

EXAMINATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PARTNER SELECTION PRIORITIES**Latife KABAKLI ÇİMEN**

*Dr. Lecturer, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, latife.cimen@izu.edu.tr
ORCID Number: 0000-0002-4973-3630*

*Received: 29.10.2017**Accepted: 23.02.2018***ABSTRACT**

This research is a descriptive study in which the spouse selection priorities of university students are examined in the context of specific data. The study group of the research consists of 384 participants studying at various departments of a foundation university in Istanbul of the 2016-2017 academic year. The data were obtained using the assessment tool for Priorities in Spouse Selection and the Personal Information Form. According to the results of the study, the spouse selection priorities of the students that participated in the study are listed as being tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic, being of the same religion/sect, and not having been married before. While males paid more attention to being tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic among the characteristics of a prospective spouse than females, females paid more attention to the quality of being of the same religion/sect than males. It was determined that single students preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic, married students preferred that a prospective spouse was of the same religion/sect. Both third-grade and fourth-grade students preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic in the first place. Students in the age group of 18-25 years and at the age of 26 and above preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic. While students with high-income level preferred that a prospective spouse had not been married before, students with middle-income level preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic. While those with a monthly expense of 1000 TL and below, and between 1001 and 2000 TL preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic, those with a monthly expense of 2001 TL and above preferred the quality of being skilful/talented/hard-working. While those who planned to get married by experiencing a romantic relationship/flirting or dating preferred that a prospective spouse was tolerant/sensitive/sympathetic, those who planned to marry through an arranged marriage preferred that a person whom they would marry was religious

Keywords: Marriage, Family, University Student, Spouse Selection, Culture

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN EŞ SEÇME ÖNCELİKLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu araştırma, üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçme önceliklerinin incelendiği betimsel bir çalışmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, 2016-2017 Eğitim-Öğretim Yılında İstanbul'da bir vakıf üniversitesinin 384 öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır. Veriler, Kişisel Bilgi Formu ve Eş Seçme Öncelikleri ölçme aracı ile elde edilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre; öğrencilerin eş seçimi öncelikleri; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmak, aynı dinden/mezhepten olmak ve daha önce evlenmemiş olmak şeklinde sıralanmaktadır. Erkekler eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını kadınlardan daha fazla önemserken, kadınlar aynı dinden/mezhepten olma özelliğini erkeklerden daha fazla önemsemiştir. Bekarların eş adayının; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını, evlilerin ise aynı dinden/mezhepten olmasını tercih ettikleri belirlenmiştir. Hem üçüncü sınıf hem de dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını ilk sırada tercih etmiştir. 18-25 yaş grubu ve 26 yaş ve üstü öğrencileri eş adayının; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını tercih etmişlerdir. Maddi gelir seviyesi yüksek olan öğrenciler eş adayının daha önce evlenmemiş olmasını, maddi gelir seviyesi orta düzeyde olan öğrenciler eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olması özelliğini tercih ettikleri görülmüştür. Aylık harcaması 1000 TL ve altı ile 1001-2000 TL arası olanlar eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını tercih ederken, aylık harcaması 2001 TL ve üstü olanların becerikli/yetenekli/ hamarat olma özelliğini tercih ettikleri görülmektedir. Aşk ilişkisi/flört ederek veya tanışarak evlenmeyi planlayanlar eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olması tercih ederken; görücü usulü ile evlenmeyi planlayanlar eş adaylarının dindar olmasını tercih ettikleri belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Evlilik, aile, üniversite öğrencisi, eş seçme, kültür.

INTRODUCTION

Mankind tries to find the way that will lead him to happiness in many, social, psychological, economic, political and religious fields. Marriage is one of the most important ways that will take him to happiness. Various definitions have been made for marriage. According to Ceylan (1994), it is the union of the people of two different genders who have reached marriage maturity from physical, social, psychological, economic aspects and in terms of age to form a complete and permanent life partnership. This union takes place in the manner foreseen by social rules and laws. According to Ersanlı and Kalkan (2008), it is a social contract made by woman and man to unite their lives in the manner foreseen by social values, customs, traditions and laws.

Family is the institution which has been accepted as indispensable for civilizations from past to present and is known as a common value and in which the continuation of the generation is provided and people's socialization process is completed. Family that forms the basis of society is the carrier of social continuity with cultural and human values (Ondaş, 2007). To get married, to start a family is to meet individual's needs such as intimacy, power, significance (Nazlı, 2007), sexuality, continuation of the generation (Çaplı, 1992; Ondaş, 2007; Özgüven 2009), to love and to be loved (Özgüven, 2009; Yurtkuran Demirkan et al., 2009). In this respect, marriage strengthens the social harmony of individuals.

Since marriage relationship may involve more than half of the human life span or even a period of time that sometimes reaches two third of it, the partner selection decision is an important and also a difficult and complex process (Bener, 2011). The factors affecting the candidates for marriage are important in partner selection since they also make it easier or difficult to decide. According to Yıldırım (2007), with this decision, the person has decided on how and with whom he/she will continue his/her future life, with whom he/she will move forward, develop and change, and even from whom he/she will have a child and with whom he/she will bring up a child.

Partner Selection Theories

The question "How do people select their partners?" has been asked for years and various theories have been put forward about it. Dynamic theories in psychology, complementarity approach, similarity approach, evolutionist psychology, social structure theory and shopping approach are the theories that try to explain partner selection. When these theories are examined in general, their common point is the understanding that partner selection is a conscious choice for a certain purpose. The similarity match, which is the most emphasized explanation of these thoughts, means that individuals are engaged in marriage with those who look like themselves with respect to socio-economic level, physical attractiveness, ethnic origin, religious status, social trends, educational level, family structure, intelligence level and lifespan (cited from Lauer and Lauer, 1991 by Bacanlı, 2001; Warren, 1999).

It is known that woman or man is affected by different psychological and physical characteristics in the partner selection process. First of all, it is emphasized that both genders also care about attractiveness. Why do

partners find each other attractive? Brehm (1992) states that attractiveness is related to material and spiritual gains such as support, money and status. Beauty or handsomeness, physical affection to each other, having similar or opposite characteristics to each other, and the fact that the individual is a difficult-to-reach person form the basis of attractiveness.

Partner selection preferences vary from society to society due to the cultural differences of societies. Studies have revealed that there are many factors that influence the partner selection. These are age, ethnic origin, settlement, physical characteristics, attitude and thought similarity, form of communication, personality traits, assets, virginity and religious belief. Individuals are influenced by their previous experiences while determining their decisions. The meaning they have attributed to these experiences and the level of investments made in them under their present conditions also play an important role in the decision-making process.

Lauer and Warren indicate that the presence of similarities between the partners is very important in a good marriage. Warren explains this by saying that "Although the differences are perceived as attractive, the similarities between couples are like their money in the bank and the differences are like their debts". Warren also believes that couples will have spent their energy needed to improve their marriage while trying to deal with the differences between them. The common world-view and similar goals that the partners will have will also positively affect the harmony and happiness in the unity of couples.

