionary perspective proposes that men more than women, regardless of cultural background, tend to seek physically attractive, younger mates. However, women generally prefer older men with resources and higher social status and value these criteria more highly than men. Geary et al. (2004) also stated that evolutionary theory shows a possible gender difference in mate selection. Age differences are known to be as a result of the sexes' 'inherited reproductive strategies'. Men would be more advantaged by choosing women who can still give birth to many children at a young age, while women would benefit by seeking older and loyal mates.

Both evolutionary and social-cultural theories have existed as explanations for sex differences in mate preferences (Lippa, 2007). Evolutionary theorists constantly use sexual selection theory as the main framework for analysing the origins of sex differences in mating strategies. Smith (2005) also agreed that the evolutionary theory states that men invest less in child rearing, both biologically and behaviourally, compared with women. Men are likely to father many young ones whereas women can only give birth to a few children. Smith (2005) continues to argue that men have evolved more of a "quantity" strategy in mating and reproduction while women have developed a more "quality" strategy. Men tend to be more

interested in casual sex than women are (Shoemaker, 2007). Men are said to be less committed in their sexual attitudes and behaviour, and they are particularly attracted to mates who are young and attractive (Shoemaker, 2007). In contrast, women have developed to be more selective in choosing mates (in mates' behavioural traits and mates' genetic capabilities) and also choose mates who can guarantee that their relatively few offspring are protected, provided for, and cared for in the long run (Lippa, 2007).

According to sexual selection theory women develop interest in men who have high status and resources and who are fully committed to those they love (Lippa, 2007). These observations suggest that in mate selection, male students would select a mate from social service occupations while women would like to select a mate from occupations that promise high income with which to attend to the children that result from the marriage.

2.3 Review of Foreign Empirical Literature

2.3.1 Preferred occupations in mate selection

The study by Abubakar (2002) investigated preferred occupations in mate selection among Kenyan university students and the reasons behind their preferences. Furthermore, it aimed to find out the extent to which variables such as gender, age, level of study, faculty, and religious affiliations would form a basis for their responses. The central idea was to critically analyse the counselling implications of the findings. The methodology used to collect data was a survey design. The participants consisted of 385 first and fourth year students from Kenyatta and Nairobi universities. Stratified sampling strategy was used to develop the sample of study. An occupational preference inventory was used to collect data. Both descriptive and statistical analyses were done. The t-test, ANOVA, and the Chi-square were done to test if there were any significant differences between variables. It was found that students had preferred occupations in mate selection and these occupations were "computer science", "pharmacy", "medicine" and "banking and finance" (Abubakar, 2002).

Another study assessed preferred occupations in mate selection among undergraduate students of two Kenyan universities (Tumuti, 2012). The study involved 403 undergraduate students enrolled in different faculties. Findings showed that students had preferred occupations in mate selection. The occupations which were most preferred by the students

included computer science, pharmacy, medicine, banking and finance. Occupations which were rejected by the students include: police, military, carpentry and fishing. Gender and individual course of study were the two variables that seemed to influence how students formed their preferences (Tumuti, 2012). Male students were less concerned about choosing an occupation because of its high earning potential, meanwhile female students preferred occupations of high income status. The low-status and earning occupations were rejected. Moreover, it was also found that variables such as gender, faculty and course of study had partial influence in the students' preferences. Students also had reasons for their choices of preferred occupations. The most common reason given by male students was the general favourable traits associated with an occupation. However, for female students, it was because "it pays well" (Abubakar, 2002).

2.3.2 Mate selection and level of education

Research suggests that undergraduate students were more likely to prefer partners who are university graduates than non-graduates even though male undergraduates have showed less importance in their preferred mates to be college graduates (Koehler, 2005). In contrast to this the study by The University of Iowa News Services (2009) suggests that men are also increasingly interested in an educated woman who has good financial prospect and less interested in chastity. In the past marriage was arranged and about women exercising domestic skills but at present men look for women who are intelligent and beautiful as they ranked in a high position 12 in the year 2008 in comparison to the year of 1939 which was 17. These results were consistent with the rise of educational and career opportunities for women and the growing desire to share the financial burdens with a future spouse (The University of Iowa News Services, 2009). Furthermore, occupations which women constantly show a preference for in mate selection include those of partners with professions of higher status and they assign greater worth to men who have more potential career orientation and are hardworking and driven (Malik, 2009).

2.3.3 Sex differences

The study of determinants of mate selection choice among university students in South zone of Nigeria was carried out by Malik (2009). The sample consisted of 1420 randomly selected undergraduates in South South zone of Nigeria. The sample included 907 male students and

512 female students, between the ages of 16-46 years ($M=38.89$, $SD =7.72$). The instrument used to collect data was a survey questionnaire. The findings of the study indicated that students consider character as the most important factor in their mate selection considerations. According to Malik (2009) educational background plays an essential part in future mate selection in most societies. In most surveys conducted, women are reported to prefer higher education and even mates with the same educational qualifications as theirs were preferred in mate selection. Furthermore, female graduates are found to prefer men that are more educated than themselves and in the study of Kalmijn (2005), undergraduates showed they desire university graduates with a more promising paying profession (Malik, 2009). In addition, the students' response indicated a preference for well-educated and appealing profession in potential mates (Todosijevic, Ljubinkovic & Arancic, 2003). It was predicted that female undergraduates are more likely to prefer partners who are university graduates than non-graduates. However, male undergraduates placed less importance in their preferred mates being college graduates (Koehler, 2005 in Malik, 2009). Secondly, parental influence has played a significant role in their children's mate selection in the past. They approve of who their children marry and go as far as arranging marriages for them. This is predominantly in developing countries (Koehler, 2005 in Malik, 2009). In addition, males place more value on domestic skills and females on good financial prospects, in fact cross culturally it is found that men, more than women, place greater value on physical attractiveness than the women would in their choice of a partner (Henry, Helm & Cruz, 2013).

Two studies on mate selection preferences in Germany and in the United States were conducted by Buss (1989). In the first study, (German sample $N = 343$; American sample $N = 313$) subjects ranked 13 potential mate characteristics on their desirability. Large and consistent sex differences were predicted and found within each country with respect to valuation of good earning capacity (females more) and physical attractiveness (males more). The largest cultural differences were found for being a good housekeeper, which was higher among German subjects, and physical attractiveness was more significant for American subjects. A second study was used to replicate the above study and extend the results. This was done by Buss (2001), with an expanded and more diverse sample of Germans ($N = 751$); and Americans ($N = 1137$). The findings showed that the basic sex differences within countries and cultural differences across sexes were robustly replicated and in both, Germany

and America, countries showed outstanding similarity in patterns of mating preferences across characteristics (Buss & Angleitner, 1989). These results seem to support the hypothesis that males seek as mates those females whose reproductive value appears to be high, and that females prefer mates whose resource potential is highly promising. Females, more than males, appear to value the mate characteristics of similar educational background, dependable character, emotional stability and maturity, desire for home and children, and education and intelligence. In contrast, males more than females value good cook and housekeeper and chastity in potential mates.

Another study replicated by Buss (2001) conducted an international survey of mate preferences for long-term relationships within an Arab Jordanian context. The study was conducted by Khallad (2005). It used a sample from an uncommonly studied Arab society, Jordan. The instrument used to collect data was a survey questionnaire. The findings showed that there are indeed sex differences in which male students desired good looks and younger potential mates than female students, who showed greater interest for mates who demonstrate economic ability and commitment (Khallad, 2005). The study also corroborated the casually observed social phenomenon of aversion to marrying divorcees among Jordanians, with men in this sample being particularly disinclined to seek this type of mate. The findings are discussed in the context of some evolutionary and sociocultural notions posited in explanations of mating behaviour. Furthermore, the study of sex differences in mate selection among college students at the time of the study were not in serious relationships, in their preferences women were the most demanding sex, meanwhile men continued to place great value on the physical attractiveness of their favoured potential partner than the women (Schwarz & Hassebrauck, 2012).

The study titled *Marriage Among the Migrant Kwawu Community in the Cape Coast Metropolitan Area of Ghana* was conducted by Acheampong (2010). It aimed to explore the marriage patterns of the Kwawu (mate selection). Current and related literature on marriage and migration were reviewed. All the Kwawu migrants living in the Cape Coast Metropolitan Area, who have attained 18 years served as the targeted sample for the study. Out of the 200 adults only 119 availed themselves for the study. Both primary and secondary data were used for the study. The primary data was obtained through interviews and focus group discussion.

The Kwawus are from the Eastern Region of Ghana. They are traditionally known to be people with good business insight which has an historical basis. They are also known for protecting and maintaining their culture wherever they have migrated to, and marriage and mate selection is one of them. It was expected that as people migrate to urban centres most of their traditional lifestyles change as a result of their exposure to people from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. However, it is perceived that the Kwawus continue to maintain their traditional style of marriage and mate selection. Therefore the Kwawus are perceived to be people who do not form relationships with people outside their culture. They would therefore be referred to as endogamous people (Acheampong, 2010). The study found that history, cultural beliefs, love, character, wealth, formal education and employment status were some of the major factors influencing the selection of mates among the Kwawus. In line with these findings, it was recommended that for family life in Ghana to be sustained, the cultural values and practices in marriage should not be overlooked. Mate selection should not be a matter of imposition but by personal choice or preference.

In a study titled *Sex Differences in Mate Selection Preferences* by Furnham (2009, in Furnham & McClelland, 2015), the sample consisted of 250 participants (110 male, mean age 22.23 years) who completed a five part, two page questionnaire about mate selection. They described themselves and their ideal partner in their own words by rating 14 desirable characteristics classified under five headings (ability, personality, physical, social and values), completed a short measure of the Big Five personality traits and specified various personal details (Furnham, 2009, in Furnham & McClelland, 2015). Females rated intelligence, stability, conscientiousness, height, education, social skills and political/religious compatibility more than males, while men focused highly on good looks. Findings indicated that sex, personality and ideology, were always related to mate preference. Political and religious compatibility was strongly correlated to participants' beliefs and values (Furnham, 2009). Furthermore, in a previous study conducted with a sample of (N=668) the study explored the preferences, in both sexes, for potential mates who have resources or money. In fact both sexes had preferences of a long-term mate who has earned his or her money above all the other sources (Jonason, Norman & Li, 2012). Women preferred mates who earned their money through other ways of obtaining their resources, for example, inheritance. The findings also showed that women sustained a high level of preference for mates who earned money not taking into consideration of the duration of the

relationship. However the men became less interested in a mate who earned their money within a short period in a relationship (Jonason, Norman & Li, 2012).

The above studies have all been mainly interested in two areas, namely sex differences and similarity preferences in mate attraction. The findings showed that women are more attracted to resources and males to the attractiveness of women, all of which led to some theoretical explanations (Furnham, 2009, in Furnham & McClelland, 2015). The sex-role socialisation hypothesis proposes that “comparative structural powerlessness” often leads people to marrying mates with a high socioeconomic status. However, men were said to be more likely to allow physical attractiveness to become the standard for measuring worth in exchange for service (Furnham, 2009, in Furnham & McClelland, 2015).

2.4 Reasons Influencing Students’ Preferences

2.4.1 Socio-economic status

Women are observed to prefer men who have high social status since it is a universal indication of the control of resources. Social status is seen by women to be of value because along with it are the associations of enhanced food, plenty of territory and better healthcare (Betzig, 1986). Having a man with high social status grants children better educational opportunities compared to families with men of low social status. Both men and women place value in dependability and stability, but more so for women than men. Dependability and stability assist in acquiring resources. For instance, if a man is stable he will be able to provide for his family constantly and will not strain his partner financially (Betzig, 1986). Previous studies show that unstable men can cause financial strain for their women (Hardie & Lucas, 2010). They tend to be self-centred, control shared resources, can be possessive and are dependant. Therefore there is a high chance that men with characteristics of dependability and emotional stability will not drain their mates’ resources (Betzig, 1986). Furthermore, this was corroborated as it has been stated that high social status and good earning prospect is of great preference in a partner (mate) because they ensure security of income needed to support children. The ideal mate for both males and females possess attributes of high social status and great financial stability, for instance, having a good paying job, good or expensive apartment, being successful and financially stable (Günaydin et al., 2013). Heterosexuals and

gay or lesbian persons favoured being in relationships with potential mates who have higher, rather than lower, social status and financial resources (Günaydin et al., 2013).

Many studies suggest that men and women will stress different characteristics when choosing a potential partner (Sandhya, 2013). The customs of American culture encourage men and women to select potential partners of a similar culture, religious background, socio-economic status, common values, age, education, ideal images and physical attractiveness. It suggests that people value socio-economic status as a projector of one's ability to provide for their young ones (Sandhya, 2013). The ability and willingness to provide resources are traits that have in the past been associated with high male value. In this instance males provide a range of resources for the female before, during and after she has produced children. These may include food, shelter and protection from other males. Female would have evolved preferences for males who had good financial prospects, were older than themselves, had higher social status, and who displayed hard working and industrious characters as these are clear signs of promising resource acquisition (Mamasan, 2005, in Malik, 2011).

Hatfield and Rapson (1996) in their study *Cross-Cultural Perspective of Love and Sex* found that women value more than men, marriage partners who possess status, who had good financial prospects and who are ambitious and industrious (Sandhya, 2013). Supporting this view Khallad (2007) also showed in his study that female college students show greater interest in positional marriage partners who exhibit economic ability and commitment (Sandhya, 2013). This finding further indicated that a woman's differential preferences for resources and commitment related attributes were mainly determined by socio-economic status.

The degree to which college stratification is related to marriage market outcomes of men and women can be explored by examining data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) (Arum et al., 2008). Individuals choose to be in relationships and remain in marriages only when this will enhance individual well-being (Arum et al., 2008). One way to optimise individual well-being in a relationship is to choose a partner who shares the same resources and abilities, complementing one's own (Hakim, 2010). In a society where men traditionally earned considerably more than women, this has resulted in significant gender differences in

marriage. Glass ceilings, occupational segregation, academic degrees in fields with lower income potential and the use of discrimination restricted women's employment opportunities and income in the past (Hakim, 2010).

2.5 Summary and Synthesis of the Review

According to the literature just reviewed most previous studies focused on exploring the theories of mate selection namely: homogamy, heterogamy, social learning, evolutionary, social role theory and other characteristics which have an effect on the choices made by men and women in the context of mate selection. In addition, most studies focused more on exploring the sex differences found in mate selection in which women preferred a mate with a higher educational level, higher prospective occupations, high socio-economic status and stability in mates, while men mainly preferred mates that are physically attractive and have more child-rearing potential. Other studies discovered that most individuals or university students have the tendency to select a mate of the same race, religion, social class, ethnic group, educational level, and age group. The majority of the studies also explored many other characteristics which influence the choices of potential mates. Thus for most students from foreign, rather than South African universities these characteristics include religion, sex differences, culture especially in arranged marriages, educational level, socio-economic background, age and ethnicity. Some of the literature reviewed focused on identifying reasons that influence people's choice in mate selection. The findings from such literature revealed that most of the reasons that influence people's mate selection decisions placed emphasis on high income and high status of the mate with most of these reasons coming from the female students studied. Based on the above, it would be expected that most females in the present study would select mates in high income and high status occupations, and would reject males from low income or non-promising occupations.

2.6 Research/Operational Hypotheses

The above review shows that there are male and female differences in their choices of occupations when selecting a marriage partner. It is therefore to be hypothesised that female students in the present study are likely to prefer mates in high earning occupations while male students are expected to prefer mates from social service and domestic occupations.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

The theoretical framework that was used in the current study includes the social role theory. The social role theory states that sex differences are due to the tendency of men and women to take on different social roles (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2003). Social role theory also suggests that men and women often take into account how certain characteristics will have an effect on marital, familial, and occupational roles that take on different responsibilities and obligations (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2003). Gender role beliefs are founded in a society's division of labour whereby individuals observe men and women engaging in different types of activities. Eagly and Wood (1999) pointed out how the division of responsibilities in society places pressure on the sexes (e.g. men as providers and women as homemakers) and this is a major determinant of the criteria that people look for in a potential mate. This could explain why men place importance in younger women having domestic skills. Meanwhile women place more importance than men on older age and earning potential. Furthermore, it argues that there are low gender differences, however it can also be argued that there is a decrease in the differences found in mate selection as a result of the increase in gender equality (Eagly & Wood, 1999).