According to the "principle of similarity", selection is made based on age, race, religion, ethnic origin, social class, education and personality similarities within a limited group of individuals. The principle of similarity (homogamy) is based on the fact that similarities attract each other. On the contrary, the "principle of integration" argues that partners are selected because of their different and complementary characteristics, especially in terms of their personality. This principle is based on the fact that opponents attract each other. Studies have not been able to reveal which principle has been applied more. However, there are impressions that the principle of similarity is more valid. The fact that this principle is more valid may be due to the facts that such a selection would lead to fewer conflicts in the areas such as socio-economic class, religion and education and that the mutual socialization process is easier especially in the first years of marriage. Furthermore, parental demands and social pressure are also in line with the principle of similarity. The factors of psychological development, sexual attraction and love also evoke marriage. An emotive awakening towards someone of the opposite sex who is more or less at the same time and has physical attractiveness can be interpreted as love. The decision of marriage is not taken based on a romantic love but based on the decision of loving which includes bearing happy or unhappy consequences.

Studies have revealed that men and women also have different criteria, as well as similar criteria, in partner selection (Bacanlı, 2001; Başar, 2006; Efe, 2013; Farajzadeh, 2011; Güngör, Yılmaz and Balci, 2011; Keklik, 2011; Ondaş, 2007; Türkarslan and Yurtkuran, 2007; Tüzemen and Özdağoglu, 2007). It has been found that women pay more attention to criteria such as economic potential (Shipman, 2011), social status (Yurtkuran Demirkan et al., 2009) and marriage relationships (Uraz, 1979), and that men pay more attention to criteria such as the

form of religious life, physical characteristics (Uraz, 1979; Yurtkuran Demirkan et al., 2009) and virginity (Shipman, 2011). When the partner selection criteria of Islam are taken into account, The Prophet (pbuh) proclaimed that: "A woman is married for four things: for her wealth, for her lineage, for her beauty or for her piety. Select the pious, may you be blessed" (Buhâri, Nikâh 15, Müslim, Radâ 53. Ebû Dâvûd, Nikâh 2; Nesâî, Nikâh 13; İbni Mâce, Nikâh 6). When some other priority criteria are examined, piety, good morality, nobility, physical and mental health, beauty, matching each other, belief harmony and character alignment between the partners seem to be compatible with similarity theories in partner selection.

According to the data of Turkish Statistical Institute in 2016, the number of married people is 594 thousand 493. The number of married people decreased by 1.4% compared to the previous year. Divorces decreased by 4.3% to 126 thousand 164 compared to the previous year. According to the data, 39.1% and 21% of divorces occur within the first 5 years of marriage and within 6-10 years of marriage, respectively.

The high number of divorces during the first years indicates that individuals are not aware of their own criteria and that they have high expectations (Şentürk, 2012). Researchers have emphasized that the person's perception of himself/herself and his/her partner, in other words, the perception in interpersonal relationships is an important indicator of marital harmony (Möller and Van Zyl, 1991). It has been also determined that the self-recognitions of the couples who can get along well are similar compared to the couples who cannot get along well (Creamer and Campbell, 1988; White and Hatcher, 1984).

According to the "Research on Domestic Violence against Women in Turkey" conducted by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies and Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, the ratio of married women expressed that they were exposed to physical violence throughout the country was 36%. 44% of the women stated that they were exposed to emotional violence while 30% of them stated that they were exposed to economic violence. It was stated that "The level of physical and/or sexual violence exposed by divorced or separated women is 75%, which is twice the ratio of violence exposed among all women. This situation suggests that violence itself could be the reason for divorce ". According to the research, while it has been determined that 26% of women throughout Turkey get married before the age of 18, it has been observed that there is a significant relationship between the age of marriage and the level of violence and that the ratio of physical violence is 48% among women who get married early and is 31% among women who get married after the age of 18.

University Youth

People usually make a decision to marry during the period of transition from adolescence to adulthood. This period, which is also called as young adulthood, is described in the literature as partner selection, learning to live together with a partner, founding a family, bringing up a child, conducting the home affairs, taking the citizenship responsibility, and adapting to the changes that may occur in life. In this respect, university students have a different position within the young adult population (Bozgeyikli and Toprak, 2013). University youth is

accepted as a group, who study at the highest level of our education system and receive education at a higher level than the other youth groups, have more social life standards and are more sensitive and conscious about country's problems (Ceylan, 1994). Educational institutions such as universities have auxiliary functions apart from their main function of providing employment. One of these functions is the partner selection. University students go through a period during which their marriage ideas also develop along with the differentiation in their socialization until they graduate. Erikson defined the period between the ages of 19-25 as the period of "isolation against intimacy" of psychosocial personality development phases (Atkinson et al., 2002; Bee and Boyd, 2009). At this age which is a university period, the individual can establish closeness and friendship with others. In this period, getting married, partner selection and marriage become more important in the life of the young (Senemoğlu, 1998). The two most important issues for the individual during university period are to get a good job and to select his/her partner to found a family. Young people encounter many different opportunities and facilities during university life and can meet with the people who will be their partners in the future. Young adulthood, by its nature, is a period during which romantic relationships and becoming a couple come to the forefront. This is also an ideal period to turn towards healthy relationship behaviors and partner selection (Aytaç and Bayram, 2001; Haskan, 2014).

Friendship is a period of "seeking" for young people who begin to think about marriage. In this period, the "ideal partner" type of individuals begins to take shape, and young people define the characteristics they expect in the person they will marry, and the characters they never want to marry. The studies carried out show that many individuals strive to adhere to the ideal partner attributes they have designed as far as possible when they are unable to reach the candidates with the "ideal partner" attributes they determined before partner selection. Friendships to be made before marriage are useful both in terms of "determining" and "finding" the attributes of this ideal type. Individuals form their ideal types themselves. In marriage, it is important to make partner selection accurately. Making a good selection is related to "the abundance of options" and "the adequacy of the opportunity to know them". partner selection is the union of two people of opposite gender; in addition to personal satisfaction provided by this union, the main purpose is to examine and explore the adequacy of the parties in this relationship in terms of liking each other, the suitability of features and expectations, and meeting each other's needs. Friendship process is an important step since it has the possibilities that the girl and boy can "terminate" or "maintain" the friendship or that they may "decide to marry" by seeing that they are compatible (Özgüven, 2000: 40).

Although there are various studies on partner selection when the literature is examined, the aim of this study is to examine university students' priorities in partner selection especially in the context of the changing world and the changes in our day and in individuals' preferences. University youth, separated from other young people in terms of differences in life standards and differences in consciousness levels, is a social group that is worth examining partner selection priorities. The fact that individuals know in advance their expectations regarding marriage and the priorities of the partner they will marry is expected to decrease the problems such as divorce and domestic violence.

METHOD

Research Model

The descriptive scanning model was used in this study aimed at determining the factors affecting university students' partner selection priorities. Scanning models are appropriate models for the studies that aim to describe a past or present event as it exists (Karasar, 2009:77).