Secondly, the social learning theory argues that mate preferences occur as a result of social and cultural factors through learning, socialisation and positive reinforcement of steady role behaviour (Lam Le, 2004). On the other hand, the social roles theory states that gender differences are mainly due to socialisation because as children develop they begin to imitate and learn social roles by observing adults of the same gender as themselves and they receive much positive reinforcement from the adult for regular gender behaviour (Lam Le, 2004). As children grow up to become adults they endorse these consistent gender behaviours therefore grooming their own children to imitate the same social roles. This might explain why most men tend to end up in high status and high income occupations while women end up in social service occupations like teaching and nursing. Buss and Barnes's (1986) "Structural Powerlessness Hypothesis" is also in line with the framework of the present study. As mentioned earlier in this report, it states that for many women in societies, the main path to gaining resources or benefiting from them is through marriage. Therefore in order to be materially fulfilled women have to select mates that can provide more than others wealth-wise (Lippa, 2007).

2.8 Summary

The above review has proved that mate selection issues have occupied the attention of many researchers both within and outside South Africa. Past research has shown that it is possible to determine the occupational preferences of male and female students in South Africa as was planned in the present study, using the structured mate selection questionnaire. Using a study instrument similar to some of the previous researchers, it was considered possible to determine the most preferred and rejected occupations in mate selections. In addition, reasons behind students' preferences in this regard, would also be explored.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will summarise the aims and research design of the study, sampling techniques and data collection methods. It will also consider the ethical issues involved in conducting the study and discuss the process of data collection and analysis.

3.2 Design of the Study

3.2.1 Research design. The current study adopted a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative research design. Quantitative research measures relationships between variables (Hopkins, 2008). Quantitative research measured university students' occupational preferences in mate selection. Qualitative design was used to investigate the reasons that influence students' preferences in mate selection. It was introduced to give in-depth information in the data collected (Hopkins, 2008). According to Babbie and Mouton (2005) qualitative research involves the following features: interaction with the participants who are the subjects of study; allows the selection of only a small group of people to be studied who are relevant to the study. Moreover, qualitative research attempts to understand the feelings, experiences, social situations or phenomena as they occur in the participant's real world (Kelly, 2006).

3.2.2 Focus groups

Focus group method was used to collect data in the form of words rather than numbers. Through this qualitative technique, the uniqueness of each participant's experience and understanding is recognised as a source of data (Mnyipika, 2014). Focus groups enable participants to have the liberty to disclose what they want to contribute to the discussion, the direction it will take, content and emotional tone of the discussion (Gorven, 2014). The advantage of using the focus groups method relates to its ability to obtain individual attitudes and beliefs as they produce a variety of perspectives and emotional reactions within a group setting and allow for the gathering of information within a short time, unlike individual interviews (Mnyipika, 2014). A focus group method was used to collect qualitative data from

participants in order to investigate the reasons that influence students' preferred occupations in mate selection.

3.3 Location of Study.

The study was located in two different universities situated in South Africa, namely the University of KwaZulu-Natal and Durban University of Technology, both of which are located in Pietermaritzburg.

3.4 Study Population

University students were selected for the purpose of the current study. In order to participate in the study the students had to be on campus and from either of the two universities, University of KwaZulu-Natal or Durban University of Technology, as well as being unmarried. To qualify to participate in the study the students had to be between the age ranges 18-25 because most students in universities are between these ages. It was decided to use students at the age of 18 and above because of ethical purposes and people are usually future focused at this age and more likely to be interested in pursuing relationships in future. In addition, they were also legally permitted to participate in research from this age and above. The sex of the students was important as the study needed this criterion to see if there are sex differences in students' mate selection preferences. The year of study was a criterion in the current study since undergraduates and postgraduates were participants consisting of (1st, 2nd, 3rd, honours and masters level). The study also aimed to include students of all races (White, African, Indian, and Coloured) as part of the demographics of the study.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

In total, 200 students participated in the study which was suitable for collecting quantitative data using the structured questionnaire method. One hundred participants were from UKZN and the other half was from DUT. All the participants were unmarried, and were currently studying different courses within their respective universities. Both male and female students took part in the study and it was the intention of the researcher to include both sexes equally. The average age of participants was 21.5 years. The average year of study for participants

was third year and the courses studied by the students included BSS, BCom, BSc, BTech and BA.

3.5.1 Recruitment.

Participants in the present study were introduced to this research at different lecture classes by the researcher. Since the participants were university students the researcher targeted potential undergraduate and postgraduate participants from different courses. The student participants were from commerce, social science and law studies from the first university (UKZN). Other participants were students from nursing studies, education, administration studies and engineering studies from the second university (DUT). The researcher went about the recruiting process by visiting various lecture rooms within the different faculties and explaining the purpose of the study to the students. The students were then given a chance to fill in the surveys voluntarily in the last few minutes of the lecture they were attending. This became a challenge because not every student approached in this way participated in the study. Therefore in order to obtain the proposed sample of 200 participants, some of the surveys were collected using convenient sampling by approaching some students during lunch times and some from their residences.

In order to collect qualitative data the students were given a sheet of paper with the researcher's contact details for those interested in being part of the focus group process. The details of venues and ethical considerations were briefly explained to them because of the nature of having other participants present in the discussions.

3.6 Research Instruments: Occupational Preference Inventory (OPI)

A total of 200 survey questionnaires, an adapted occupational preference inventory (OPI), were administered among the participating university students from both universities. The participants completed the questionnaire within five to ten minutes. The OPI was completed after the end of each lecture by each participant voluntarily in each lecture room that was permitted to the researcher. This questionnaire was designed using similar surveys found in the literature and aimed to explore the following:

1. Which are the leading occupations in mate selection among South African university students?
2. Which occupations are least preferred or rejected?

The OPI contained of a list of occupations (see appendix 3). Participants were requested to indicate using a tick in the appropriate column, the type of worker the participant will most prefer (MP), least prefer (LP), will reject (RJ) or can consider (CC) as a marital spouse if given the choice. To maintain confidentiality, the participants were not asked to write down their names on the survey sheet. The participants were only required to note their demographic details including year of study, marital status, course, ethnicity and sex which would not enable any link to the actual individual. The survey also contained a qualitative question which allowed for a brief explanation of what influences their preference of occupations in mate selection. This method was also used to guide the focus group discussion.

3.6.1 Focus groups

Two focus groups were used. One consisted of both male and female participants from UKZN, while the other participants were both male and female, from DUT. Each focus group consisted of eight participants. The focus group sessions lasted for approximately two hours each. One session was held in a room at the School of Psychology where privacy was maintained. The other session was held in a room within the DUT premises. The discussion was conducted in the form of a structured interview. A set of questions (see Appendix 4) was created to explore and investigate the research question and the reasons which influence students' preferences. The questions were: 1) Which occupations will you most prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage? 2) Which occupations will you least prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage? 3) Which occupations will you reject in your choice of a spouse for marriage? 4) Which occupations can you consider in your choice of a spouse for marriage? 5) What reasons do you have for your preferences?

3.6.2 Equipment

An audio recorder was used to record information during the focus group sessions. This was done in order to ensure the best quality of recording information. The audio information was converted to written verbatim by the researcher. Transcription conventions by Du Bois (2010) were used to aid the process of analysis and ensure the text was presented in the best possible way.

3.6.3 Reliability and validity

Reliability refers to whether a particular research technique will yield the same results if applied repeatedly to the same object (Lewis, 2009). Validity asks the extent to which a given study instrument measures precisely what it intends to measure (Borbasi, Jackson & Wilkes, 2005)). It is also about the degree to which the instrument measures what it claims to measure. To ensure validity in the present study, the draft instrument for data collection was first submitted to my supervisor, Prof. A. Nwoye for evaluation and feedback. The feedback from my supervisor on where the instrument needed improvement was then taken into account in working the final version of the instrument for the study.

Survey methodology and focus groups were used to collect data. A survey was used because it is a systematic method for gathering information from a sample, allowing quantitative descriptions of the characteristics of the population to which the sample belongs (Groves et al., 2011). A self-developed and administered Occupational Preference Inventory (OPI) was made in order to collect quantitative information for the present study. Babbie and Mouton (2005) explained that when conducting a focus group interview it only requires a small group size from six to eight participants, which will enable them to share their beliefs and reasons in the discussion. The advantages of using a focus group to collect data in the current study were that it is less time consuming while allowing more interaction about the topic of study. Also it discovers similarities and differences between participants' views (Babbie & Mouton, 2005) on the issue under study.

3.7 Data Analysis

The study used two form of analysis. A Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the quantitative data collected in the current study. The use of descriptive statistics, such as frequency tables and bar-graph trends, assisted to illustrate results.

The five steps of Terre-Blanche et al. (2006) were used to analyse the data. These steps included familiarisation, inducing themes, coding, elaboration and interpretation and checking. To analyse qualitative data the five steps of interpretive thematic analysis as identified by Terre Blanche et al. (2006) were used to “code” the reasons that influence occupational choices in the present study. Thematic analysis was used because it is a useful method in identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) of qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 7). This part entailed encoding information that requires an overt code, using several themes. The themes were used as clear information patterns that describe, organise and interpret aspects of the phenomenon of research (Boyatzis, 1998). It was flexible and described the themes of the data in-depth, interpreting the reasons which influence students’ occupational preferences in mate selection (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

During the first stage of data analysis the reading and rereading of the data was done in order to see what was supported by the data (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). The first step was familiarising oneself with the data. In this present study the data was re-read in order to see what was supported by the data in the search for meanings. The second step involved using what was said by the participants to generate codes and label themes (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). After the data was analysed, a list of ideas about what is in the data were coded, examined and categorised into groups of meaning which refer to the topic of study. In the third step the relevant data were coded under the themes (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). This worked in conjunction with the fourth stage as the raw information became less of a text and more of a way of grouping related issues, themes and codes (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). The last step involved producing the report and searching for reasons behind students’ occupational preferences in mate selection.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

3.8.1 Permission from relevant authorities

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the UKZN Ethics Committee. Upon receipt of ethical clearance, the recruitment of participants commenced.

3.8.2 Informed consent

The aims and objectives of the study were explained to the participants when they were personally approached in their lecture rooms and in the university rooms used for the focus groups before the discussions. This information was given verbally and in written form for the participants to keep, in case they needed any necessary contact details. The participants' informed consent was obtained by giving them a written information letter and consent form (Appendix 1) explaining clearly the aims and objectives of the study and what will be required of them, as well as the amount of time the study will take. The standard consent form consisted of the following: proposal of the study, routine change and any possible risk, assurance of voluntariness, notification that the candidate would be able to withdraw at any time and that the researcher will explain the form to the candidate. The form also indicated that there will be disclosure and should candidates wish to know the results of the study they could contact the researcher for information. It was carefully explained that audio devices would be used but confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained using pseudo-names. However, it will not be possible to give the participants a report of the whole research project due to financial restrictions.

3.8.3 Anonymity and confidentiality

Anonymity requires the protection and privacy of all research participants (Wassenaar, 2006). Anonymity was assured by instructing participants to place their completed survey questionnaire inside a box. The questionnaire required only details such as sex and age and no names were requested. In the focus group sessions, anonymity was maintained by allocating each participant a pseudo-name or code so that the researcher was unable to identify participants in the audio-taped discussion. Confidentiality refers to keeping information given by participants and the participant's personal information private and to

protect the identity of the participant (Wassenaar, 2006). In order for the proposed study to assure confidentiality, the participants' names were not written in the findings. Confidentiality was kept by using pseudo-names for each participant and their location. They were also given passwords. To protect privacy the venue was one in which the participants chose and felt comfortable in and which ensured fewer disturbances.

3.8.4 Privacy

The participants were invited to participate without invading their privacy. To protect privacy the venue was chosen by the participants. It was a place without any disturbances.

3.8.5 Protection of participants from harm

Due to the nature of the study, no potential harm to the participants was anticipated. However, to ensure that the participants were protected, each participant was notified that the study was voluntary. Pseudo-names were used for the focus group to avoid any link of personal information. The group members were requested to sign an information letter which requested information shared in the group is confidential.

3.8.6 Deception

There was no deception of participants as consent was sought. Participants gave consent to partake voluntarily in the research.

3.8.7 Storage and dissemination

The data collected in the current study was saved and stored in a safe lock by the researcher's supervisor and it will be safely locked in for five years.

3.8.8 Incentives

Refreshments were offered as appreciation for their time after the participants had completed the focus group.

3.9 Summary

This chapter summarised the aims and research design of the study, sampling techniques and data collection methods. It also considered the ethical issues involved in conducting the study and discussed the process of data collection and analysis.

CHAPTER 4: Results of the Study

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented. The chapter shows which of the occupations studied were the most preferred, and which ones were the least preferred or rejected. It also shows the significant gender differences in the preferred and rejected occupations among the participants. The results of the focus group discussion will also be presented which focused on identifying the reasons for students' occupational preferences in mate selection. The presentation of the results will be organised according to the order of the research questions investigated, as follows:

4.2 Research Question One

Which are the leading or most preferred occupations in mate selection among university students in South Africa?

Information relevant to this question is contained Table 1 and 2 below.

Key:

3.50-4.49= 4 -Most Preferred (MP)

3.50-3.49= 3-Can Consider (CC)

1.50-2.49= 2- Least Preferred (LP)

1.00-1.49= 1- Rejected (R)

Table 1: Students' occupational preferences in mate selection

Occupation	Sex	Location	Most prefer (4pts)	Could consider (3pts)	Least prefer (2pts)	Reject (1pts)	N	Total score	Mean
Lawyer	M	UKZN	8	14	13	6	41	106	2.58
		DUT	17	16	8	3	44	135	3.07
	F	UKZN	32	21	4	2	59	201	3.41
		DUT	23	19	9	5	56	172	3.07
	TOTAL						200	614	3.07
Dentist	M	UKZN	7	15	7	12	41	99	2.41
		DUT	17	12	9	6	44	128	2.91
	F	UKZN	30	17	7	5	59	190	3.22
		DUT	27	16	11	2	56	180	3.21
	TOTAL						200	597	2.99
Optometrist	M	UKZN	12	10	8	11	41	105	2.56
		DUT	14	15	10	5	44	126	2.86
	F	UKZN	26	20	7	6	59	184	3.12
		DUT	18	19	12	7	56	160	2.86
	TOTAL						200	575	2.88
Medical doctor	M	UKZN	14	13	6	8	41	115	2.8
		DUT	26	9	7	2	44	147	3.34
	F	UKZN	44	10	2	3	59	213	3.61
		DUT	34	11	8	3	56	188	3.36
	TOTAL						200	663	3.32
Pharmacist	M	UKZN	16	13	7	5	41	122	2.98
		DUT	13	16	9	6	44	128	2.91
	F	UKZN	24	20	8	7	59	179	3.03
		DUT	18	21	11	6	56	164	2.93
							200	593	2.97

Surveyor	M	UKZN	12	11	11	7	41	110	2.68
		DUT	23	9	8	4	44	139	3.16
	F	UKZN	27	20	3	9	59	183	3.1
		DUT	25	13	13	5	56	170	3.04
TOTAL						200	602	3.01	
Miner	M	UKZN	5	1	10	25	41	68	1.66
		DUT	6	10	16	12	44	98	2.23
	F	UKZN	4	11	18	26	59	111	1.88
		DUT	6	15	20	15	56	124	2.21
TOTAL						200	401	2.01	
Electrician	M	UKZN	9	8	9	16	41	94	2.29
		DUT	11	13	10	10	44	113	2.57
	F	UKZN	8	12	26	13	59	133	2.25
		DUT	6	9	18	23	56	110	1.96
TOTAL						200	450	2.25	
Engineer	M	UKZN	26	4	6	5	41	133	3.24
		DUT	37	0	5	2	44	160	3.64
	F	UKZN	45	6	3	5	59	209	3.54
		DUT	46	5	4	1	56	208	3.71
TOTAL						200	710	3.55	
Architect	M	UKZN	15	9	6	11	41	110	2.68
		DUT	16	12	9	7	44	125	2.84
	F	UKZN	21	15	5	18	59	157	2.66
		DUT	27	10	9	10	56	166	2.96
TOTAL						200	558	2.79	
Builder	M	UKZN	2	8	7	24	41	70	1.71
		DUT	5	11	16	12	44	97	2.21
	F	UKZN	18	3	8	30	59	127	2.15
		DUT	4	9	20	23	56	106	1.89
TOTAL						200	400	2	
Farmer	M	UKZN	7	16	8	10	41	102	2.49
		DUT	10	11	19	4	44	115	2.61
	F	UKZN	23	9	10	17	59	196	3.32
		DUT	28	17	5	6	56	202	3.61
TOTAL						200	615	3.08	

Carpenter	M	UKZN	4	7	9	21	41	76	1.85
		DUT	5	4	12	23	44	79	1.8
	F	UKZN	0	8	26	25	59	101	1.71
		DUT	0	3	16	37	56	134	2.4
TOTAL						200	390	1.95	
University lecturer	M	UKZN	18	12	4	7	41	123	3
		DUT	21	14	6	3	44	141	3.2
	F	UKZN	8	20	21	10	59	144	2.44
		DUT	15	26	7	8	56	160	2.86
TOTAL						200	568	2.84	
Secondary school teacher	M	UKZN	9	11	8	13	41	98	2.39
		DUT	8	12	14	10	44	98	2.23
	F	UKZN	14	5	20	20	59	131	2.22
		DUT	12	12	18	14	56	134	2.4
TOTAL						200	461	2.31	
Primary school teacher	M	UKZN	7	11	6	17	41	90	2.2
		DUT	8	12	16	8	44	100	2.27
	F	UKZN	9	6	23	21	59	121	2.05
		DUT	10	15	14	17	56	130	2.32
TOTAL						200	441	2.21	
Graduate teacher	M	UKZN	11	12	8	10	41	106	2.59
		DUT	9	11	18	6	44	111	2.52
	F	UKZN	12	8	18	21	59	129	2.19
		DUT	11	14	19	12	56	136	2.43
TOTAL						200	482	2.41	
Bank manager	M	UKZN	23	10	3	5	41	133	3.24
		DUT	24	12	3	5	44	143	3.25
	F	UKZN	26	22	7	4	59	188	3.19
		DUT	34	19	3	0	56	199	3.55
TOTAL						200	663	3.32	
Musician	M	UKZN	10	6	4	21	41	87	2.12
		DUT	12	15	10	7	44	120	2.73
	F	UKZN	11	6	16	26	59	120	2.03
		DUT	12	16	18	10	56	142	2.54
TOTAL						200	469	2.35	

Theatre artist	M	UKZN	3	6	10	22	41	72	1.76
		DUT	4	6	11	23	44	79	1.8
	F	UKZN	4	6	22	27	59	105	1.78
		DUT	6	7	19	24	56	107	1.91
TOTAL						200	363	1.81	
Actor	M	UKZN	3	5	9	24	41	69	1.68
		DUT	12	14	13	5	44	121	2.75
	F	UKZN	4	15	16	24	59	117	1.98
		DUT	14	16	20	6	56	150	2.68
TOTAL						200	457	2.29	
Dancer	M	UKZN	6	4	8	23	41	75	1.83
		DUT	5	5	20	14	44	89	2.03
	F	UKZN	2	9	19	29	59	102	1.73
		DUT	3	8	21	24	56	102	1.82
TOTAL						200	368	1.84	
Linguist	M	UKZN	7	6	10	18	41	84	2.05
		DUT	2	3	14	25	44	70	1.59
	F	UKZN	2	5	25	27	59	100	1.69
		DUT	3	4	20	29	56	93	1.66
TOTAL						200	347	1.74	
Gardener	M	UKZN	7	1	8	25	41	72	1.76
		DUT	0	3	17	24	44	67	1.52
	F	UKZN	0	1	7	51	59	68	1.15
		DUT	0	0	15	41	56	71	1.27
TOTAL						200	278	1.38	
Police Officer	M	UKZN	4	3	8	26	41	67	1.63
		DUT	9	12	11	12	44	106	2.41
	F	UKZN	5	7	13	34	59	101	1.71
		DUT	11	16	14	15	56	135	2.41
TOTAL						200	409	2.05	
Military personnel	M	UKZN	0	7	7	27	41	62	1.51
		DUT	6	16	13	9	44	107	2.43
	F	UKZN	5	5	25	24	59	109	1.85
		DUT	7	21	17	11	56	136	2.43
TOTAL						200	414	2.07	

Soldier	M	UKZN	2	3	4	32	41	57	1.39
		DUT	16	10	13	5	44	125	2.84
	F	UKZN	28	6	8	17	59	163	2.76
		DUT	21	11	17	7	56	158	2.82
	TOTAL						200	503	2.52
Salesperson	M	UKZN	9	12	13	7	41	105	2.56
		DUT	10	11	15	8	44	111	2.52
	F	UKZN	5	8	18	28	59	108	1.83
		DUT	12	14	20	10	56	140	2.5
	TOTAL						200	464	2.32
Lab technician	M	UKZN	13	18	6	4	41	122	2.98
		DUT	14	18	5	7	44	127	2.89
	F	UKZN	21	20	10	8	59	172	2.92
		DUT	18	15	14	9	56	154	2.75
	TOTAL						200	575	2.88
Nurse	M	UKZN	12	9	6	14	41	101	2.46
		DUT	15	16	8	5	44	129	2.93
	F	UKZN	3	13	19	24	59	100	1.69
		DUT	18	20	12	6	56	162	2.89
	TOTAL						200	492	2.46
Mechanic	M	UKZN	10	4	9	18	41	88	2.14
		DUT	5	9	14	16	44	91	2.07
	F	UKZN	10	7	13	29	59	116	1.97
		DUT	7	12	22	15	56	123	2.2
	TOTAL						200	418	2.09
Professional driver	M	UKZN	8	3	8	19	41	76	1.85
		DUT	2	6	15	21	44	77	1.75
	F	UKZN	2	3	22	32	59	93	1.58
		DUT	8	7	15	26	56	109	1.95
	TOTAL						200	355	1.78

Bank accountant	M	UKZN	29	5	5	2	41	143	3.49
		DUT	24	15	3	2	44	149	3.4
	F	UKZN	35	17	6	1	59	204	3.46
		DUT	34	15	5	2	56	193	3.45
	TOTAL						200	689	3.45
Psychologist	M	UKZN	14	12	8	8	41	116	2.83
		DUT	17	14	9	4	44	132	3
	F	UKZN	31	13	8	6	59	185	3.14
		DUT	23	18	9	6	56	170	3.04
	TOTAL						200	603	3.02
Entrepreneur	M	UKZN	27	7	4	3	41	140	3.41
		DUT	22	13	7	2	44	142	3.23
	F	UKZN	33	15	7	4	59	195	3.31
		DUT	30	15	6	5	56	182	3.25
	TOTAL						200	659	3.3
Security guard	M	UKZN	2	2	5	32	41	56	1.37
		DUT	3	2	3	36	44	60	1.36
	F	UKZN	1	2	4	52	59	70	1.19
		DUT	0	3	7	46	56	112	2
	TOTAL						200	298	1.49
Administrative officer	M	UKZN	13	11	6	11	41	108	2.63
		DUT	9	13	10	12	44	119	2.7
	F	UKZN	4	9	16	30	59	105	1.78
		DUT	13	13	15	15	56	136	2.43
	TOTAL						200	468	2.34
Clerk	M	UKZN	8	14	7	12	41	100	2.44
		DUT	7	12	16	9	44	105	2.39
	F	UKZN	3	6	28	22	59	108	1.83
		DUT	8	12	19	17	56	115	2.05
	TOTAL						200	428	2.14
School counsellor	M	UKZN	4	9	16	12	41	87	2.12
		DUT	7	14	15	8	44	108	2.45
	F	UKZN	2	15	22	20	59	117	1.98
		DUT	19	16	13	8	56	164	2.93
	TOTAL						200	476	2.38

Scientist	M	UKZN	15	11	3	12	41	111	2.71
		DUT	24	13	4	3	44	143	3.25
	F	UKZN	25	20	13	1	59	187	3.17
		DUT	30	16	6	4	56	184	3.3
TOTAL						200	625	3.13	
Financial officer	M	UKZN	20	12	3	6	41	128	3.12
		DUT	14	15	11	4	44	127	2.89
	F	UKZN	26	24	6	3	59	191	3.24
		DUT	19	20	11	6	56	164	2.93
TOTAL						200	610	3.05	
Therapist	M	UKZN	16	4	13	8	41	110	2.68
		DUT	11	10	9	14	44	106	2.41
	F	UKZN	9	18	8	24	59	129	2.19
		DUT	14	12	12	18	56	134	2.39
TOTAL						200	479	2.4	
Philosopher	M	UKZN	6	9	7	19	41	84	2.05
		DUT	3	5	15	21	44	78	1.77
	F	UKZN	8	12	18	21	59	127	2.15
		DUT	6	5	19	26	56	103	1.84
TOTAL						200	392	1.96	
Sociologist	M	UKZN	6	8	14	13	41	89	2.17
		DUT	5	9	13	17	44	90	2.05
	F	UKZN	15	10	11	23	59	135	2.29
		DUT	9	11	16	20	56	121	2.16
TOTAL						200	435	2.18	
Politician	M	UKZN	1	4	3	33	41	55	1.34
		DUT	17	14	7	6	44	130	2.95
	F	UKZN	20	4	6	29	59	133	2.25
		DUT	19	18	8	11	56	157	2.8
TOTAL						200	475	2.38	
Footballer	M	UKZN	12	3	4	22	41	87	2.12
		DUT	15	13	10	6	44	125	2.84
	F	UKZN	7	15	11	26	59	121	2.05
		DUT	20	24	4	8	56	168	3
TOTAL						200	501	2.51	

Sports coach	M	UKZN	8	10	10	13	41	87	2.12
		DUT	10	12	16	6	44	114	2.59
	F	UKZN	3	15	26	15	59	124	2.1
		DUT	30	15	4	7	56	180	3.21
	TOTAL						200	505	2.53
Biologist	M	UKZN	10	10	13	8	41	104	2.54
		DUT	13	16	11	4	44	126	2.86
	F	UKZN	14	11	17	17	59	140	2.37
		DUT	24	12	14	6	56	166	2.96
	TOTAL						200	536	2.68
Environmental scientist	M	UKZN	15	11	8	7	41	116	2.83
		DUT	13	15	12	4	44	125	2.84
	F	UKZN	20	19	17	3	59	174	2.95
		DUT	22	15	13	6	56	165	2.95
	TOTAL						200	580	2.9
Geologist	M	UKZN	16	5	11	9	41	110	2.68
		DUT	10	17	11	6	44	119	2.71
	F	UKZN	8	33	14	4	59	155	2.63
		DUT	14	21	14	7	56	154	2.75
	TOTAL						200	538	2.69
Climatologist	M	UKZN	14	7	8	12	41	105	2.56
		DUT	16	12	9	7	44	119	2.7
	F	UKZN	23	21	12	3	59	182	3.08
		DUT	21	16	11	8	56	162	2.89
	TOTAL						200	568	2.83
Chartered accountant	M	UKZN	23	9	5	4	41	133	3.24
		DUT	27	11	4	2	44	151	3.43
	F	UKZN	45	6	4	4	59	200	3.39
		DUT	34	15	6	1	56	194	3.5
	TOTAL						200	678	3.39
Social worker	M	UKZN	13	11	14	3	41	116	1.97
		DUT	9	17	10	8	44	115	2.61
	F	UKZN	7	27	18	7	59	152	2.57
		DUT	11	21	22	2	56	153	2.73
	TOTAL						200	536	2.68

Marketing manager	M	UKZN	20	9	7	5	41	126	3.07
		DUT	18	17	6	3	44	138	3.14
	F	UKZN	24	19	8	8	59	177	3
		DUT	24	22	8	2	56	180	3.21
TOTAL						200	621	3.11	
Radiologist	M	UKZN	15	9	13	4	41	117	2.85
		DUT	12	14	15	3	44	123	2.8
	F	UKZN	6	19	17	17	59	132	2.24
		DUT	18	18	14	6	56	160	2.9
TOTAL						200	532	2.66	
Gynaecologist	M	UKZN	11	5	12	13	41	96	2.34
		DUT	21	15	7	1	44	144	3.27
	F	UKZN	22	33	3	1	59	194	3.29
		DUT	24	20	10	2	56	178	3.18
TOTAL						200	612	3.06	
Physician	M	UKZN	17	5	7	12	41	99	2.41
		DUT	10	12	13	7	44	109	2.5
	F	UKZN	24	12	20	3	59	175	2.97
		DUT	20	15	13	8	56	159	2.84
TOTAL						200	542	2.71	
Surgeon	M	UKZN	14	8	8	11	41	107	2.61
		DUT	22	13	7	2	44	143	3.25
	F	UKZN	28	21	7	3	59	192	3.25
		DUT	28	21	7	0	56	189	3.4
TOTAL						200	631	3.16	
Receptionist	M	UKZN	9	15	7	10	41	105	2.51
		DUT	7	10	18	9	44	103	2.34
	F	UKZN	2	4	13	40	59	86	1.46
		DUT	8	13	26	9	56	132	2.36
TOTAL						200	426	2.13	
Taxi driver	M	UKZN	3	2	4	32	41	58	1.41
		DUT	0	2	2	40	44	50	1.14
	F	UKZN	1	1	6	51	59	70	1.19
		DUT	0	1	1	54	56	59	1.05
TOTAL						200	237	1.19	

Chef	M	UKZN	16	10	7	8	41	116	2.83
		DUT	17	11	10	6	44	127	2.89
	F	UKZN	13	9	19	18	59	135	2.29
		DUT	15	22	11	8	56	156	2.79
TOTAL						200	534	2.67	
Cashier	M	UKZN	3	5	14	19	41	74	1.8
		DUT	3	3	16	22	44	75	1.71
	F	UKZN	3	7	17	32	59	99	1.68
		DUT	5	6	16	29	56	99	1.77
						200	347	1.74	
Management consultant	M	UKZN	17	12	7	5	41	123	3
		DUT	16	19	5	4	44	135	3.07
	F	UKZN	15	25	14	5	59	168	2.85
		DUT	21	21	7	7	56	168	3
TOTAL						200	594	2.97	
Human resources manager	M	UKZN	16	11	10	4	41	121	2.95
		DUT	16	13	9	6	44	127	2.89
	F	UKZN	19	18	16	6	59	168	2.85
		DUT	22	14	8	12	56	160	2.86
TOTAL						200	576	2.87	
Mathematician	M	UKZN	20	9	6	6	41	125	3.05
		DUT	19	11	10	4	44	133	3.02
	F	UKZN	32	15	9	3	59	194	3.29
		DUT	31	15	9	1	56	188	3.4
TOTAL						200	640	3.2	
Journalist	M	UKZN	6	3	10	22	41	75	1.83
		DUT	7	9	15	13	44	98	2.23
	F	UKZN	5	12	21	21	59	119	2.02
		DUT	9	11	19	17	56	124	2.21
TOTAL						200	416	2.08	
Librarian	M	UKZN	8	7	15	11	41	92	2.24
		DUT	6	4	18	16	44	88	2
	F	UKZN	4	5	16	34	59	97	1.64
		DUT	9	6	23	18	56	118	2.11
TOTAL						200	395	1.98	

Cleaner	M	UKZN	5	3	7	26	41	69	1.68
		DUT	4	3	13	24	44	67	1.52
	F	UKZN	0	0	10	49	59	69	1.17
		DUT	0	0	17	39	56	73	1.3
	TOTAL						200	278	1.39

The above table shows that students have occupational differences in mate selection and they do not have the same preferences for all the occupations. Only a few occupations were categorised as Most Preferred based on the ranking by the student participants. These included Engineer, Chartered accountant and Medical doctor. Most of the occupations were under the Can Consider (CC) and Least Preferred (LP) ranking. There were a few occupations that were totally rejected by the student participants in the present study.