Study Group

The study was carried out with 384 students to determine the partner selection priorities of student studying in different faculties of Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University during the 2016-2017 academic year. Since the 'Partner Selection Priorities Measurement Tool' was developed by Başay (2015) to be applied to 3rd and 4th grade university students, it was applied to 3rd and 4th grade university students. The characteristics of the study group are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of University Students (n= 384)

Faculty	%	Gender	%
Education	30.7	Female	83.9
Health Sciences	17.4	Male	16.1
Human and Social Sciences	16.1	Monthly Expense Status	
Eng. and Natural Sciences	28.1	1000 TL and below	73.7
Islamic sciences	7.6	1001-2000 TL	16.4
		2001 TL and above	9.9
Grade		Marital Status	
3 rd grade	47.7	Single	96
4 th grade	52.6	Married	4
Age		Economic Level of the Family	
		Low	
18-25	93	Medium	87
26 years and above	7	High	13
Mother-Father Form of Marriage		Marriage Plan	
Love relationship/flirting	17.2	Love relationship/flirting	48.7
By meeting	24	By meeting	40.4
Arranged	49.5	Arranged	9.1
Consanguineous Marriage	9.1		-

Data Collection Tools

a) Personal Information Form

The Personal Information Form was prepared by the researcher to obtain information about students' gender, age, financial income level of the family, faculty attended, financial income of the family, amount of monthly allowance, to which geographical region he/she feels a sense of belonging.

b) Partner Selection Priorities Measurement Tool

It was developed by Başay (2015) to determine students' preferences for priorities in partner selection. The measurement tool developed to measure information such as love relationship, beauty, handsomeness, being virgin/untouched, equal educational level, family's consent, religion/sect similarity, being of the same race, political view similarity, cultural similarity, professional status level, close age, equal socioeconomic status, being sexually attractive and being physically attractive, that would ensure that students put their priorities in partner selection in order of importance, consists of 20 questions. The 5-point Likert-type measurement tool was prepared as Not Important At All (1), Not Important (2), Partially Important (3), Important (4) and Very Important (5). Value Ranges of the Measurement Tool; Not Important At All (Very Low) 1-1.80, Not Important (Low) 1.81-2.60, Partially Important (Moderate) 2.61-3.40, Important (High) 3.41-4.20 and Very Important (Very High) 4.21-5.00. KMO and Bartlett test were applied to determine the construct validity of the data set by performing the Principal Components Analysis on the data set obtained from the measurement tool. As a result of the application, the KMO value was found to be .771. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the measurement tool is $R=.741$. These values show that the data set is close to the very good level of the sample size and is a reliable scale. In this study, the reliability of the scale was determined as $R=.802$.

Analysis of Data

The arithmetic means were taken into account to determine the partner selection priorities of the individuals who were included in the study, and the marriage criteria were ranked accordingly. The standard deviations of the scores were calculated to reveal the differences between the scores obtained and averages.

FINDINGS

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the most preferred and least preferred criteria in partner selection were examined in Table 2.

Table 2. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection

Item No	Criteria	$\bar{X}$	SS
1	Being Tolerant/Sensitive/Lovable	4.50	.698
2	Being a member of the same religion/sect	4.35	1.05
3	Having been unmarried previously	4.32	1.00
4	My family's consent in partner selection	4.26	.934
5	Matching life styles	4.25	.851
6	Having a similar/same political view	4.22	.725
7	Piety of the person I will marry	4.08	1.04
8	Falling in love/Having a love relationship	4.03	.972
9	Being Virgin/Untouched	4.02	1.24
10	Equal level of education with me	3.79	1.01
11	Being Skillful/Talented/Diligent	3.73	1.71
12	Having a similar/same culture as me	3.66	.978
13	The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	3.57	1.02
14	Having a similar/same political view	3.45	1.02
15	Being sexually attractive	3.32	1.01
16	Having a similar or close age	3.35	1.05
17	Having/having had a flirting relationship	3.27	1.17
18	Being Beautiful/Handsome	3.25	.876
19	Having a good financial situation (being rich)	3.01	.944
20	High popularity of the person I will marry	2.33	1.06

According to Table 2, the criteria that all of the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.50$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.35$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.32$), 4. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.26$), 5. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 6. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{x}=4.08$), 8. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.02$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.02$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.79$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=4.73$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.57$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.45$), 15. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.32$), 16. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.35$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.27$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=43.25$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.01$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=1.06$).

The general average and standard deviations of the criteria preferred by university students in partner selection by gender are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Gender

	Male			Female		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being Tolerant/Sensitive/Lovable	1	4.27	.871	2	4.54	.645
Having been unmarried previously	2	4.16	1.13	4	4.35	.978
Being devoted to family ties	3	4.08	.996	6	4.28	.818
Being Virgin/Untouched	4	3.91	1.34	9	4.04	1.22
Matching life styles	5	3.90	.935	5	4.29	.661
Being Skillful/Talented/Diligent	6	3.79	.870	11	3.72	1.83
Falling in love/Having a love relationship	7	3.66	1.22	8	4.09	.901
Piety of the person I will marry	8	3.51	1.41	7	4.18	.919
Equal level of education with me	9	3.48	1.15	10	3.85	.981
My family's consent in partner selection	10	3.48	1.26	3	4.41	.773
Being sexually attractive	11	3.43	1.11	16	3.30	.995
Being a member of the same religion/sect	12	3.37	1.50	1	4.54	.815
Having a similar/same culture as me	13	3.35	1.31	12	3.72	.876
Being Beautiful/Handsome	14	3.35	1.11	18	3.23	.823
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	15	3.30	1.23	13	3.62	.975
Having a similar or close age	16	3.29	1.07	15	3.36	1.05
Having/having had a flirting relationship	17	3.24	1.30	17	3.27	1.15
Having a similar/same political view	18	2.83	1.34	14	3.56	1.07
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	2.61	1.23	19	3.08	.860
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.24	1.30	20	2.34	1.01

According to Table 3, the partner selection priorities of men who participated in the study are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.27$), 2. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.16$), 3. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.08$), 4. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.91$), 5. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=3.90$), 6. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.79$), 7. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 8. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=3.51$), 9. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.48$), 10. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=3.48$), 11. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.43$), 12. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=3.37$), 13. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.35$), 14. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.35$), 15. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.30$), 16. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.29$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.24$), 18. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=2.83$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.61$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.24$).

The partner selection priorities of women who participated in the study are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.54$), 2. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.54$), 3. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.41$), 4. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.35$), 5. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.29$), 6. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.28$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.18$), 8. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.09$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.04$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.85$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.72$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.72$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.62$), 14. having a similar/same

political view ($\bar{X}$ =3.56), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}$ =3.36), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{x}$ =3,30), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}$ =3,27), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}$ =3.23), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}$ =3.08), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}$ =2.34)

The general average and standard deviations of the priorities preferred by university students in partner selection by marital status are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Marital Status

	Single			Married		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.51	.691	3	4.46	.660
Being a member of the same religion/sect	2	4.35	1.06	1	4.61	.506
Having been unmarried previously	3	4.30	1.01	2	4.61	.650
My family's consent in partner selection	4	4.27	.939	8	4.00	.816
Being devoted to family ties	5	4.25	.856	7	4.07	.759
Matching life styles	6	4.22	.731	5	4.23	.599
Piety of the person I will marry	7	4.07	1.05	4	4.38	.506
Falling in love/having a love relationship	8	4.03	.970	6	4.15	.688
Being virgin/untouched	9	4.03	1.24	10	3.61	1.26
Equal level of education with me	10	3.80	1.01	11	3.61	1.19
Being skillful/talented/diligent	11	3.75	1.74	16	3.38	.767
Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.66	.976	12	3.61	.767
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.56	1.03	9	3.84	.800
Having a similar/same political view	14	3.45	1.16	14	3.46	.776
Having a similar or close age	15	3.35	1.05	15	3.46	1.12
Being sexually attractive	16	3.32	1.02	17	3.30	.854
Having/having had a flirting relationship	17	3.26	1.17	13	3.61	1.12
Being beautiful/handsome	18	3.25	.881	18	3.07	.640
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	3.03	.940	19	2.46	.776
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.32	1.07	20	2.46	.877

According to Table 4, the partner selection priorities of single individuals who participated in the study are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}$ =4.51), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}$ =4.35), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}$ =4.30), 4. my family's consent in partner

selection ($\bar{X}=4.27$), 5. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 6. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.07$), 8. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.03$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.03$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.80$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.75$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.56$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.45$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.35$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.32$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.26$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.25$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.03$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.32$).