Table 2: Ranking of the various occupations in the mate selection preferences of University of KwaZulu-Natal students

Occupations	Mean score	Rank	Remarks	Attitude Trend
Engineer	3.55	1	MP	Highly positive
Bank accountant	3.45	2	CC	Positive
Chartered accountant	3.39	3	CC	Positive
Medical doctor	3.32	4	CC	Positive
Bank manager	3.32	4	CC	Positive
Entrepreneur	3.3	5	CC	Positive
Mathematician	3.2	6	CC	Positive
Scientist	3.13	7	CC	Positive
Surgeon	3.16	8	CC	Positive
Marketing manager	3.11	9	CC	Positive
Farmer	3.08	10	CC	Positive
Lawyer	3.07	11	CC	Positive
Gynaecologist	3.06	12	CC	Positive
Financial officer	3.05	13	CC	Positive
Psychologist	3.02	14	CC	Positive
Surveyor	3.01	15	CC	Positive
Dentist	2.99	16	CC	Positive
Management consultant	2.97	17	CC	Positive
Pharmacist	2.97	17	CC	Positive
Environmental scientist	2.9	18	CC	Positive
Optometrist	2.88	19	CC	Positive
Lab technician	2.88	19	CC	Positive
Human resources manager	2.87	20	CC	Positive
University lecturer	2.84	21	CC	Positive

Climatologist	2.83	22	CC	Positive
Architect	2.79	23	CC	Positive
Physician	2.71	24	CC	Positive
Geologist	2.69	25	CC	Positive
Social worker	2.68	26	CC	Positive
Biologist	2.68	26	CC	Positive
Chef	2.67	27	CC	Positive
Radiologist	2.66	28	CC	Positive
Sports coach	2.53	33	CC	Positive
Soldier	2.52	29	CC	Positive
Footballer	2.51	30	CC	Positive
Nurse	2.46	31	LP	Low positive
Graduate teacher	2.41	32	LP	Low positive
Therapist	2.4	33	LP	Low positive
School counsellor	2.38	34	LP	Low positive
Politician	2.38	34	LP	Low positive
Musician	2.35	35	LP	Low positive
Administrative officer	2.34	36	LP	Low positive
Salesperson	2.32	37	LP	Low positive
Secondary school teacher	2.31	38	LP	Low positive
Actor	2.29	39	LP	Low positive
Electrician	2.25	40	LP	Low positive
Primary school teacher	2.21	41	LP	Low positive
Sociologist	2.18	42	LP	Low positive
Clerk	2.14	43	LP	Low positive
Receptionist	2.13	44	LP	Low positive
Mechanic	2.09	45	LP	Low positive
Journalist	2.08	46	LP	Low positive
Military personnel	2.07	47	LP	Low positive
Police officer	2.05	48	LP	Low positive
Miner	2.01	49	LP	Low positive

Librarian	1.98	50	LP	Low positive
Carpenter	1.95	51	LP	Low positive
Philosopher	1.96	52	LP	Low positive
Dancer	1.84	53	LP	Low positive
Theatre artist	1.81	54	LP	Low positive
Professional driver	1.78	55	LP	Low positive
Cashier	1.74	56	LP	Low positive
Linguist	1.74	56	LP	Low positive
Security guard	1.49	57	RJ	Negative
Cleaner	1.39	58	RJ	Negative
Gardener	1.38	59	RJ	Negative
Taxi driver	1.19	60	RJ	Negative

The table above presents the ranking of occupations as preferred by the participants in the study. The table shows that of the 68 occupations tested, Engineer compared to other occupations like Chartered accountant or Medical doctor was the Most Preferred (MP) ranking in the mate selection considerations. This means that university students would prefer to be with a future spouse (woman or man) that works as an engineer rather than any other occupation. Also four occupations were rejected in the ranking, these were, Taxi driver, Gardener, Cleaner and Security guard. This means that the university students studied would not want a mate in these occupations.

4.3 Research Question Two

Are there any significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection?

Information relevant to this question is contained in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6

Table 3: Rank order of occupations in the mate selection preferences of male university students

Occupation	Mean score	Rank	Remarks	Attitude trend
Engineer	3.5	1	MP	Highly positive
Bank accountant	3.44	2	CC	Positive
Chartered accountant	3.34	3	CC	Positive
Entrepreneur	3.32	4	CC	Positive
Bank manager	3.25	5	CC	Positive
Marketing manager	3.11	6	CC	Positive
University lecturer	3.11	6	CC	Positive
Medical doctor	3.08	7	CC	Positive
Management consultant	3.04	8	CC	Positive
Mathematician	3.04	8	CC	Positive
Financial officer	3	9	CC	Positive
Scientist	2.98	10	CC	Positive
Pharmacist	2.94	11	CC	Positive
Surgeon	2.94	11	CC	Positive
Surveyor	2.93	12	CC	Positive
Lab technician	2.93	12	CC	Positive
Human resource management	2.92	13	CC	Positive
Psychologist	2.92	13	CC	Positive
Chef	2.86	14	CC	Positive
Environmental scientist	2.84	15	CC	Positive
Lawyer	2.84	15	CC	Positive
Radiologist	2.82	16	CC	Positive
Gynaecologist	2.82	16	CC	Positive
Architect	2.76	17	CC	Positive
Social worker	2.72	18	CC	Positive
Optometrist	2.72	18	CC	Positive
Biologist	2.71	19	CC	Positive
Nurse	2.71	19	CC	Positive

Geologist	2.69	20	CC	Positive
Administrative officer	2.67	21	CC	Positive
Dentist	2.67	21	CC	Positive
Climatologist	2.62	22	CC	Positive
Farmer	2.55	23	CC	Positive
Graduate teacher	2.55	23	CC	Positive
Therapist	2.54	24	CC	Positive
Salesperson	2.54	24	CC	Positive
Footballer	2.51	25	CC	Positive
Receptionist	2.45	26	LP	Low positive
Physician	2.45	26	LP	Low positive
Musician	2.44	27	LP	Low positive
Electrician	2.44	27	LP	Low positive
Clerk	2.41	28	LP	Low positive
Sports coach	2.36	29	LP	Low positive
Secondary school teacher	2.31	30	LP	Low positive
School counsellor	2.29	31	LP	Low positive
Primary school teacher	2.24	32	LP	Low positive
Actor	2.24	32	LP	Low positive
Politician	2.18	33	LP	Low positive
Soldier	2.14	34	LP	Low positive
Librarian	2.12	35	LP	Low positive
Sociologist	2.11	36	LP	Low positive
Mechanic	2.11	36	LP	Low positive
Journalist	2.04	37	LP	Low positive
Police officer	2.04	37	LP	Low positive
Military personnel	1.99	38	LP	Low positive
Builder	1.96	39	LP	Low positive
Miner	1.95	40	LP	Low positive
Dancer	1.93	41	LP	Low positive
Philosopher	1.91	42	LP	Low positive
Carpenter	1.82	43	LP	Low positive

Linguist	1.81	44	LP	Low positive
Professional driver	1.8	45	LP	Low positive
Cashier	1.75	46	LP	Low positive
Gardener	1.64	47	LP	Low positive
Cleaner	1.6	48	LP	Low positive
Security guard	1.36	49	RJ	Negative
Taxi driver	1.27	50	RJ	Negative

The table above shows that male students will reject women that are Security guards and Taxi drivers in mate selection considerations. Women who are Engineers or Bank accountants have the most preferred rating in the males' mate selection considerations compared with women in other occupations. Most of the occupations were favoured by the males studied. This means that women in these occupations are likely to be considered in mate selection by males.

Table 4: Rank order of occupations in the mate selection preferences of female university students

Occupation	Mean score	Rank	Remarks	Attitude trend
Engineer	3.63	1	MP	Highly positive
Medical doctor	3.5	2	MP	Highly positive
Farmer	3.5	2	MP	Highly positive
Bank accountant	3.45	3	CC	Positive
Chartered accountant	3.43	4	CC	Positive
Bank manager	3.37	5	CC	Positive
Mathematician	3.32	6	CC	Positive
Surgeon	3.31	7	CC	Positive
Entrepreneur	3.28	8	CC	Positive
Lawyer	3.24	9	CC	Positive
Scientist	3.23	10	CC	Positive
Gynaecologist	3.23	10	CC	Positive

Dentist	3.22	11	CC	Positive
Psychologist	3.1	12	CC	Positive
Marketing manager	3.1	12	CC	Positive
Financial officer	3.09	13	CC	Positive
Surveyor	3.07	14	CC	Positive
Climatologist	2.99	15	CC	Positive
Optometrist	2.99	15	CC	Positive
Pharmacist	2.98	16	CC	Positive
Environmental scientist	2.95	17	CC	Positive
Management consultant	2.92	18	CC	Positive
Physician	2.9	19	CC	Positive
Human resources management	2.85	20	CC	Positive
Lab technician	2.83	21	CC	Positive
Architect	2.81	22	CC	Positive
Soldier	2.79	23	CC	Positive
Geologist	2.7	24	CC	Positive
Biologist	2.66	25	CC	Positive
Social worker	2.65	26	CC	Positive
Sports coach	2.64	24	CC	Positive
University lecturer	2.64	24	CC	Positive
Radiologist	2.54	25	CC	Positive
Chef	2.53	26	CC	Positive
Politician	2.52	27	CC	Positive
Footballer	2.51	28	CC	Positive
School counsellor	2.44	29	LP	Low positive
Actor	2.32	30	LP	Low positive
Graduate teacher	2.3	31	LP	Low positive
Secondary school teacher	2.3	31	LP	Low positive
Therapist	2.29	32	LP	Low positive
Musician	2.28	33	LP	Low positive
Nurse	2.28	33	LP	Low positive

Sociologist	2.23	34	LP	Low positive
Primary school teacher	2.18	35	LP	Low positive
Salesperson	2.16	36	LP	Low positive
Military personnel	2.13	37	LP	Low positive
Electrician	2.11	38	LP	Low positive
Journalist	2.11	38	LP	Low positive
Administrative officer	2.1	39	LP	Low positive
Mechanic	2.08	40	LP	Low positive
Police officer	2.05	41	LP	Low positive
Miner	2.04	42	LP	Low positive
Carpenter	2.04	42	LP	Low positive
Builder	2.03	43	LP	Low positive
Philosopher	2	44	LP	Low positive
Clerk	1.94	45	LP	Low positive
Receptionist	1.9	46	LP	Low positive
Librarian	1.87	47	LP	Low positive
Theatre artist	1.84	47	LP	Low positive
Dancer	1.77	48	LP	Low positive
Professional driver	1.76	49	LP	Low positive
Cashier	1.72	50	LP	Low positive
Linguist	1.68	51	LP	Low positive
Security guard	1.58	52	LP	Low positive
Gardener	1.2	53	RJ	Negative
Taxi driver	1.12	54	RJ	Negative

Table 4 above shows that female students most preferred only three of the 67 occupations. These are Engineer, Medical doctor and Farmer. Therefore preferences show that female students will want to have men with these occupations. Only two of the occupations were rejected. These were Gardener and Taxi driver. This means that men in these occupations are not likely to be considered in mate selection by females.

Table 5: Top 10 positively rated occupations in mate selection by the students studied.

Occupation	Females	Rank	Occupation	Males	Rank
Engineer	3.63	1	Engineer	3.5	1
Medical doctor	3.5	2	Bank accountant	3.44	2
Farmer	3.5	2	Chartered accountant	3.34	3
Bank accountant	3.45	3	Entrepreneur	3.32	4
Chartered accountant	3.43	4	Bank manager	3.25	5
Bank manager	3.37	5	Marketing manager	3.11	6
Mathematician	3.32	6	University lecturer	3.11	6
Surgeon	3.31	7	Medical doctor	3.08	7
Entrepreneur	3.28	8	Management consultant	3.04	8
Lawyer	3.24	9	Mathematician	3.04	8

The table above shows ten highly rated occupations in the mate selection of university students. For females the list is headed by Engineer, Medical Doctor, Farmer and Bank accountant. For males the list is headed by Engineer, Bank Accountant and Chartered accountant.

Table 6: Top ten highly rejected occupations in the mate selection considerations of the students studied.

Occupation	Females	Rank	Occupation	Males	Rank
Taxi driver	1.12	1	Taxi driver	1.27	1
Gardener	1.2	2	Security guard	1.36	2
Security guard	1.58	3	Cleaner	1.6	3
Linguist	1.68	4	Gardener	1.64	4
Cashier	1.72	5	Cashier	1.75	5
Professional driver	1.76	6	Professional driver	1.8	6
Dancer	1.77	7	Linguist	1.81	7

Theatre artist	1.84	8	Carpenter	1.82	8
Librarian	1.87	9	Philosopher	1.91	9
Receptionist	1.9	10	Dancer	1.93	10

The table above shows the ten most rejected occupations in the mate selection of university students studied. For females the list is headed by Taxi driver and Gardener, and for males the list is headed by Taxi driver and Security guard.

4.4 Qualitative Analysis of Data

The participants were asked which occupations they most prefer in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The female participants responded as follows.

4.4.1 Females prefer marital spouses in occupations that are of a high financial status.

P1, female “You see when it comes to my most preferred occupations in a partner it has to be those that are high earning. For example an Engineer would get paid more than other occupations such as Gardner. I would rather marry someone who is rich so he could support the needs of our family you see not someone who would depend on me to provide.”(p.93)

P2, female “Medical doctor that would be my number one, another would be a farmer yah.” (p.93)

P6, female “For me it would have to be someone who is a dentist, medical doctor, pharmacist, bank manager, entrepreneur those kind of fields.” (p.93)

P7, female “I would most prefer a dentist too, medical doctor, surveyor, engineer, architect, farmer, psychologist of course, surgeon and even a chartered accountant.”(p.103)

P8, female *“In my case it would be an optometrist, medical doctor, engineer, mathematician, geologist those kind of occupation to name a few.” (p.103)*

4.4.2 High earning occupations chosen by males. The same question about the most preferred occupations in mate selection were posed to the male participants. Some of their responses were as set down below:

P4, male *“I prefer someone that would meet me halfway like a dentist or a journalist hmmm it would have to be a musician uhmm, an entrepreneur, a psychologist and these occupations are more flexible.”(p.93)*

P5, male *“I would most prefer to be with someone that works as a pharmacist, electrician, engineer, teacher and a nurse is also fine.”(p. 93)*

P9, male *“It would be nice to be with a woman who is a dentist, engineer, nurse, psychologist, mechanic, financial officer or human resources manager.”(p.104)*

P10, male *“I would most prefer to be with someone working as a lawyer, doctor, musician, clerk, social worker and chef.”(p.105)*

P11, male *“It would most probably someone that works as an architect, bank manager, entrepreneur, marketing manager and chartered.”(p.105)*

P12, male *“I would definitely most prefer someone who is a bank manager, a salesperson, entrepreneur, aaah a management consultant and one in marketing industry.”(p.12)*

4.5 The Occupations Students Will Consider in their Choice of a Mate.

The participants were asked which occupations they can consider in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The female participants responded as follows:

4.5.1 Occupations females will consider.

P1, female “For me it would have to be someone with a career that does not pay so much can be able to make a decent living (laughs) uhm I could consider being with someone who is a chef and pharmacist because that means they have studied and got a qualification. It is still satisfactory in this case because it would mean someone in these careers would meet me halfway and still be financially stable.”(p.96)

P2, female “It would have to be a dentist and even someone working as a pharmacist to name a few. I know I would be taken care of financially.” (p.96)

P6, female “I think I could consider being with a man who is a psychologist, sociologist, biologist, and politician in this case I still feel there is some financial stability.”(p.97)

P7, female “I like someone who is smart and wealthy so I can consider marrying someone who is a lawyer, pharmacist, linguist, bank accountant, financial officer, therapist and even footballer.” (p.106)

P8, female “I have to agree with most people here I would also be comfortable with a lawyer, farmer, professional driver, scientist, marketing manager and a chef.”(p.106)

4.5.2 Occupations males will consider. The participants were asked which occupations they can consider in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The male participants responded as follows:

P3, male “It would have to be a social worker, secondary school teacher or a school teacher. This partner would understand my personality and my interests.” (p.96)

P4, male “A lawyer I could consider. Engineers I could consider cause they are at least more of entrepreneurs it’s just that the field is a bit different.”(p.96)

P12, male “I could consider marrying someone that is a medical doctor, pharmacist, farmer, scientist, footballer and management consultant because the income is important at the end of the day.” (p.106)