The priorities taken into account by married people who participated in the study in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.61$), 2. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.61$), 3. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.46$), 4. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.38$), 5. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.23$), 6. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.15$), 7. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.07$), 8. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.00$), 9. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.84$), 10. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 11. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 13. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.46$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.46$), 16. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.38$), 17. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.30$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.07$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.46$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.46$).

The general average and standard deviations of the priorities preferred by university students in partner selection by grade level are presented in table 5.

Table 5. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Grade Level

	3 rd GRADE			4 th GRADE		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.51	.628	1	4.50	.748
Being a member of the same religion/sect	2	4.42	.976	2	4.30	1.11
Having been unmarried previously	3	4.37	.959	3	4.27	1.04
My family's consent in partner selection	4	4.30	.959	5	4.22	.911
Being devoted to family ties	5	4.28	.831	6	4.21	.870
Matching life styles	6	4.23	.721	4	4.22	.731
Piety of the person I will marry	7	4.15	.996	7	4.01	1.08
Being virgin/untouched	8	4.09	1.21	9	3.95	1.26
Falling in love/having a love relationship	9	4.06	.941	8	4.00	1.00
Being skillful/talented/diligent	10	3.87	2.30	13	3.61	.891
Equal level of education with me	11	3.83	1.06	10	3.76	.973

Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.66	.959	11	3.66	.980
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.51	1.06	12	3.62	.990
Having a similar/same political view	14	3.50	1.13	14	3.40	1.16
Having a similar or close age	15	3.40	1.07	16	3.31	1.04
Being sexually attractive	16	3.34	1.07	17	3.30	.959
Being beautiful/handsome	17	3.23	.917	18	3.27	.840
Having/having had a flirting relationship	18	3.18	1.18	15	3.35	1.16
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	3.11	.893	19	2.91	.981
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.30	1.16	20	2.35	.978

In Table 5, the partner selection priorities of third grade students who were included in the study are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.51$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.42$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.37$), 4. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.30$), 5. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.28$), 6. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.23$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.15$), 8. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.09$), 9. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.06$), 10. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.87$), 11. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.83$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.51$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.50$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.40$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.34$), 17. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.23$), 18. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.18$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.11$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.30$).

The priorities taken into account by fourth grade students who were included in the study in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.50$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.30$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.27$), 4. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 5. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 6. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.21$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.01$), 8. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.00$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.95$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.76$), 11. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 12. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.62$), 13. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.40$), 15. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.35$), 16. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.31$), 17. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.30$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.27$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.91$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.35$).

The general average and standard deviations of the priorities preferred by university students in partner selection by age are presented in table 6.

Table 6. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Age

	18-25 YEARS			26 YEARS and ABOVE		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.52	.677	1	4.18	.833
Being a member of the same religion/sect	2	4.37	1.04	3	4.11	1.18
Having been unmarried previously	3	4.34	.971	5	3.96	1.37
My family's consent in partner selection	4	4.28	.924	6	3.88	1.01
Being devoted to family ties	5	4.26	.846	4	4.00	.919
Matching life styles	6	4.22	.725	2	4.18	.735
Piety of the person I will marry	7	4.11	1.01	9	3.62	1.30
Being virgin/untouched	8	4.05	1.21	11	3.48	1.47
Falling in love/having a love relationship	9	4.03	.976	7	3.85	.948
Equal level of education with me	10	3.80	1.01	8	3.66	1.10
Being skillful/talented/diligent	11	3.75	1.76	12	3.48	.975
Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.68	.978	13	3.37	.791
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.57	1.03	10	3.51	.975
Having a similar/same political view	14	3.45	1.16	16	3.25	1.02
Having a similar or close age	15	3.34	1.03	14	3.37	1.24
Being sexually attractive	16	3.31	1.00	15	3.33	1.07
Having/having had a flirting relationship	17	3.28	1.16	17	3.11	1.31
Being beautiful/handsome	18	3.27	.868	18	2.85	.863
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	3.02	.936	19	2.74	.984
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.32	1.07	20	2.44	1.08

In Table 6, the priorities that the students aged between 18-25 who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}$ =4.52), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}$ =4.37), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}$ =4.34), 4. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}$ =4.28), 5. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}$ =4.26), 6. matching life styles ($\bar{X}$ =4.22), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}$ =4.11), 8. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}$ =4.05), 9. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}$ =4.03), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}$ =3.80), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}$ =3.75), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}$ =3.68), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}$ =3.57), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}$ =3.45), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}$ =3.34), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}$ =3.31), 17. having/having had a flirting

relationship ($\bar{X}=3.28$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.27$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.02$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.32$).

The priorities that the students aged 26 years and above who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.18$), 2. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.18$), 3. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.11$), 4. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.00$), 5. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=3.96$), 6. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=3.88$), 7. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.85$), 8. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 9. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=3.62$), 10. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.51$), 11. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.48$), 12. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.48$), 13. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.37$), 14. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.37$), 15. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.33$), 16. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.25$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.11$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=2.85$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.74$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.44$).

The general average and standard deviations of the criteria preferred by university students in partner selection by the family's economic situation are presented in table 7.

Table 7. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by the Family's Economic Situation

	MODERATE			HIGH		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.51	.652	2	4.48	.88
Being a member of the same religion/sect	2	4.38	1.00	5	4.22	1.26
Having been unmarried previously	3	4.28	1.01	1	4.60	.755
My family's consent in partner selection	4	4.28	.927	8	4.16	.976
Being devoted to family ties	5	4.26	.809	7	4.18	1.00
Matching life styles	6	4.20	.709	4	4.34	.823
Piety of the person I will marry	7	4.06	1.03	6	4.20	1.10
Falling in love/having a love relationship	8	4.04	.947	11	3.98	1.05
Being virgin/untouched	9	4.02	1.24	10	4.08	1.15
Equal level of education with me	10	3.74	1.03	9	4.10	.839
Being skillful/talented/diligent	11	3.62	.833	3	4.46	4.20
Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.60	.956	12	3.98	.979
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.51	1.01	13	3.94	.998
Having a similar/same political view	14	3.41	1.11	16	3.60	1.38
Having a similar or close age	15	3.31	1.04	17	3.60	1.08
Being sexually attractive	16	3.25	.993	14	3.82	.962
Having/having had a flirting relationship	17	3.23	1.16	18	3.52	1.19
Being beautiful/handsome	18	3.18	.858	15	3.64	.851
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	2.94	.896	19	3.46	1.07
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.25	1.01	20	2.78	1.23

According to Table 7, the priorities that the students with a middle familial economic situation primarily took into account in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.51$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.38$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.28$), 4. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.28$), 5. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.26$), 6. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.20$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.06$), 8. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.04$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.02$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.74$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.62$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.51$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.41$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.34$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.25$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.23$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.18$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.94$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.25$).

The priorities that the students with a high level of familial economic situation primarily took into account in partner selection are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.60$), 2. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.48$), 3. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=4.46$), 4. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.34$), 5. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 6. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.20$), 7. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.18$), 8. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.16$), 9. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=4.10$), 10. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.08$), 11. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.98$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.98$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.94$), 14. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.82$), 15. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.64$), 16. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 17. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 18. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.52$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.46$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.78$).

The general average and standard deviations of the criteria preferred by university students in partner selection by monthly expense status are presented in table 8.

Table 8. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Monthly Expense Status

	1000 and below			1001-2000			2001 and above		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.51	.626	1	4.46	.819	2	4.50	.922
Being a member of the same religion/sect	2	4.42	.969	6	4.22	1.21	9	4.13	1.31
Having been unmarried previously	3	4.30	.999	4	4.33	1.06	3	4.42	.976
My family's consent in partner selection	4	4.25	.911	5	4.26	.953	5	4.28	1.08
Being devoted to family ties	5	4.22	.841	3	4.34	.806	6	4.26	1.00

Matching life styles	6	4.16	.710	2	4.44	.690	4	4.3 6	.819
Being virgin/untouched	7	4.08	1.17	8	3.98	1.45	16	3.6 0	1.30
Piety of the person I will marry	8	4.08	.996	9	3.98	1.28	7	4.2 1	.934
Falling in love/having a love relationship	9	4.04	.897	7	4.01	1.11	11	3.8 9	1.24
Equal level of education with me	10	3.72	1.00	10	3.92	1.11	8	4.1 3	.934
Being skillful/talented/diligent	11	3.61	.832	11	3.80	.820	1	4.5 7	4.81
Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.60	.913	12	3.74	1.04	10	3.9 4	1.18
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.51	.972	13	3.71	1.11	12	3.8 1	1.22
Having a similar/same political view	14	3.38	1.09	14	3.61	1.24	14	3.6 3	1.36
Having a similar or close age	15	3.29	1.00	15	3.50	1.18	17	3.5 7	1.19
Being sexually attractive	16	3.23	.998	16	3.49	1.02	13	3.7 1	1.01
Having/having had a flirting relationship	17	3.22	1.11	19	3.25	1.30	15	3.6 3	1.32
Being beautiful/handsome	18	3.20	.847	17	3.38	.887	18	3.3 6	1.05
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	2.90	.880	18	3.26	1.03	19	3.3 6	1.10
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.22	.970	20	2.55	1.25	20	2.7 3	1.28

In Table 8, the criteria that university students primarily took into account in partner selection by a monthly expense of 1000 TL and below are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.51$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.42$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.30$), 4. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 5. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 6. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.16$), 7. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.08$), 8. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.08$), 9. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.04$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.72$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.51$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.38$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.29$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.23$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.22$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.20$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.90$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.22$).

The criteria that the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection by a monthly expense of between 1001-2000 TL are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.46$), 2. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.44$), 3. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.34$), 4. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.33$), 5. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.26$), 6. being a

member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.22$), 7. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.01$), 8. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.98$), 9. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=3.98$), 10. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.92$), 11. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.80$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.74$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.71$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.50$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.49$), 17. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.38$), 18. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.26$), 19. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.25$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.55$).

The criteria that the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection by a monthly expense of 2001 TL and above are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=4.57$), 2. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.50$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.42$), 4. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.36$), 5. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.28$), 6. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.26$), 7. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.21$), 8. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=4.13$), 9. . being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.13$), 10. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.94$), 11. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.89$), 12. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.81$), 13. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.71$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.63$), 15. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.63$), 16. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 17. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.57$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.36$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.36$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.73$).

The general average and standard deviations of the criteria preferred by university students in partner selection by marriage plans are presented in table 9.

Table 9. General Average and Standard Deviations of the Criteria Preferred in Partner Selection by Marriage Plans

	Love relationship/flirting			By meeting			Arranged		
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD
Being tolerant/sensitive/lovable	1	4.48	.650	1	4.54	.666	5	4.51	.817
Falling in love/having a love Relationship	2	4.39	.811	10	3.74	.924	15	3.60	1.09
Being devoted to family ties	3	4.32	.839	8	4.06	.894	4	4.60	.553
Matching life styles	4	4.25	.752	7	4.14	.715	8	4.40	.603
Being a member of the same religion/sect	5	4.22	1.13	2	4.48	.914	2	4.74	.505
My family's consent in partner selection	6	4.19	.981	6	4.25	.888	3	4.62	.645
Having been unmarried previously	7	4.18	1.09	3	4.45	.839	7	4.45	1.03
Being skillful/talented/diligent	8	3.78	2.33	12	3.61	.705	12	3.85	.879
Being virgin/untouched	9	3.76	1.34	5	4.25	1.04	6	4.48	.981

Piety of the person I will marry	10	3.74	1.11	4	4.29	.875	1	4.88	.322
Equal level of education with me	11	3.66	1.05	9	3.93	.894	11	3.85	1.16
Having a similar/same culture as me	12	3.57	1.05	11	3.65	.849	9	4.00	.874
The same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family	13	3.54	1.02	13	3.56	.974	13	3.71	1.12
Being sexually attractive	14	3.41	1.04	16	3.18	.888	16	3.40	1.14
Having/having had a flirting relationship	15	3.36	1.16	18	3.10	1.13	17	3.34	1.25
Having a similar/same political view	16	3.33	1.22	14	3.43	1.08	10	3.91	.853
Being beautiful/handsome	17	3.28	.899	17	3.16	.796	18	3.28	.893
Having a similar or close age	18	3.28	1.07	15	3.34	.990	14	3.62	1.08
Having a good financial situation (being rich)	19	2.95	.926	19	3.02	.925	19	3.02	.984
High popularity of the person I will marry	20	2.39	1.15	20	2.21	.875	20	2.17	.984

According to Table 9, the criteria that the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection by love relationship/flirting by their marriage plans are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.48$), 2. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=4.39$), 3. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.32$), 4. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 5. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 6. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.19$), 7. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.18$), 8. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.78$), 9. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=3.76$), 10. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=3.74$), 11. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.66$), 12. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.57$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.54$), 14. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.41$), 15. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.36$), 16. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.33$), 17. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.28$), 18. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.28$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=2.95$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.39$).

The criteria that the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection by meeting by their marriage plans are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.54$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.48$), 3. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.45$), 4. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.29$), 5. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 6. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.25$), 7. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.14$), 8. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.06$), 9. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.93$), 10. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.74$), 11. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=3.65$), 12. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.61$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.56$), 14. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.43$), 15. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.34$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.18$), 17. being

beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.16$), 18. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.10$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.02$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.21$).