4.6 Occupations Students Least Prefer in their Choice of a Mate

The participants were asked which occupations they will least prefer in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The female participants responded as follows:

4.6.1 Occupations female students least prefer.

P1, female“ For me I would least prefer to be with someone like a secondary school teacher, theatre artists and (silence, 2sec) a dentist uh these are not for me. In this case it’s not necessarily about the money but I just don’t find their careers fascinating.” (p.94)

P2, female“ The least occupational preference in my choice of a partner would be a builder, actor, yah a gardener no I would not go for that choice. I don’t think I will get what I am looking for. I think I would live a life of struggle and lack and I want to have a luxurious lifestyle in a relationship”. (p.94)

P6, female “I would least prefer to be with someone in these occupations: university lecturer, actor, dancer, military personnel and administration, footballer oh and journalist it would not be enough for the lifestyle I desire to have.”(p.95)

P7, female“ A professional driver, university lecturer, lab technician, philosopher, journalist and taxi driver.” (p.105)

P8, female “I would less likely be interested in being with someone that works as a builder, carpenter, any kind of teacher, soldier, school counsellor and someone in human resources management.” (p.105)

4.6.2 Occupations male students least prefer. Participants were asked which occupations they will least prefer their choice of a spouse for marriage. The male participants responded as follows:

4.6.2.1 Males prefer less time consuming occupations.

P5, male “I would least prefer a woman who is an architect, secondary school teacher, therapist, climatologist and a marketing manager.” (p.95)

P9, male “I am not in favour of a potential spouse that has the occupation of being a lawyer, miner, medical doctor, farmer, musician and artist and marketing director and these occupations are very time consuming and I want my wife to spend more time at home.”(p.105)

P10, male “I would not like to be with a medical doctor, surveyor, architect, actor, psychologist, politician and surgeon. They require a lot of moving and travelling and spending a lot of time at work.” (p.104)

4.6.1.2 Men prefer mates in good paying occupations.

P3, male “I think a farmer, taxi driver because most of the time. People in these occupations have often failed in life, it’s like there is no future.” (p.95)

P4, “(laughs) This is hard I am not being discriminative or whatever but ok (silence, 1 sec). One I must say I am not a picky person but I would not want to have a partner of a security

guard, the teacher my god! Especially the lower grade teacher...the primary teacher no.”
(p.95)

4.7 The Occupations Students Will Reject in their Choice of a Spouse

The participants were asked which occupations they will reject in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The female participants responded as follows:

4.7.1 Occupations females will reject.

P1, female “A taxi driver firstly, a cleaner (laughs) secondly and security guard no not these jobs I would not be able to tolerate. In my view someone who is a taxi driver eish (laughs) that will never work because he does not really have a profession and in most cases my view is people that do not have a qualification or did not attend school, just like most taxi drivers it seems like they are not smart and empty.”(p.98)

P2, female “A security guard, a cleaner, taxi driver, receptionist I would not be able to be with because of the level they occupy. It does not fit my standard and one should often associate with people of their own status and class.” (p.98)

P7, female “I would not be with a miner, electrician, administrative officer or cashier, a taxi driver I really can’t. I also do not see myself being with someone who is a cleaner or social worker.” (p.107)

4.7.2 Females interest in intelligent males

P6, female “I do not see myself getting married to a builder, carpenter, teacher, gardener, police uhmm nurse oh no and a security guard.”(p.98)

P1, female “If I had to be married to a taxi driver and I have a job that requires me to stay in for meetings until late he would not understand my lifestyle because aaah (silence, 3secs) yah because his level of education is different.”(p.98)

4.7.3 Occupations males will reject. The participants were asked which occupations they will reject in their choice of a spouse for marriage. The male participants responded as follows:

4.7.4 Males view of low income occupations.

P3, male “I would not like to be involved with someone that works as a cleaner (silence, 5secs) because it would seem like I am the bread-winner in the home and I would be expected to produce a lot more than her.”(p.98)

P5, male “I would probably reject someone working as a lawyer, miner, artist, musician, police, soldier, clerk, sports coach.”(p.99)

4.7.5 Males view of females in low status jobs.

P1, male “I would reject a teacher and a security guard (unclear) and taxi driver and fortunately you find least women as taxi drivers....they are so narrow minded, greedy and stubborn so I cannot deal with that.” (p.99)

P9, male “It would have to be someone working as a builder, carpenter, dancer, soldier, security, scientist, philosopher and even a politician yah I would not choose to be with someone in these occupations if I could choose.”(p.107)

P12, male “I would reject a miner, lawyer, teachers, actor, dancer, gardener, librarian and journalist.” (p.107)

4.8 Reasons for Occupational Preferences in Mate Selection

When both male and female participants responded in the discussion the following reasons for their choices were given:

4.8.1 Importance of financial status in a partner

P3, female “The choice of jobs I chose for my spouse, give us the opportunity in life for a good financial status.”(p.100)

P9, female “The jobs I most preferred are the ones that could give us the freedom to explore, enjoy and make it easy to face the challenges of today more positively financially.” (p.100)

P6, female “I can’t date someone who earning a small amount because I love money, I cannot manage my needs. Money is important to me.” (p.100)

4.8.2 Females prefer men who can be providers for their family.

P8, female “My reasons are there would be stability financially wise coming from the marital spouse if given these choices and life would be much easier all based on being financial-wise.” (p.109)

P2, female “I think it’s important to be with someone that has an occupation I would benefit from...because a man is supposed to provide for his woman.” (p.100)

P8, female “My reasons are based on being financially stable, having a partner who would be able to support me and our children.” (p.109)

P1, male “I can never be with someone of lower standards and class meanwhile I am of higher status occupation wise. I believe even the way we think would clash because of our educational and qualification differences.”(p.100)

4.8.3 An educated spouse means high earning potential

P9, female “I’d rather be with an educated person who can afford my needs than to be with someone who would want me to take care of him.” (p.109)

4.8.4 Men preferred a spouse with an occupation requiring flexible working hours

P4, male “Some of my reasons are other professions are time consuming. I’m a traditional man and I need my woman to be at home earlier than me so she can cook for the family.” (p.100)

P5, male “The reason I chose all careers for my spouse is that they have flexible hours so I can spend some time with her and she will be earning a good salary which will help us to support our family.” (p.100)

P10, male “Based on time management of occupation to which we can spend together and their level of education.” (p.16)

4.8.5 Men love to be with partners who can assist.

P11, male “My own reason is I prefer somebody that will meet me halfway due to my needs and wants.” (p. 110)

4.8.6 Financial stability is important for both partners

P6, male “In as much as love is important in a relationship but at the same time the future is important. For example what if I lose my job then who would assist our family financially?” (p.100)

P3, male “I am a kind of person that fights to get to the top so it’s difficult for me to choose a partner that will be of a lower occupation than myself considering how hard I work to get to the top.” (p.101)

P4, male “I know that I prefer a person that is one, flexible in terms of whom might not always be office bound, two, someone with an occupation that is very much broad and flexible.” (p.101)

P5, male “In my selection I am most concerned about our kids that we will be raising because I would need them to know as they grow up.... So that when they have to choose career-wise we can teach them a number of options.”(p.101)

Table 7: Summary of male and female reasons of occupational preferences in mate selection

	Males	Females
1.	Flexible working hours	High financial status
2.	Equality/ meeting financial demands halfway	Men must offer provision for family
3.	Financial stability	Security
4.	Childrearing duties	High earning potential

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter the results of the study are presented. The trend showed that there were few occupations that were most preferred by university students that participated in the study. Males only preferred Engineer, Bank accountant and Chartered accountant and females preferred Engineer, Medical doctor and Farmer in mate selection. The trend also showed that very few occupations than expected were rejected by the student participants. For males only Taxi driver, Security guard and Cleaner will not be considered in mate selection. However for females they would not consider occupations such as Taxi driver, Gardener and Security guard in mate selection.

In terms of occupational preferences in mate selection, the findings show that students do have occupational preferences in their choice of a potential mate. Other occupations were most preferred than others. University students mostly prefer occupations that have high earning potential and high status and these occupations were medical doctor, engineer, dentist, lawyer, entrepreneur, bank manager, psychologist, chartered accountant, management consultant, surgeon, marketing manager, physician and architect. In contrast some occupations were least preferred and rejected by students in their choice of a potential mate. Most university students studied rejected mates in the occupations cleaner, cashier, taxi driver, security guard, carpenter and gardener.

The students had reasons which influenced their occupational preferences in mate selection. For males these were that they wanted a woman in an occupation that has flexible working hours, provides equality in terms of sharing responsibilities in the marriage and a spouse that is financially stable. Females' reasons were based on the fact that they wanted a man that is in an occupation with high financial status, allows the man to provide for them in the marriage, security and is of high earning potential.

CHAPTER 5: Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings according to the research questions investigated. The discussion will include the interpretation of the results, and relate the findings of the study to the related literature reviewed. Thereafter, a summary of the entire study will follow the conclusion of the study, limitations and recommendation for future studies and further practice.

5.2 Discussion of Results

5.2.1 Research question one. Which are the leading or most preferred occupations in mate selection among South African university male and female students?

To answer this question, data was presented in Table 1, and 2. Data presented in these tables show the occupations that are Most Preferred (**MP**) and Least Preferred (**LP**) or Rejected (**RJ**) by students' participants in mate selection.

The findings of the current study showed that in mate selection, both males and females prefer to select partners with high financial or high status occupations. This refers to the occupations that are identified as having high earning potential, demand education and are considered more popular than others. These are the occupations that accumulated the highest points in the present study and ranked first as can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2. These correlate with the research that undergraduates students were more likely to prefer partners who are university graduates than non-graduates even though male undergraduates have showed less importance in their preferred mates to be college graduates (Koehler, 2005). This means that male and female students would select a mate that has acquired a high level of education. The most preferred occupations are those of high financial status. Therefore this means that both males and females prefer to select mates who have high financial status based on the findings seen in the present study. This corroborates with the study of Abubakar

(2002) who suggested that university students' preferred occupations in mate selection were computer science, pharmacy, medicine, banking and finance. Most university students are likely to select future spouses that have secure and high financial status occupations, since most of the preferred occupations persons to have high level of education. Therefore education seems to play as an important factor in selecting a mate for both males and female.

In the present study, Table 2 shows the top 10 positively rated occupations and these are of high education and financial status. This implies that university students, both from the University of KwaZulu-Natal and Durban University of Technology, prefer to select mates with a high socioeconomic status. In corroboration, Malik (2009) showed that educational background plays an essential part in future mates selection in most societies. In most surveys conducted, women are reported to prefer mates with higher education and even mates with the same educational qualifications as theirs. Furthermore, female graduates are found to prefer men that are more educated than themselves and in the study of Kalmijin (2005), undergraduates showed they desire university graduates with a more promising paying profession (Malik, 2009). This supports Günaydin et al., 2005 findings that high social status and good earning prospect is of great preference in a mate because they ensure security of income needed to support child care. Both males' and females' ideal mate possesses attributes of high social status and great financial stability, for instance, having a good paying job and best apartment and being successful and financially stable (Günaydin et al., 2005). Furthermore, the study of Malik (2009) as he explored in mate choice surveys women consistently expresses a preference for partners who have high status profession. Women place high value on men who possess a promising career orientation, industriousness and ambition. This can be supported by the responses of some of the students.

“You see when it comes to my most preferred occupations in a partner it has to be those that are high earning. For example an Engineer would get paid more than other occupations such as Gardener. I would rather marry someone who is rich so he could support the needs of our family you see not someone who would depend on me to provide.” – (P1, Female, p.93)

“I would most prefer a dentist too, medical doctor, surveyor, engineer, architect, farmer, psychologist of course, surgeon and even a chartered accountant.” (P7, Female, p.103)

“For me it would have to be someone who is a dentist, medical doctor, pharmacist, bank manager, entrepreneur those kind of fields.” (P6, Female, p.93)

“I would most prefer to be with someone working as a lawyer, doctor, musician, clerk, social worker and chef.”(P10, Male, p.105)

This shows that both males and females with high economic status prefer would prefer to select a mate with high educational level and who is also a university student. Both males and females would select a partner of a high socioeconomic status and give less attention to those of less.

5.2.2 Research question two.

Which occupations are least preferred or rejected in mate selection by South African university male and female students?

Data presented in Table 1 and 2 show the occupations that are least preferred or rejected by students’ participants in mate selection.

The findings of the current study suggested that both males and females reject the idea of selecting a partner in an occupation of average or low status earning potential. University students are therefore likely to reject mates in occupations which are of a lower financial status, low education or none at all. These are the occupations that accumulated the lowest points in the response categories of the students studied. See Table 1 and Table 2. Moreover, findings in Table 2 showed that potential mates with least popular occupations were those that were least preferred and rejected by both male and female students in mate selection. These could be considered to be occupations that do not require much education and have low earning potential. Therefore both male and female university students consider potential mates with a level of education which also predicts a good job. In line with this is the study of Kalmijin (2005) who stated that female graduates are found to prefer men that are more

educated than themselves. Undergraduates showed that they desired university graduates with a more promising paying profession (Malik, 2009). In some cases, the choice of occupation for a spouse are least preferred or rejected because they are believed to reflect the potential spouse's perceived lower educational level or qualification. The lower the status of the job and its earning capacity the more likely it will be rejected by students, both male and female. In support of this are the following responses by students.

"The least occupational preference in my choice of a partner would be a builder, actor, yah a gardener no I would not go for that choice. I don't think I will get what I am looking for, I think I would live a life of struggle and lack and I want to have a luxurious lifestyle in a relationship." (P2, female, p.94)

"I would less likely be interested in being with someone that works as a builder, carpenter, any kind of teacher, soldier, school counsellor and someone in human resources management." (P8, Female, p.105)

"If I had to be married to a taxi driver and I have a job that requires me to stay in for meetings until late he would not understand my lifestyle because (silence, 3secs) yah because his level of education is different." (P1, female, p.98)

"I would not like to be involved with someone that works as a cleaner (silence, 5secs) because it would seem like I am the bread-winner in the home and I would be expected to produce a lot more than her." (P3, Male, p.98)

"A taxi driver firstly, a cleaner (laughs) secondly and security guard no not these jobs I would not be able to tolerate. In my view someone who is a taxi driver eish (laughs) that will never work because he does not really have a profession and in most cases my view is people that do not have a qualification or did not attend school, just like most taxi drivers it seems like they are not smart and empty." (P1, female, p.98)

“A security guard, a cleaner, taxi driver, receptionist I would not be able to be with because of the level they occupy. It does not fit my standard and one should often associate with people of their own status and class.” (P2, female, p.98)

In line with this are findings that women are significantly more likely to discontinue relationships with males who become unemployed, lack career motivation or show laziness (Betzig, 1989). Moreover, male's choices were influenced firstly by the general favourable traits associated with an occupation while for female students it was, “It pays well.” (Abubakar, 2002).

In conclusion, research has found that students' responses indicated a preference for well-educated and appealing professions in potential mates (Todosijevic, Ljubinkovic & Arancic, 2003).

5.2.3. Research question three.

Are there any significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection? Data presented in tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 showed that there are gender differences between male and female students' participants in mate selection. The findings from these tables show that there are gender differences between male and female students in their occupational preferences in selecting a mate. In support of this pattern it is found that cross culturally, women consistently valued a mate's earning capacity more than men did, while men continually valued a mate's good looks. These findings were seen as supporting the sex mate selection theory which states that women develop interest in men who have high status and resources and who are fully committed to those they love meanwhile men are more interest in a woman's physical attractiveness (Lippa, 2007). This is in line with the study of Townsend (2003) where female students stated their willingness to engage in relationships with the men at six levels of romantic involvement. High status males were preferred over the low status males at all six levels and status was more important than attractiveness. Women who were high status themselves also preferred males of high status, preferably of even higher status than themselves. Similarly, in a survey of university students, it was reported that females become more selective in their criteria in entering a relationship, while males were convinced that their increasing status would enable them to engage in a relationship

(Townsend, 2003). These findings are also similar to those in the present study. Subjects in the current study were university students with potential for future high socio-economic status, and their occupational preferences were in favour of occupations with high socio-economic status. This means that the kind of mate that female university students prefer to be with are males that have the same or even higher socio-economic status. Males place less emphasis on female socio-economic status compared with females. These findings relate with the assumptions of the evolutionary theory that explains women have developed to be more selective in choosing mates (in mates' behavioural traits and mates' genetic capabilities) and to choose mates who can guarantee that women's relatively few offspring are protected, provided for in future (Lippa, 2007).

Hence, the findings in the current study indicated that when males are compared with females, males prefer less those occupations with high socio-economic status as shown in Tables 3, 4 and 5. In addition, the findings in the study of Furnham (2009, in Furnham & McClelland, 2015) showed that women are more attracted to resources, and men to the attractiveness of women, all of which led to some theoretical explanations. It would therefore be expected that male students in this study would prefer women in lower income, but service-based occupations, while female students would be expected to go for mates in high income generating occupations in their mate selection considerations.

To support these differences the female participants' preferences were as follows:

“You see when it comes to my most preferred occupations in a partner it has to be those that are high earning. For example an Engineer would get paid more than other occupations such as Gardener. I would rather marry someone who is rich so he could support the needs of our family. You see not someone who would depend on me to provide.” – (P1, Female, p.93)

“It would have to be a dentist and even someone working as a pharmacist to name a few. I know I would be taken care of financially.” (P2, Female, p.96)

To support these differences the male participants' preferences were as follows:

“I would least prefer a woman who is an architect, secondary school teacher, therapist, climatologist and a marketing manager.” (P5, Male, p.95)

“I am not in favour of a potential spouse that has the occupation of being a lawyer, miner, medical doctor, farmer, musician and artist and marketing director and these occupations are very time consuming and I want my wife to spend more time at home.” (P9, Male, p.105)

The exchange theory is in line with the findings of the current study it suggests that both males and females are relationships because of exchange of beneficial things (Rosenfeld, 2005). It suggests that men with high status and good financial potential, as women look for these mates, should be involved with women of physical attractiveness as they can reproduce and are still young of age. This kind of combination between these individuals is meant to reflect an exchange of a man's economic resources for the woman's beauty (Rosenfeld, 2005). As seen in the present study the females preferred to select a mate that with a high paying occupation and of good status than males.

Findings of the present study supported the social learning theory that states that in traditional families men are held responsible for gaining financial resources for their families while women are responsible for domestic and childrearing responsibilities and this leads to a high preference for those characteristics to carry out these duties (Lam Le, 2004). In contrast with females, males mostly prefer potential spouses with occupations that are less time consuming with the expectation that women will spend more time at home taking care of their children. Even though financial stability is partially important to males, their main preference is a flexible job in their mates.

Angletier (1989) supported the hypothesis that males seek as mates those females whose reproductive value appears to be high, and that females prefer mates, whose resource potential is highly promising. However, the current study did not explore sex differences in mate selection preferences even though it was evident that sex differences emerged across cultures that were not explicitly predicted. Females, more than males, appear to value the mate characteristics of similar educational background, dependable character, emotional stability and maturity, desire for home and children, and education and intelligence. In contrast, males more than females, value good cooking and housekeeping abilities and chastity in potential mates (Angletier, 1989). These findings, although not specifically

predicted, are none the less consistent with an emphasis on the reproductive functions currently served by males and females.

Women tend to least prefer males in occupations regarded as having low financial status. Female students reported that they would rather not choose to be with someone in an occupation that does not have a high earning capacity and that will not fulfil their needs as the woman in the relationship.

The support the above statement the participants responded as follows:

“The least occupational preference in my choice of a partner would be a builder, actor, yah a gardener no I would not go for that choice. I don’t think I will get what I am looking for. I think I would live a life of struggle and lack and I want to have a luxurious lifestyle in a relationship.” (P2, female, p.94)

“I would least prefer to be with someone in these occupations: university lecturer, actor, dancer, military personnel and administration, footballer oh and journalist. It would not be enough for the lifestyle I desire to have.”(P6, Female, p.95)

Social role theory argues that gender differences in people’s preferences in desired mate characteristics are due to the tendency of men and women to take on different social roles (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Social role theory also suggests that men and women often take into account how certain characteristics will have an effect on marital, familial, and occupational roles that require different responsibilities and obligations (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Gender role beliefs are founded in a society’s division of labour whereby men and women engage in different types of activities. Eagley and Wood (1999) noted that the division of responsibilities a society places on the sexes (e.g. males as providers and women as homemakers) is a major determinant of the criteria that people look for in a potential mate. This could strongly account for the reason men prefer younger women with domestic skills, while women place more importance than men on older age and earning potential. Furthermore, they argued that there is a decrease in the difference in mate selection as a result of the increase in gender equality.

5.2.4 Research question four. What reasons do the students give in support of their occupation preferences in mate selection? Male and female students in the current study were found to have differences in the reasons influencing their occupational preferences in selecting a mate. Females will always prefer to be with partner that has high socio-economic status and will be able to provide for their needs and for their children in marriage. Women are less likely to compromise this influence in their choice of a mate. In contrast, men are usually influenced by other reasons such as physical attraction and favourable traits. Even though they also consider financial stability in a partner, they are outweighed by women in this aspect. In line with the present study, Betzig (1986) stated that the preference of high financial status in occupations of males was often referred to in the discussion among females. Furthermore, women are observed as preferring men who have high social status since it is a universal indication of the control of resources. Social status is seen by women to be powerful because along with it are the associations of enhanced food, plenty of territory and better healthcare (Betzig, 1986). To support this, some of the students' reasons for their preferences were:

To support the above statement participants responded as follows:

(Female, P2, undergraduate, p.100) "The jobs I most preferred are the ones that could give us the freedom to explore, enjoy and make it easy to face the challenges of today more positively financially."

(P2, female, p.100) "I think it's important to be with someone that has an occupation I would benefit from...because a man is supposed to provide for his woman."

(Female, P3, p.109) "My reasons are based on being financially stable, having a partner who would be able to support me and our children."

Hence the findings in the current study suggested that having a man with high social status grants children with better educational opportunities compared to families with men of low social status. Both men and women place value in dependability and stability but more so for women than men. Dependability and stability facilitate resource acquisition. For instance, if a

man is stable he will be able to provide for his family constantly and will not strain his partner financially.

The current study indicated how individuals choose to be in relationships only when this will enhance individual well-being. One way one can optimise individual well-being in a relationship is to choose a partner who shares the same resources and abilities, complementing one's own (Hakim, 2010).

To support the above statement participants responded as follows:

(P3, Male, p.101) "I am a kind of person that fights to get to the top so it's difficult for me to choose a partner that will be of a lower occupation than myself considering how hard I work to get to the top."

Men and women will stress different characteristics when choosing a potential partner (Sandhya, 2013) as was discovered in the present study. The current study show that males are more likely to choose women in most occupations when selecting a partner see Table 3. However, women are most likely to choose males in high-status or income occupations but reject males in occupations of low-status or income see Table 4.

To support the above statement the participants responded as follows:

P2, female "Medical doctor that would be my number one, another would be a farmer yah." (p.93)

P6, female "For me it would have to be someone who is a dentist, medical doctor, pharmacist, bank manager, entrepreneur those kind of fields." (p.93)

P3, male "It would have to be a social worker, secondary school teacher or a school teacher. This partner would understand my personality and my interests."

P4, male *“I prefer someone that would meet me halfway like a dentist or a journalist hmmm it would have to be a musician uhmm, an entrepreneur, a psychologist and these occupations are more flexible.”(p.93)*

American culture encourages men and women to select potential partners of a similar culture, religious background, socio-economic status, common values, age education, ideal images and physical attractiveness. It suggests that people value socio-economic status as a projector of a person’s ability to provide for their young ones (Sandhya, 2013). The ability and willingness to provide resources are traits that have in the past been associated with high male value. In this instance males provide a range of resources for the female before, during and after she has produced children. This includes food, shelter and protection from other males. For most students, especially females, they consider a person’s educational course and qualifications as they are attracted by an intelligent man with status. For most students an educated partner correlates with good earning potential and this means security from a marital spouse. Moreover, females have evolved preferences for males who have good financial prospects, were older than themselves, had higher social status, and who displayed hard working and industrious characters as these are clear signs of resource acquisition (Mamasan, 2005, in Malik, 2011).

This is supported by Hatifield and Rapson (1996) in their study Cross-Cultural perspective of Love and Sex, where it was found that women value more than men, marriage partners who possess status, who had good financial prospects and who are ambitious and industrious (Sandhya, 2013). Supporting this view Khallad (2005) also noted in his study that female college students showed greater interest in positional marriage partners who exhibit economic ability and commitment (Sandhya, 2013). This finding further indicated that a woman’s differential preferences for resources and commitment related attributes were mainly determined by socio-economic status. The female students had said the following.

To support the above statement the participants responded as follows:

“I can never be with someone of lower standards and class meanwhile I am of higher status occupation wise. I believe even the way we think would clash because of our educational and qualification differences.”(P1, female, p.100)

However, it also seems some males find it necessary to choose a partner that will complement their educational level. Some males find it important and attractive to choose a woman that is intelligent and highly educated. This shows that men have developed an interest in women being educated and having a good career which is a shift from the traditional view of men being the only breadwinners. This fits well with Doosje et al., (1999 in Saunders et al., 2011) who stated that gender differences were evident in mate preferences on occupation and social economic status, and relative to this, males were found to desire socio-economic status to be more essential more than females. This is what some males said:

To support the above statement the participants responded as follows:

“Some of my reasons are other professions are time consuming. I’m a traditional man and I need my woman to be at home earlier than me so she can cook for the family...” (P4, Male, p.100)

“The reason I chose all careers for my spouse is that they have flexible hours so I can spend some time with her and she will be earning a good salary which will help us to support our family.” (P5, Male, p.100)

“Based on time management of occupation to which we can spend together and their level of education.” (P10, Male, p.16)

This study’s findings were in agreement with Saunders et al. (2011) who indicated that income and economic status are important in everyone’s daily life so people do not want to marry mates who are not financially stable. People want to marry mates who earn more than they do. Aside from occupation, were other important characteristics such as personality, physical appearance, intelligence, and emotional capabilities, occupation, social status, family and background were also crucial characteristics in mate selection. However, in marriage males were less worried about good earning capacity than females. Instead, females would not compromise their preference of good earning capacity and were not likely to marry a male whose income was lower and who had an unstable job (South, 1991). Men prefer a spouse with an occupation requiring flexible working hours and this is what was mentioned by some of the males.

5.3 Summary and Implications of the Study

The current study was designed to explore the preferred occupations in mate selection among students in two South African universities. Four principal research questions guided the study. The aim was to explore the occupations that are preferred and those rejected by the study participants, significant gender differences in students' occupational preferences in mate selection and reasons students have in support of their occupational preferences in mate selection.

The relevant literature was reviewed to capture the history of mate selection by reviewing mate selection theories and previous studies done internationally and locally on mate selection preferences among university students. The reviewed literature included these mate selection theories: homogamy, heterogamy, social learning, social role, evolutionary, exogamy, endogamy and complementary theory. Overall the mate selection theories indicated that people have preferences based on different aspirations. For instance, females consider a man with a high financial earning potential to provide for them and later on for their offspring. For males the focus is not on the financial prosperity of the woman but on physical attractiveness and the ability to bare children.

The survey research design and focus group discussions were used to conduct the study. A self-developed Occupational Preference Questionnaire (OPQ) was used to collect data from 200 university students (100 from UKZN and 100 from DUT) that formed the sample of the study. The instruments were administered directly to the participants by the researcher of the study. The data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics, facilitated by means of SPSS. In the analysis, emphasis was placed on frequency and mean calculations according to students' preferences as illustrated in the mean attracted by each of the occupations rated.

The findings showed that about one third of the occupations rated attracted students' positive preferences across gender lines. Some gender differences stood out in the students in the overall rating of the occupations. In general, female students showed preference for mates from high income earning occupations, while their male counterparts were not very much

particular about the income of the occupations of their mates. Hence, among the male students, it was only women in Taxi driving business that attracted a total rejection rating. Among female students, not many occupations attracted high rejection ratings. These findings are interpreted to mean that in South Africa, it is the social role, the exchange and the evolutionary theories assumptions that seem to capture the mate selection orientation of the students studied. This implies that irrespective of a woman's occupational value, what matters more for men appears to be physical characteristics and the mate's fertility index, while for women, it is the mate's financial prospects that appear to take the centre stage.

The findings are of value in premarital affairs. They will help to show that in mate selection in South Africa the traditional views of men as providers and women as home makers are still strong in people's minds, even among university students.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The current study was designed to explore the occupational preferences in mate selection of university students from two different universities in South Africa. This means that the sample could be extended if the number of participating students was increased and if the study was also carried out in other provinces besides KwaZulu-Natal. The items in the questionnaire were limited as other occupations were omitted to meet the demands of the period given to complete the task, as well as to avoid a very long questionnaire. The current study only looked at the issue of occupation preferences in mate selection taking into account that there are many factors that could be explored within this phenomenon. The current study was conducted in two universities from KwaZulu-Natal. Therefore the results were limited to university students and may not be generalisable to the entire population. The financial and time constraints for a much bigger sample made it difficult to enlarge the study.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

Considering the limitations of the present study, it is recommended that there is a need for further studies. Since the present study focused on two universities, the sample could be broadened by including students from other universities, provinces and races which would help make it more generalisable.

A similar study could be carried out to explore many factors in mate selection such as socio-economic status, family background, educational level or qualification and other influences such as age and race in mate selection. The present study only focused on occupation preferences in mate selection. Therefore expanding the study by focusing on the above issues would be helpful in terms of generalisation as well.

A similar study exploring the above factors among different populations, i.e. other than university students, would help to generalise the results to a broader population, for example, individuals who are employed but unmarried and searching for a potential future spouse.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, A. (2002). *Preferred occupation in mate selection among undergraduate students of two Kenyan universities: implications for counselling*. Masters dissertation in Nairobi Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Acheampong, G. K. (2010). *Marriage among the migrant Kwawu community in the Cape Coast metropolitan area*. Masters dissertation, University of Cape Coast, Nigeria.
- American Sociological Review. (2014). *Beauty and status: The illusion of exchange in partner selection*. Retrieved from doi: 10.1177/0003122414536391
- Anderson, R. C., & Klofstad, C. A. (2012). The influences of personal resources and environmental resource pressures on human mate preferences. *International Journal of Behavioural Biology*, 118(2012), 841-849.
- Angletier, A. (1989). Mate preferences questionnaire-measurement instrument database for the social sciences.
- Arnesen, E. (2006). *The Encyclopedia of U.S. labor and working- class history (p.1359)*. United States: CRC Press.
- Arum, R., Roksa, J., & Budig. (2008). The romance of college attendance: Higher education stratification and mate selection. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. 26, 107-121.

- Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (Eds.). (2005). Qualitative studies. In: Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (Eds). *The practice of social research* (pp. 269-311). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, A. J. L. (2013). Spike in SA divorce rate. News24 November <http://m.news24.com/news24/SouthAfrica/News/Spike-in-SA-divorce-rate-20131103>
- Balthazart, J., & Young, L. J. (2015). *Mate selection, sexual orientation and part bonding*. Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- Beguy, D. (2011). Timing and sequencing of events marking the transition to adulthood in two informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Urban Health*, 88(2), 318-340.
- Belsky, J. (1997). For better or for worse: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Association for Psychological Science*, 16 (6), 300-304.
- Bergad, L. W., & Klein, H. S. (2010). *Hispanics in the United States 1980-2005*. United States: Cambridge University Press.
- Betzig, L. (1986). *Despotism and differential reproduction: A Darwinian view of history*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Birkelund, G. E., & Heldal, J. (2003). Who marries who? Educational homogamy in Norway. *Demograph Research*. 8, 1-30.
- Blackwell, D. L., & Litcher, D. T. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting and married couples. *Sociological Quarterly*, 45, 719-737.

- Borbasi, S., Jackson, D., & Wilkes, L. (2005). Fieldwork in nursing research: positionality, practicalities and predicaments. *Journal of Advanced nursing*, *51*(5), 493-501.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Buss, D. M., & Angleitner, A. (1989). Mate selection preferences in Germany and the United States. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *10*(2), 1269-1280.
- Buss, D. M. (2001). A half century of mate preferences: The cultural evolution of values. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 491-503.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3* (2), 77-101.
- Casper, L. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2002). *Continuity and change in the American family*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Doosje, B., Rojahn, K., & Fischer, A. (1999). Partner preferences as a function of gender, age, political orientation and level of education. *Sex Roles*, *40*(1), 45-60.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2010). Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research. *Pragmatics*, *1*(1), 71-106.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behaviour: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 408-423.