The criteria that the individuals who were included in the study primarily took into account in partner selection by arranged marriage by their marriage plans are ranked by arithmetic mean as follows; 1. piety of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=4.88$), 2. being a member of the same religion/sect ($\bar{X}=4.74$), 3. my family's consent in partner selection ($\bar{X}=4.62$), 4. being devoted to family ties ($\bar{X}=4.60$), 5. being tolerant/sensitive/lovable ($\bar{X}=4.51$), 6. being virgin/untouched ($\bar{X}=4.48$), 7. having been unmarried previously ($\bar{X}=4.45$), 8. matching life styles ($\bar{X}=4.40$), 9. having a similar/same culture as me ($\bar{X}=4.00$), 10. having a similar/same political view ($\bar{X}=3.91$), 11. equal level of education with me ($\bar{X}=3.85$), 12. being skillful/talented/diligent ($\bar{X}=3.85$), 13. the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family ($\bar{X}=3.71$), 14. having a similar or close age ($\bar{X}=3.62$), 15. falling in love/having a love relationship ($\bar{X}=3.60$), 16. being sexually attractive ($\bar{X}=3.40$), 17. having/having had a flirting relationship ($\bar{X}=3.34$), 18. being beautiful/handsome ($\bar{X}=3.28$), 19. having a good financial situation (being rich) ($\bar{X}=3.02$), 20. high popularity of the person I will marry ($\bar{X}=2.17$).

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

As a result of the study carried out to determine the primary criteria preferred in partner selection, it was determined that university students primarily preferred the characteristics of being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, family's consent and matching life styles in partner candidates. When the results are generally evaluated, love that is highly glorified and nearly blessed nowadays is on the 8th rank while family's consent is on the 4th rank. While piety is on the 7th rank, political view similarity is preferred on the 6th rank. It is seen that the least important criteria in partner selection of age difference, flirting relationship, handsomeness/beauty, richness and popularity have lost their importance for university students.

The results of the study reveal that university students do not seem to approve the anticipation that the values also change along with the society-wide changes. The primarily preferred characteristics become intense at the centre of being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being a member of the same religion/sect, having not married, family's consent and similar lifestyles, and traditions and beliefs.

When similar studies were evaluated, the first five criteria prioritized by university students were ranked as being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, having been unmarried previously, family's consent, being devoted to family ties and matching life styles in the study of Başı (2015). The characteristics preferred at the backmost among the characteristics required in partner candidates were determined to be popularity and richness of the partner candidate, political views similarity, and being beautiful/handsome.

The results are generally similar to both the primarily preferred criteria and the least preferred criteria of this study. However, while the criteria of being a member of the same religion/sect is on the 2nd rank in our study, it was on the 6th rank in the study of Başı (2015). It can be said that this is due to the uneasiness caused by

religious and sectarian conflicts that exist in our immediate neighbors and in the world today, and the sensitivity of the study group.

When other studies carried out in this regard were evaluated, in the family and marriage research carried out by Tütengil (1978) with university students, the primary criteria in partner selection were determined to be beauty and elegance by 24%, richness by 25%, chaste character of the partner by 11.9% and mutual agreement by 75.3%. In the study of Ceylan (1994), university students preferred to have same religious beliefs and age, but they stated that financial situation difference and physical attractiveness were not important. There are studies revealing that family's consent maintains its importance in partner selection (Türkarslan and Demirkan, 2007; Pinar, 2008). In addition to these studies, it is seen that Özgüven (2000) similarity of religious beliefs, Kılıç et al. (2007) consensus and honesty/maturity, Medora et al. (2002) same ideological view and personality, Pinar, (2008) good natured, educated, beautiful/handsome partner of the same culture with matching world-view are considered important in the studies on partner selection. Being good natured and having the same world-view were primarily preferred in the study of Türkarslan and Süleymanov (2010). In the study of Farajzadeh (2011) in which Turkish and Iranian university students' opinions about partner selection were examined, it was determined that the characteristics of being honest, respectful, loyal and lovable were primarily preferred. In the study of Aytaç and Bayram (2001), it was determined that university students' primary preferences in partner selection were ranked as physical characteristics, personality, love family structure (socio-economic matching of families), and the person's socio-cultural level, social status, life philosophy and world view.

When the results of the study are generally evaluated, primary criteria reveal that university students do not approve the anticipation that the values also change along with the society-wide changes. The primarily preferred criteria become intense at the centre of traditions and beliefs. It can be said that giving importance to similarity and harmony in partner selection, domestic violence spreading in society, conflicts experienced among families, and the increase in high divorce rates have influences on it.

It was determined that university students' partner selection priorities differed by gender. It is seen that being tolerant/sensitive/lovable was the first choice of men while it was on the second rank in women, and that being a member of the same religion/sect was the first choice of women while it was preferred by men on the 12th rank. Being devoted to family ties was on the 3rd rank and 6th rank in men and women, respectively. While virginity, which is one of the controversial topics, was on the 4th rank in men, it was on the 9th rank in women. Family's consent is on the 3rd rank in women while it is on the 10th rank in men. Being a member of the same religion/sect is on the 12th rank in men while it is on the 3rd rank in women. Sexual attractiveness is on the 11th rank in men while it is on the 16th rank in women. Being beautiful/handsome is on the 14th rank in men while it is on the 18th rank in women. Political view is on the 18th rank in men and on the 14th rank in women. Accordingly, religion/sect similarity, piety, family's consent, having been unmarried previously, political view similarity, and socio-cultural similarity of the family are more primary preferences for women compared to

men. It was determined that men more primarily preferred the criteria of being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, having been unmarried previously, being devoted to family ties, being virgin/untouched, being skillful/talented/diligent, falling in love, equal level of education, being sexually attractive and being beautiful compared to women.

It is seen that the least preferred criteria of having/having had a flirting relationship, having a good financial situation (being rich) and high popularity of the person I will marry were common preferences in both genders. Accordingly, it is seen that political view similarity, richness, beauty/handsomeness and popularity, that were considered significant at one time, have lost their values.

In the studies carried out on this subject, it is seen that there are different points although similar results were obtained in many issues. In the study carried out by Durmazkul (1991) among university students, female students further wanted a partner with the same religious beliefs as them compared to male students. In the study of Yıldırım (2007), although being a member of the same religion/sect is in the last rank, the sensitivity of girls is higher than compared to boys. In the study of Bener (2011), being a member of the same religion/sect and piety are among the preferred criteria and support the results of this study. Farajzadeh, (2011) determined that Turkish female university students pay more attention to the similarity of religious beliefs than male students and Iranian female students. In the study of Türkarslan and Yurtkuran (2007), the finding that female students pay more attention to family's consent than male students supports the results of this study.

According to Turkey Family Structure Research (2011), the fact that the person to be married will be married for the first time (84,7%), having similar family structures (75,3%) and the woman's piety (75,3%) are the most important criteria cared by men in partner selection. The fact that the person to be married has a job (91,7%) and will be married for the first time (83,4%) and having similar family structures (81,5%) are preferred by women. It was determined that the fact that the partner is pious and a member of the same sect was further cared by women compared to men. In terms of men and women, the same hometown, social environment or ethnic origin of the person to be married are considered less important compared to other social attributes. In the study of Aytaç and Bayram (2001), it was determined that the primary attributes required by women were personality, love and physical characteristics, and the primary attributes required by men were love and personality. When it is examined in general, it is seen that both men and women are in search of a partner with a similar family structure to their families.