- Ferguson, G. M., & Iturbide, M. (2013). Jamaican boys' construals of Jamaican and American teenagers. *Caribbean Journal of Psychology, 5*(1), 65-84.
- Forde, A. (2011). Evolutionary theory of mate selection and partners of trans people: A qualitative study using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(5), 1407-1434.
- Fu, X., & Heaton, T. B. (2008). Racial and educational homogamy: 1980 to 2000. *Sociological Perspectives, 51*(4), 735-758.
- Furnham, A. (2009). Sex differences in mate selection preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 262-267.
- Furnham, A., & Mc Clelland, A. (2015). What men want in a woman: Personality is more important than academic record or athleticism. *Psychology, 6*, 942-947.
- Geary, D. C., Vigil, J., & Byrd-Craven, J. (2004). Evolution of human mate choice. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*(1), 27-42.
- George, J., & Hancock, D. (2002). Where's the money honey? The socioeconomic effects of mate choice, <http://www.feeladmaps.com>.Access date 10.08.2013
- Gorven, A. R. (2014). *Sex workers' discursive constructions of intimate partner violence*. Unpublished thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski., Singer., E., & Tourangeau, R. (2011). *Survey methodology (Vol. 561)*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Guarte, J. M., & Barrios, E. B. (2006). Estimation under purposive sampling, communications in statistics. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 35(2), 277-284 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03610910600591610>.
- Gunaydin, G., Selcuk, E., & Hazan, C. (2013). *Finding the one: A process model of human mate selection*. New York: Guilford.
- Gyuris, P., Jarai, R., Bereczkei, T. (2010). The effect of childhood experiences on mate choice in personality traits: Homogamy and sexual imprinting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 1-6.
- Hakim, C. (2010). Psychological inquiry. *An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, 17(2), 75-151.
- Hardie, J. H., & Lucas, A. (2010). Economic factors and relationship quality among young couples: Comparing cohabitation and marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 72(5), 1141-1154.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (1996). *Stress and passionate love*. *Stress and Emotion: Anxiety, Anger, and Curiosity*, 16, 29-50.
- Hattori, A. (2013). Pacific Asia inquiry. *Multidisciplinary Perspectives in the Liberal Arts and Social Sciences*, 5, 1-211.
- Henry, J., Helm, H. W., & Cruz, N. (2013). Mate selection: Gender and generational differences. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 61-77.
- Hitsch, G. J., Hortaçsu, A., & Ariely, D. (2010). *What Makes You Click? – Mate Preferences in Online Dating*. Unpublished thesis, University of Chicago.

- Hooper, P. L. (2008). Mutual mate choice can drive ornament evolution even under perfect homogamy. *International Society for Adaptative Behaviour*, 16(1), 53-70.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2008). Research Designs: Choosing and fine-tuning a design for your study. *Journal of Sport science*, 12, 12-21.
- Jackson, D., & Borbasi, S. (2012). *Qualitative Research: the whole picture*. In Borbasi, S, and Jackson, D, (Eds.) *Navigating the Maze of Research: Enhancing Nursing and Midwifery Practice* (pp. 3-26). Australia: Elsevier.
- Jenson, J., & Sineau, M. (2001). *Who cares? Women work, childcare, and welfare state redesign*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Eagly, A. H. (2003). Another look at sex differences in preferred mate characteristics: The effects of endorsing the traditional female gender role. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 322-328.
- Jonason, P. K., Norman, P., & Li, L. M. (2012). It is not all about the Benjamins: Understanding preferences for mates with resources. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 306-310. Doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.032
- Kabeta, G. G., & Gebremeskel, H. H. (2013). Impact of gender roles on women involvement in functional adult literacy in Ethiopia: A review. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 37-54.
- Kalmijn, M. (2005). Intermarriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 395-421.

- 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.
- Knox, D. (2015). *M & F3*. United States: Cengage learning
- Knox, D., & Schatch, C. (2014). *Choices in relationships: An introduction to marriage and the family*. United States: Cengage learning.
- Koehler, N. (2005). Characteristics and impression formation in marriage choice. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 72, 230-738.
- Kornblum, W. (2011). *Sociology in a changing world*. United States: Cengage Learning.
- Lam Le, Y. C. (2004). *Social power and long term mate preferences*. Unpublished thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Lewis, J. (2009). Redefining qualitative methods: Believability in the fifth moment. *International Institute for Qualitative Methodology*, 8(2), 1-14.
- Lippa, R. A. (2007). The Preferred Traits of Mates in a Cross-National study of Heterosexual Influences. *Archives Sex Behaviour*, 36, 193–208.
- Malik, A. E. (2009). Determinants of mate selection choice among university students in south zone of Nigeria. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, 2(2), 165-174.

- Mamason, M. A. (2005). Female mate preferences: What's love got to do with it. <http://www.relationshipsbloecity.com/womenobjectivity-men.htm>. Date of access 10.08.2014.
- Merryman, A. (2006). *Will this marriage last? Opposites attract, but do they stay married?* Nurture Shock, pp. 1-3.
- Moss, S. (2008). *Social role theory*. <http://www.psych-it.com.au>
- Mnyipika, N. (2014). *Exploring factors that influence condom use among high school teenagers age between ages 16 and 18 in DUTWYA District, Western Cape, South Africa*. Unpublished thesis, University of South Africa.
- Northrup, J. (2006). Extramarital sexuality, monogamy, and mate poaching: evolutionary and societal forces that define sexual behaviours and roles for men and women. *Journal of Undergraduate Student Research*, 8, 43-49.
- Nugent, R. (2006). *Youth in a global world*. United States of America: Population Reference Bureau.
- 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.
- Orisaremi, T. C. (2014). Gender, sexual health seeking behaviour, and HIV/AIDS among Tarok women in North-Central Nigeria. *Health Care for Women International*, (ahead-of-print), 1-18.

- Orisaremi, T. C., & Alubo, O. (2012). Gender and reproductive rights of Tarok women in Central Nigeria. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 16(1), 83-96.
- Regan, P. (2008). *The Mating Game: A primer on love, sex, and marriage*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Richardson, J. G., & Simpson, W. R. (1983) *Sex differences: Summarizing more than a century of scientific research*. United States: Psychology Press.
- Rosenfeld, M. J. (2005). A critique of exchange theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(5), 1284-1325.
- Sandhya, S. J. (2013). Socio-economic status and physical attractiveness in mate selection choice. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(10), 2250-3153.
- Saunders, D. G., Kurko, J. F., Barlow, K., & Crane, C. E. (2011). What attracts men who batter to their partners? An exploratory study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(4), 2747-2763.
- Schwarz, S., & Hassebrauck, M. (2012). Sex and age differences in mate selection preferences. *Human Nature*, 23(4), 447-466.
- Shipman, A. C. S. (2013). *Mate selection in Modern India*. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Bangalore.
- Shoemake, E. G. (2007). Human Mate Selection Theory: An Integrated Evolutionary and Social Approach. *Journal of Scientific Psychology*, 1-41.

- South, S. J. (1991). Socio-demographic differentials in mate selection preferences. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(4), 928-940.
- Smith, J. M. (2005). John Maynard Smith and evolutionary game theory. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 68, 7-10.
- Smith-Tyler, J. (2007). Informed Consent, Confidentiality, and Subject Rights in Clinical Trials. *Proceedings of the American Thoracic Society*, 4(2), 189-193.
- Sterbova, Z., & Valentova, J. (2012). Influence of homogamy, complementary, and sexual imprinting on mate choice. *International Journal of Human Diversity and Evolution*, 50(1), 1923-1941.
- Suhaimi, N. B. M., Jin Yep, S. L., & Rahman, W. A. (2007). Mate selection: Comparison of mate preferences between Malay and African male students in IIUM. *The 6th International Postgraduate Research Colloquium*, 6, 29-46.
- Surra, C. A., & Boelter, J. M. (2013). *Dating and mate selection*. United States: Springer
DOI: 10.1007/978-1-46143987-5_10
- Sussman, M. B., Steinmetz, S. K., & Peterson, G. W. (2013). *Handbook of marriage and the family*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media
- Teddle, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 77.
- Terre Blanche, M. J., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in practice: Applied methods for social sciences*. Cape Town: Juta and Company Ltd.

- Todosijevic, B., Ljubinkovic, S., & Arancic, A. (2003). Mate selection criteria: A trait desirability assessment study of sex differences in Serbia. *Evolutionary Psychology, 1*, 116-126.
- Townsend, J. M. (2003). Sexuality and partner selection: Sex differences among college students. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 14*, 305-330.
- Tumuti, D.W. (2012). Relationship guidance sources, fears and reasons for marriage among young urban Christians in Kenya. *International Journal of Prevention and Treatment, 1*(2), 31-39.
- University of Iowa News Services. (2009). Study finds education and money attract a mate; chastity sinks in importance (February 5), http://news-releases.uiowa.edu/2009/february/020509study_mate.html
- Wassenaar, D. R. (2006). Commentary: Ethical considerations in international research collaboration: The Bucharest early intervention project. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 27*(6), 577-580.
- Wassenaar, D. R. (2006). Ethical Issues in Social Science Research. In TerreBlanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D (Eds), *Research in Practice*. (pp 61-79). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Weiten, W., Dunn, D., & Hammer, E. (2014). Psychology applied to modern life: Adjustment in the 21st century (Eds). Furnham, A. (2009). Sex differences in mate selection preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 262–267.
- Wong, L. Y. (2003). *An empirical study of Darwin's theory of mate choice*. Unpublished thesis, University of Chicago and Binghamton University.

Zhang, F., Wang, T., Zheng, Y., Chen, B & Tam, B. K. (2013). Mate selection criteria among university students in China: A survey of one university in Xiamen, Fujian. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 16 (1), 1-137.

Appendices



Appendix 1 Informed consent

I hereby agree to participate in the study regarding preferred occupations in mate selection among university students in South Africa. I understand that the study will not impose any risks. I understand that my participation is voluntary without being forced to do so. I also understand that I can freely withdraw from the study at any point should I decide I do not want to continue. This decision will not harm me in any way.

I have understood the purpose of the study, and I understand what is expected of my participation.

I understand that information provided in the current study will be kept confidential, and that this consent form will not in any way be linked to my answers in the questionnaire.

Signature of participant: _____ Date: _____

Disclosure of information in the study:

If participants want to know more information regarding the results of the study they can contact me.

Gugu Zondi (guguzondi3@gmail.com)

Participants that are interested in taking part in the group discussion regarding the reasons influencing their choices may provide their contact details (cell number or email address) in the loose sheet provided.



Appendix 2 Audio consent

I hereby agree to the audio recording of this interview and/or focus group for the purposes of data capturing. I understand that no personally identifying information or recordings concerning me will be released in any form. I understand that these recordings will be kept in a safe lock and will be destroyed after data capturing and analysis are complete.

Initials and signature of participants: _____ Date: _____



Appendix 3 Directions

Directions: From the list provided below check (tick) in the appropriate column provided, the type of worker you will most prefer (MP), least prefer (LP), will reject (RJ) or can consider (CC) as a marital spouse if given the choice.

	MP	CC	LP	RJ
Lawyer	()	()	()	()
Dentist	()	()	()	()
Optometrist	()	()	()	()
Medical doctor	()	()	()	()
Pharmacists	()	()	()	()
Surveyor	()	()	()	()
Miner	()	()	()	()
Electrician	()	()	()	()
Engineer	()	()	()	()
Architect	()	()	()	()
Builder	()	()	()	()
Farmer	()	()	()	()
Carpenter	()	()	()	()

University lecturer	()	()	()	()
Secondary school teacher	()	()	()	()
Primary school teacher	()	()	()	()
Graduate teacher	()	()	()	()
Bank manager	()	()	()	()
Musician	()	()	()	()
Theatre artist	()	()	()	()
Actor	()	()	()	()
Dancer	()	()	()	()
Linguist	()	()	()	()
Gardener	()	()	()	()
Police	()	()	()	()
Military personnel	()	()	()	()
Soldier	()	()	()	()
Salesperson	()	()	()	()
Lab technician	()	()	()	()
Nurse	()	()	()	()
Mechanic	()	()	()	()
Professional driver	()	()	()	()
Teller	()	()	()	()
Psychologist	()	()	()	()
Entrepreneur	()	()	()	()
Security guard	()	()	()	()
Administrator	()	()	()	()
Clerk	()	()	()	()
Lay counsellor	()	()	()	()

Scientist	()	()	()	()
Chief Financial officer	()	()	()	()
Therapist	()	()	()	()
Philosopher	()	()	()	()
Sociologist	()	()	()	()
Politician	()	()	()	()
Sportsman	()	()	()	()
Sports coach	()	()	()	()
Biologist	()	()	()	()
Environmental scientist	()	()	()	()
Geologist	()	()	()	()
Climatologist	()	()	()	()
Chartered Accountant	()	()	()	()
Social worker	()	()	()	()
Marketing manager	()	()	()	()
Radiologist	()	()	()	()
Gynaecologist	()	()	()	()
Physician	()	()	()	()
Surgeon	()	()	()	()
Receptionist	()	()	()	()
Taxi driver	()	()	()	()
Chef	()	()	()	()
Cashier	()	()	()	()
Manager	()	()	()	()
Human Resources Manager	()	()	()	()
Mathematician	()	()	()	()

Journalist () () () ()

Librarian () () () ()



Appendix 4 Focus group questionnaire

Which occupations will you most prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

Which occupations will you least prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

Which occupations will you reject in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

Which occupations can you consider in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

What reasons do you have for your preferences?



Appendix 5 Letter to authorities

To the academic leader of the discipline

My name is Gugu Zondi. I am a postgraduate student from the Discipline of Psychology. I am conducting a study on preferred occupations in mate selection among students in two South African universities and I would like to request permission to announce the study in various first year, final year and postgraduate level lectures within your Discipline.

If permission is granted, the announcements will be arranged in consultation with the lecturers of the courses. The announcements will be brief and should not be disruptive to those attending the lectures. Students will be given a short description of the study and what participation will entail and will be asked if they would like to participate in the study at a later date.

If you would like to discuss any further details of my project or have any questions about this request please contact me via guguzondi3@gmail.com, or my supervisor Augustine Nwoye (033 260 5100).

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Gugu Zondi

guguzondi3@gmail.com

UKZN focus group transcript

Interviewer: Which occupations will you most prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: You see when it comes to my most preferred occupations in a partner it has to be those that are high earning. For example an Engineer would get paid more than other occupations such as Gardner. I would rather marry someone who is rich so he could support the needs of our family you see not someone who would depend on me to provide. (P1, Female, p.93)

P: Medical doctor that would be my number one, another would be a farmer yah. (P2, female)

P: for me it would have to be someone who is a dentist, medical doctor, pharmacist, bank manager, entrepreneur those kind of fields. (P6, Female)

P:I prefer someone that would meet me halfway like a dentist or a journalist hmmm it would have to be a musician uhmm, an entrepreneur, a psychologist and these occupations are more flexible.(P4, Male)

Interviewer: What occupational preferences do the rest of the group most prefer

P: I would most prefer to be with someone that works as a pharmacist, electrician, engineer, teacher and a nurse is also fine. (P5, Male)

P: I agree with the other ladies because I would also go for someone in the occupations which are of a higher educational level and income. For instance I would to date a doctor,

engineer, CA a spouse in that occupation will guarantee be a very comfortable lifestyle when we are married. (P6, female)

Interviewer: ok I hear you

P: (silence, 5secs) I can really relate (laughs)I can't marry someone below with an unstable income or does not have enough to support himself imagine when I am part of his life?

Interviewer: Which occupations will you least prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: For me I would least prefer to be with someone like a secondary school teacher, theatre artists and (silence, 2sec) a dentist uh these are not for me. In this case it's not necessarily about the money but I just don't find their careers fascinating.- (P1, female)

P: why are these least in your occupational preferences in your spouse?

P: The least occupational preference in my choice of a partner would be a builder, actor, yah a gardener no I would not go for that choice. I don't think I will get what I am looking for, I think I would live a life of struggle and lack and I want to have a luxurious lifestyle in a relationship.- (P2, female)

P: "I would least prefer to be with someone in these occupations lawyer, university lecturer, actor, dancer, military personnel and administration, footballer or coach oh and journalist."(P6, Female)

P: I would least prefer a woman who is an architect, secondary school teacher, therapist, climatologist and a marketing manager. (P5, Male)

P: For me I would least prefer to be with someone like a secondary school teacher, theatre artists and (silence, 2sec) a dentist uh these are not for me. In this case it's not necessarily about the money but I just don't find their careers fascinating. (P1, female)

P: The least occupational preference in my choice of a partner would be a builder, actor, yah a gardener no I would not go for that choice. I don't think I will get what I am looking for, I think I would live a life of struggle and lack and I want to have a luxurious lifestyle in a relationship. (P2, female)

P: I would least prefer to be with someone in these occupations lawyer, university lecturer, actor, dancer, military personnel and administration, footballer or coach oh and journalist. (P6, Female)

P: I think a farmer, taxi driver because most of the time people in these occupations have often failed in life, it's like there is no future. (P3, male)

P: (laughs) this is hard I am not being discriminative or whatever but ok (silence, 1 sec) one I must say I am not a picky person but I would want to have a partner of a security guard, the teacher my god! Especially the lower grade teacher...the primary teacher no. (P4, Male)

Interviewer: Which occupations can you consider in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: For me it would have to be someone with a career that does not pay so much can be able to make a decent living (laughs) uhm I could consider being with someone who is a chef and pharmacist because that means they have studied and got a qualification. “It is still satisfactory in this case because it would mean someone in these careers would meet me halfway and still be financially stable. (P1, Female)

P: It would have to be a dentist and even someone working as a pharmacist to name a few. I know I would be taken care of financially. (P2, Female)

P: It would have to be a social worker, secondary school teacher or a school teacher this partner would understand my personality and my interests. (P3, Male)

P: A lawyer I could consider, engineers I could consider cause they are at least more of entrepreneurs it’s just that the field is a bit different.” (P4, Male)

P: The choice of jobs I chose for my spouse, give us the opportunity in life for a good financial status. (P2, female)

P: The jobs I most preferred are the ones that could give us the freedom to explore, enjoy and make it easy to face the challenges of today more positively financially. (P6, Female)

P: I can’t date someone who earning a small amount because I love money, I cannot manage my needs. Money is important to me. (P1, Female)

P: I think I could consider being a man who is a psychologist, sociologist, biologist, and politician in this case I still feel there is some financial stability.(P6, Female)

P: I think it's important to be with someone that has an occupation I would benefit from...because a man is supposed to provide for his woman. (P2, female)

P: I can never be with someone of lower standards and class meanwhile I am of higher status occupation wise. I believe even the way we think would clash because of our educational and qualification differences.”(P1, female)

“I'd rather be with an educated person who can afford my needs than to be with someone who would want me to take care of him” (P2, Female)

P: Some of my reasons are other professions are time consuming. I'm a traditional man and I need my woman to be at home earlier than my so she can cook for the family...(P4, Male)

P: The reason I chose all carriers for my spouse is that they have flexible hours so I can spend some time with her and she will be earning a good salary which will help us to support our family. (P5, Male)

P: in as much as love is important in a relationship but at the same time the future is important for example what if I lose my job than who would assist our family financially (P1, Male)

P: I am a kind of person that fights to get to the top so it's difficult for me to choose a partner that will be of a lower occupation than myself considering how hard I work to get to the top. (P3, Male)

“uhm I know that I prefer a person that is one flexible in terms of whom might not always be office bound, two someone with an occupation that is very much abroad and flexible” (P4, Male, p.)

I: Which occupations will you reject in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: A taxi driver firstly, a cleaner (laughs) secondly and security guard no not these jobs I would not be able to tolerate. In my view someone who is a taxi driver eish (laughs) that will never work because he does not really have a profession and in most cases my view is people that do not have a qualification or did not attend school, just like most taxi drivers it seems like they are not smart and empty. (P1, female)

P: A security guard, a cleaner, taxi driver, receptionist I would not be able to be with because of the level they occupy. It does not fit my standard and one should often associate with people of their own status and class. (P2, female)

P: I do not see myself getting married to a builder, carpenter, teacher, gardner, police uhhh nurse oh no and a security guard.(P6, Female)

P: If I had to be married to a taxi driver and I have a job that requires me to stay in for meetings until late he would not understand my lifestyle because aaah (silence, 3secs) yah because his level of education is different. (P1, female)

P: I would not like to be involved with someone that works as a cleaner (silence, 5secs)because it would seem like I am the bread-winner in the home and I would be expected to produce a lot than her. (P3, Male)

P: I would reject a teacher and a security guard (unclear) and taxi driver and fortunately you find least women as taxi drivers....they are so narrow minded, greedy and stubborn so I cannot deal with that.. (P1, Male)

P: I would probably reject someone working as a lawyer, miner, artist, musician, police, soldier, clerk, sports coach. (P5, Male)

P: For me it would have to be someone with a career that does not pay so much can be able to make a decent living (laughs) uhm I could consider being with someone who is a chef and pharmacist because that means they have studied and got a qualification. "It is still satisfactory in this case because it would mean someone in these careers would meet me halfway and still be financially stable. (P1, Female)

P: It would have to be a dentist and even someone working as a pharmacist to name a few. I know I would be taken care of financially. (P2, Female)

P: I think I could consider being a man who is a psychologist, sociologist, biologist, and politician in this case I still feel there is some financial stability. (P6, Female)

P: It would have to be a social worker, secondary school teacher or a school teacher this partner would understand my personality and my interests. (P3, Male)

P: A lawyer I could consider, engineers I could consider cause they are at least more of entrepreneurs it's just that the field is a bit different. (P4, Male)

Interviewer: What are the reasons or influences that you have for your occupational preferences?

P: The choice of jobs I chose for my spouse, give us the opportunity in life for a good financial status. (P3, female)

P: The jobs I most preferred are the ones that could give us the freedom to explore, enjoy and make it easy to face the challenges of today more positively financially. (P1, Female)

P: I can't date someone who earning a small amount because I love money, I cannot manage my needs. Money is important to me. (P2, Female)

P: Some of my reasons are other professions are time consuming. I'm a traditional man and I need my woman to be at home earlier than my so she can cook for the family...(unclear) (P4, Male)

P: The reason I chose all carriers for my spouse is that they have flexible hours so I can spend some time with her and she will be earning a good salary which will help us to support our family. (P5, Male)

P: I can never be with someone of lower standards and class meanwhile I am of higher status occupation wise. I believe even the way we think would clash because of our educational and qualification differences. (P1, female)

P: I think it's important to be with someone that has an occupation I would benefit from...because a man is supposed to provide for his woman. (P2)

P: In as much as love is important in a relationship but at the same time the future is important for example what if I lose my job than who would assist our family financially. (P6, male)

I know that I prefer a person that is one, flexible in terms of whom might not always be office bound, two, someone with an occupation that is very much broad and flexible. (P4, male)

I am a kind of person that fights to get to the top so it's difficult for me to choose a partner that will be of a lower occupation than myself considering how hard I work to get to the top. (P3, female)

P: uhm I know that I prefer a person that is one flexible in terms of whom might not always be office bound, two someone with an occupation that is very much abroad and flexible. (P4, Male)

P: In my selection I am most concerned about our kids that we will be raising because I would need them to know as they grow up.... So that when they have to choose career-wise we can teach them a number of options. (P5, male)

P: I mean I like someone who is smart and wealthy, rich is also exceptional. The richer you are the cleaner you become LOL! (loud out loud). Well financial security is my main concern. I come from a struggling background (well atleast black middle class), so for my kids and myself I want to be able to live a comfortable and affordable life... (unclear) I can't afford struggle. (P2, female)

Interviewer: Mmmh what do others say?

P: For me it is important to be with someone with an interesting job. I also like the idea of someone doing the same work or being in the same field as myself. Some jobs fascinate me because it shows someone's academic capabilities and usually educated people are more open-minded to things. (P3, male)

P: My reasons are also based on the fact that I would to be with someone that has a good and stable job. I prefer a comfortable life. I want someone that has a job with a good income so I can be able to live outside budget life. The career I am studying towards also needs someone that afford. (P6, female)

P: most of my decisions regarding occupational preferences in a mate are based on time that each one of them has to spend outside of their profession. I'd prefer to be married to someone who has time. (P5, male)

P: For instance my choice is based on what skills I would like my spouse to have like a gardener, then I won't have to do the garden myself (laughs). (P3, male)

P: I can't date someone who earning a small amount because I love money, I cannot manage my needs. Money is important to me. (P6, male)

DUT Group discussion

Interviewer: Which occupations will you most prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: I would most prefer a dentist too, medical doctor, surveyor, engineer, architect, farmer, psychologist ofcourse, surgeon and even a chartered accountant.(P7, Female)

P:It would be nice to be with a woman who is a dentist, engineer, nurse, psychologist, mechanic, financial officer or human resources manager.(P9, Male)

P:I would most prefer to be with someone working as a lawyer, doctor, musician, clerk, social worker and chef. (P10, Male)

P: It would most probably someone that works as an architect, bank manager, entrepreneur, marketing manager and chartered. (P 11, Male)

P: I would definitely most prefer someone who is a bank manager, a salesperson, entrepreneur aaah a management consultant and one in marketing industry. (P12, Male)

P: In my case it would be an optometrist, medical doctor, engineer, mathematician, geologist those kind of occupation to name a few. (P8, Female)

Interviewer: Why are these occupations your first choice in your potential?

P: Tthese occupations are at the top of the food chain. One needs to think ahead and we cannot be arguing about finances instead of focusing on other important things concerning our love. (P9, female)

P: I kind of agree with the previous statement even as a guy I like the idea of having a woman that has her own if you know what I mean? I am the breadwinner but however it's interesting to also have a partner that can meet you halfway and have a 50/50 relationship. I am just saying (laughs). (P10, male)

Interviewer: hmm I understand

Interviewer: Which occupations will you least prefer in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: A professional driver, university lecturer, lab technician, philosopher, journalist and taxi driver.(P7, Female)

P: I would less likely be interested in being with some that works as a builder, carpenter, any kind of teacher, soldier, school counsellor and someone in human resources management.- (P8, Female)

P: It would be nice to be with a woman who is a dentist, engineer, nurse, psychologist, mechanic, financial officer or human resources manager. (P9, Male)

Interviewer: ok

P: I would most prefer to be with someone working as a lawyer, doctor, musician, clerk, social worker and chef. (P10, Male)

Interviewer: how come potential partners in the mentioned occupations are least preferred?

P: Simple! These occupations will not be meet all my needs as his partner. It's of average income if not lower. (P7, female)

P: In my case these occupations are not of high status you know you want to be with someone of good status so you easily say my husband is a doctor etc not my husband is a nurse!

P: It would most probably someone that works as an architect, bank manager, entrepreneur, marketing manager and chartered. (P11, Male)

P: I would definitely most prefer someone who is a bank manager, a salesperson, entrepreneur aaah a management consultant and one in marketing industry.” (P12, Male)

P: A professional driver, university lecturer, lab technician, philosopher, journalist and taxi driver. (P7, Female)

P: I would less likely be interested in being with some that works as a builder, carpenter, any kind of teacher, soldier, school counsellor and someone in human resources management. (P8, Female)

P: I am not in favor of a potential spouse that has the occupation of being a lawyer, miner, medical doctor, farmer, musician and artist and marketing director and these occupations are very time consuming and I want my wife to spend more time at home. (P9, Male)

P: I would not like to be with a medical doctor, surveyor, architect, actor, psychologist, politician and surgeon they require a lot of moving and travelling and spending a lot of time at work. (P10, Male)

Interviewer: Which occupations can you consider in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: I like someone who is smart and wealthy so I can consider marrying someone who is a lawyer, pharmacist, linguist, bank accountant, financial officer, therapist and even footballer. (P7, Female)

P: I could consider marrying someone that is a medical doctor, pharmacist, farmer, scientist, footballer and management consultant because the income is important at the end of the day. (P12, Male)

P: My reasons are there would be stability financially wise coming from the marital spouse if given these choices and life would be much easier all based on being financial-wise. (P, female)

P: I have to agree with most people here I would also be comfortable with a lawyer, farmer, professional driver, scientist, marketing manager and a chef. (P8, Female)

P: My reasons are based on being financially stable, having a partner who would be able to support me and our children. (P, Female)

P: Based on time management of occupation to which we can spend together and their level of education (P10, Male)

P: My own reason is I prefer somebody that will meet me halfway due to my needs and wants.” (P11, Male)

P: In my selection I am most concerned about our kids that we will be raising because I would need them to know as they grow up.... So that when they have to choose career-wise we can teach them a number of options. (P12, male)

P: It is important to have flexibility because I am a person that likes to have my spouse mostly to me than her work more than me. (P10,male)

Interviewer: Which occupations will you reject in your choice of a spouse for marriage?

P: I would not be with a miner, electrician, administrative officer or cashier, a taxi driver I really can't. I also do not see myself being with someone who is a cleaner or social worker. (P7, Female)

P: It would have to be someone working as a builder, carpenter, dancer, soldier, security, scientist, philosopher and even a politician yah I would not choose to be with someone in these occupations if I could choose. (P9, Male)

P: I would reject a miner, lawyer, teachers, actor, dancer, gardener, librarian and journalist. (P12, Male)

P: I like someone who is smart and wealthy so I can consider marrying someone who is a lawyer, pharmacist, linguist, bank accountant, financial officer, therapist and even footballer. (P7, Female)

P: I have to agree with most people here I would also be comfortable with a lawyer, farmer, professional driver, scientist, marketing manager and a chef. (P8, Female)

P: I could consider marrying someone that is a medical doctor, pharmacist, farmer, scientist, footballer and management consultant because the income is important at the end of the day. (P12, Male)

Interviewer: What are the reasons or influences that you have for your occupational preferences?

P: My reasons are there would be stability financially wise coming from the marital spouse if given these choices and life would be much easier all based on being financial-wise. (Female)

P: My reasons are based on being financially stable, having a partner who would be able to support me and our children.” (P7, Female)

Interviewer: Are you saying someone with a high income job is of importance in making mate selection decision?

P: Ofcourse Gu this has to be number one on the list! (laughs) (P7, female)

P: I'd rather be with an educated person who can afford my needs than to be with someone who would want me to take care of him. (P8, Female)

P9, female “The jobs I most preferred are the ones that could give us the freedom to explore, enjoy and make it easy to face the challenges of today more positively financially.” (p.)

P: Based on time management of occupation to which we can spend together and their level of education (P10, Male)

P: My own reason is I prefer somebody that will meet me halfway due to my needs and wants. (P12, Male)

P: My reasons are there would be stability financially wise coming from the marital spouse if given these choices and life would be much easier all based on being financial-wise.” (P8, female)

P: In my selection I am most concerned about our kids that we will be raising because I would need them to know as they grow up.... So that when they have to choose career-wise we can teach them a number of options. (P11, Male)

P: It is important to have flexibility because I am a person that likes to have my spouse mostly to me than her work more than me. (P10, male)

P: The reality is I want a person with a fixed income that maintains a household and a family. I prefer someone with a permanent job and also some of the choices are influenced by the fact that even though money is very important but your spouse must also be available to spend time with your family. (P8, female)

P: Whoa I'd rather be with an educated person who can afford my needs than to be with someone who would want me to take care of him. (P7)

P: Me too *I'd rather be with an educated person who can afford my needs than to be with someone who would want me to take care of him.*” (P9)

P: Levels! Money! Goodlife! Hahahahaha (P8, female)

P: One of the reasons why I would like someone who is well-off financially is due to how I grew up. I would not want to marry someone who is broke and live a life of struggle. My parents would have to approve of that person and so my potential spouse would not have to be someone who cannot take care of me. I also like the idea of having a husband with a fancy and well established occupation. (P9, female)

P: My reasons are based on being financially stable, having a partner who would be able to support me and our children.” (P8)

P: My own reason is I prefer somebody that will meet me halfway due to my needs and wants. (P11, male)

-End-