Matching life styles is the 5th common preference of women and men in this study. This result is parallel with the results of (Özkan, 1989; Şahinkaya, 1975; cited by., Battal, 2008; Türkarslan and Yurtkuran, 2007). It can be said that the differences in partners' world views and their attitudes and judgments on these differences may lead to some communication conflicts between them and may cause disagreements regarding the issues related to children's education and training.

In the study of Türkarslan and Süleymanov (2010), men preferred that their partners would be good natured, beautiful, have the same world view, be of a good family, and women preferred that their partners would be good natured, have the same world view, be educated, have a good job, and be of a good family. In the study of Bacanlı (2001), among 18 characteristics preferred in partner candidates, the virginity, which was cared by the students from Ankara on the 10th rank, was on the seventh rank among the students from Konya. In a study carried out by Kaya (2002) with Hacettepe University students, 54.6% of the students cared that their partner would be virgin/untouched while 45.6% of them did not consider it important. In the study carried out by Yıldırım (2007) with Hacettepe University students, virginity was at the end of the list of desired characteristics in the partner. In the study carried out by Ondaş (2007) with Gazi, Hacettepe and Ankara University students, it was seen that male students preferred the characteristic of being virgin/untouched on the 4th rank while female students preferred it on the 9th rank. In the study of Türkarslan and Yurtkuran (2007), it was seen that men paid more attention to the criteria of having been unmarried previously compared to women. In the study of Farajzadeh (2011), it was determined that male students in Turkish and Iranian universities gave more importance to the virginity of the person to be married compared to women. In the intercultural study carried out by Buss (1989) with 37 different cultures, the virginity characteristic of the partner was also on the 16th rank in men and on the 18th rank in women. It has been determined that the study carried out by Shipman (2011) in India reflects the intercultural difference and has similar results. It is seen that men attach more importance to the virginity not only in our own culture but also in other cultures.

It is seen that it supports the results of this study when it is compared with the results of previous studies regarding this issue. It can be said that women in Turkish culture have some concerns about marriage and are more selective in partner selection compared to men. Studies have revealed that men and women also have different criteria, as well as similar criteria, in partner selection (Bacanlı, 2001; Başar, 2006; Ondaş, 2007; Türkarslan and Yurtkuran Demirkan, 2007; Tüzemen and Özdağoğlu, 2007; Farajzadeh, 2011; Güngör, Yılmaz and Balci, 2011; Keklik, 2011; Efe, 2013). It has been found that women pay more attention to criteria such as economic potential (Shipman, 2011), social status (Yurtkuran Demirkan et al., 2009) and marriage relationships (Uraz, 1979), and that men pay more attention to criteria such as the form of religious life, physical characteristics (Uraz, 1979; Yurtkuran Demirkan et al., 2009) and virginity (Shipman, 2011).

When research results are evaluated according to marital status, it seen that single university students more primarily preferred the criteria of being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, family's consent, being devoted to family ties, being virgin/untouched, being sexually attractive, equal level of education and being skillful/talented/diligent compared to married individuals. Married university students preferred the partner selection priorities of being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, matching life styles, being pious, falling in love, sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family, and having had a flirting relationship more primarily than single individuals. Other criteria are similar for both groups. It can be said that the criteria that are appealing for single people lose their importance during marriage and that the priorities become different for the continuation of the marriage.

When research results are evaluated according to grade levels, the attributes that third grade students primarily took into account in partner selection are listed as the consent of my family, being devoted to family ties, being virgin/untouched, being skillful/talented/diligent, same age, being sexually attractive and being beautiful/handsome. The attributes that fourth grade students primarily took into account in partner selection are listed as matching life styles, falling in love, similarity of culture, same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family, and having a flirting relationship. Other criteria are similar for both groups. Accordingly, it is understood that sexual attraction/beauty, handsomeness, financial situation and popularity lose their importance but flirting relationship becomes more preferable as the grade level increases. While the study results of Başıy (2015) are similar with the results of this study in the first four preferences, being a member of the same religion/sect is the second preference in both grades in our study.

When research results are evaluated by age, the partner selection priorities of the students aged between 18-25 are listed as being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, family's consent, being pious, being virgin/untouched, being skillful/talented/diligent, cultural and political opinion similarity. It is seen that the criteria of being devoted to family ties, matching life styles, falling in love, equal level of education, the same sociocultural level of him/her and his/her family as my family, similar age and being sexually attractive are different in the students aged 26 and above compared to the 18-25 age group. Other criteria are similar for both age groups. When the results are evaluated by age, it is seen that traditional values are important in both age groups.

When research results are evaluated according to the economic situations of families, the criteria that are primarily took into account in partner selection by university students whose families have a middle economic situation are listed as being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, consent of my family and being devoted to family ties. The criteria that are primarily took into account in partner selection by university students whose families have a higher level economic situation are listed as having been unmarried previously, being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being skillful/talented/diligent, matching life styles, and being a member of the same religion/sect. While university students whose families have a middle economic situation preferred being tolerant/sensitive/lovable on the first rank, university students whose families have a high economic situation stated this criteria on 3rd rank and the criteria of having been unmarried previously on the first rank. While being a member of the same religion/sect was on the second rank in the middle income group, it was preferred on the fifth rank in the high-income group. While family's consent in marriage was on the 4th rank in the middle economic level, it was preferred on the 8th rank in the high economic level. Similarly, being devoted to family ties is on the 5th rank in the middle economic level while it is on the 7th rank in the high economic level.

It can be said that the high-income group does not attach much importance to being a member of the same religion/sect, being devoted to family ties and family's consent while paying attention to having been unmarried previously on behalf of the family and social environment. It is seen that the primary preferences of

those in middle income group were mainly determined within the frame of religion and traditions. The results obtained are parallel with the results of Efe (2013) and Başıy (2015). While the last two least preferred characteristics in both groups were richness and high popularity, being beautiful/handsome was a more preferred characteristic on the 17th rank in the middle income group and on the 15th rank in the high-income group. The criteria of having/having had a flirting relationship is on the 17th rank instead of it. While the fact that richness and high popularity are the least preferred criteria in both groups is considered to be positive in terms of social values, the fact that those in the high income group considered having/having had a flirting relationship worthless while preferring being beautiful/handsome at a higher level indicates the value given to physical characteristics.

University students' priorities in partner selection differ by their monthly expense status. The criteria that are primarily taken into account in partner selection by university students with monthly expenses of 1000 TL and below are being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, my family's consent in partner selection, being devoted to family ties by arithmetic mean. The criteria that are primarily taken into account in partner selection by university students who spend between 1001-2000 TL per month are being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, matching life styles, being devoted to family ties, having been unmarried previously and my family's consent in partner selection by arithmetic mean. The criteria that are primarily taken into account in partner selection by those who spend 2001 TL and above per month are listed by arithmetic mean as follows; being skillful/talented/diligent, being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, having been unmarried previously, matching life styles and my family's consent in partner selection.

The remarkable point here is that the criterion of being skillful/talented/diligent is on the first rank in those who spend 2000 TL and above while it is on the 11th rank in other groups. While the criterion of being a member of the same religion/sect is on 2nd rank in those with the lowest monthly expense and on the 6th rank in those middle level expense, it is on the 9th rank in those with an expense of 2001 TL and above. Accordingly, it can be said that the importance of religious/sectarian sensitivities decreases as the amount of money spent per month increases. However, it is understood that adherence to traditional values, family's consent and family relations are considered important in all groups. It can be said that the fact that love marriages are not long-term, and the worries and fears caused by high domestic violence and divorce rates are among the reasons for this.

When research results are evaluated according to the marriage plans of university students, the priorities of those who think of marrying by love relationship/flirting are being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, falling in love/having a love relationship, being devoted to family ties, matching life styles, being a member of the same religion/sect. While 17.2% of the parents of the students who participated in the study married by love marriage, 48.7% of the students who participated in the study stated that they were planning to marry by love relationship/flirting. In the study of Tütengil (1978), it is seen that university students prefer love marriage by

8%. However, they also want to fall in love and that their partners would be tolerant/sensitive/lovable, be devoted to family ties, have matching life styles and be a member of the same religion/sect. In other words, they do not ignore the criteria that ensure the continuation of marriage rather than just making a decision with their feelings.

The criteria of those planning to marry by meeting are being tolerant/sensitive/lovable, being a member of the same religion/sect, having been unmarried previously, being pious and being virgin/untouched. While 24% of the parents of the students who participated in the study married by meeting, 40.4% of the students stated that they were planning to marry by meeting. It can be said that the criteria that are primarily preferred while deciding on marriage are aimed at ensuring the continuation of marriage at the logic and traditional dimensions without attaching too much importance to love.

The criteria of those planning to marry by arranged marriage are listed as piety of the person I will marry, being a member of the same religion/sect, family's consent, being devoted to family ties and being tolerant/sensitive/lovable. While 49.5% of the parents of the students who participated in the study married by arranged marriage, 9.1% of the students are planning to marry by arranged marriage. This shows that the students will make the marriage decision by protecting the traditional values. In the study of Tütengil (1978), it is seen that 20% of university students take into consideration their parents' desires. The fact that the partner is pious has been determined to be the first preference in many studies (Bacanlı, 2001; Bener, 2011; Bozgeyikli, 2013; Çalışkan et al., 2015; Yıldırım, 2007).

It is a relative phenomenon that is influenced by the attitudes and value judgments of the society and mainly affects the people living in traditional environments. It can be said that domestic violence and the increase in divorce rates have led to the strengthening of traditional attitudes.

One of the important decisions in the life of a young individual is the partner selection. People want to have a family to provide the continuation of the generation, to prepare new generations to the society and to transfer cultural values to future generations by ensuring their children's socialization. For this reason, they select a partner to be connected each other by marriage. There are some criteria they require in partner selection, and there are priorities given by them in these criteria. While some of them make a conscious selection, coincidences are effective in some of them. The results obtained from the study show that partner selection criteria are influenced by the culture in which people live. When the results of other studies carried out on this subject are evaluated together with the results of this study, it is very obvious that some changes have been experienced in terms of individual attitudes in our society. It can be said that the fact that the characteristics with social and religious qualities have been preferred more primarily, unlike some studies in this regard, has been caused by the anxiety, fear and sensitivity resulting from religious and sectarian conflicts both in our country and in the world.

SUGGESTIONS

Since it has been determined that partner selection priorities (same religion/sect/lifestyles/political views) of university youth are based on similarities, it can be suggested to pay attention to this issue while deciding on marriage. It is possible to carry out studies on partner selection priorities in divorced couples and marriages where domestic violence is experienced, and the effects of these consequences on the relevant situations can be evaluated. It can be suggested to carry out comparative studies regarding the determination of "having been unmarried previously" as a priority in our day during which divorce rates are high. Family's consent in partner selection has been also determined as an important factor. Comparative studies can be carried out to determine its effect in proving the continuation of marriages. The effects of love that is highly glorified and nearly blessed in the visual/written media and popular culture nowadays on the continuation of marriages can be investigated.

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN EŞ SEÇME ÖNCELİKLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Latife KABAKLI ÇİMEN

Doktor Öğretim Üyesi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, latife.cimen@izu.edu.tr

ORCID Numarası: 0000-0002-4973-3630

Öz

Bu araştırma, üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçme önceliklerinin incelendiği betimsel bir çalışmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, 2016-2017 Eğitim-Öğretim Yılında İstanbul'da bir vakıf üniversitesinin 384 öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır. Veriler, Kişisel Bilgi Formu ve Eş Seçme Öncelikleri Ölçme aracı ile elde edilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre; öğrencilerin eş seçimi öncelikleri; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmak, aynı dinden/mezhepten olmak ve daha önce evlenmemiş olmak şeklinde sıralanmaktadır. Erkekler eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını kadınlardan daha fazla önemserken, kadınlar aynı dinden/mezhepten olma özelliğini erkeklerden daha fazla önemsemiştir. Bekarların eş adayının; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını, evlilerin ise aynı dinden/mezhepten olmasını tercih ettikleri belirlenmiştir. Hem üçüncü sınıf hem de dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını ilk sırada tercih etmiştir. 18-25 yaş grubu ve 26 yaş ve üstü öğrencileri eş adayının; hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını tercih etmişlerdir. Maddi gelir seviyesi yüksek olan öğrenciler eş adayının daha önce evlenmemiş olmasını, maddi gelir seviyesi orta düzeyde olan öğrenciler eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olması özelliğini tercih ettikleri görülmüştür. Aylık harcaması 1000 TL ve altı ile 1001-2000 TL arası olanlar eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olmasını tercih ederken, aylık harcaması 2001 TL ve üstü olanların becerikli/yetenekli/ hamarat olma özelliğini tercih ettikleri görülmektedir. Aşk ilişkisi/flört ederek veya tanışarak evlenmeyi planlayanlar eş adayının hoşgörülü/duyarlı/cana yakın olması tercih ederken; görücü usulü ile evlenmeyi planlayanlar eş adaylarının dindar olmasını tercih ettikleri belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Evlilik, aile, üniversite öğrencisi, eş seçme, kültür.

REFERENCES

- Akın, M. H., ve Aydemir, M. A. (2007). "Üniversitede Okuyan Kız Öğrencilerin Cinsiyet Rolü Tutumları Bağlamında Aile ve Evlilik Kurumlarına Bakışları (Selçuk Üniversitesi Örneği)." *Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Edebiyat Dergisi*, 18: 43–60.
- Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., Bem, D. J., Hoeksema, S. N ve Atkinson, R. L. (2002). *Psikolojiye Giriş*. (Çev. Y. Alagon). Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınları.
- ASPB. (2014). *Türkiye’de aile yapısı araştırması 2011*. Ankara: Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.
- ASPB. (2015). *Türkiye’de evlilik tercihleri araştırması*, Ankara: Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.
- Aydın, O. ve Baran, G. (2010). "Toplumsal değişme sürecinde evlenme ve boşanma." *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*, 21(2): 117–126.
- Aytaç, S. ve Bayram N. (2001). "Üniversite gençliğinin iş ve eş seçimindeki etkin kriterlerinin Analitik Hiyerarşi Süreci (AHP) ile analizi". *İş, Güç: Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 3 (1).
- Bacanlı, H. (2001). "Eş tercihleri." *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(15): 7-16.

- Başay, A.C. (2015). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Benlik Yapısı ve Eş Seçme Kriterleri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Bee, H., Boyd, D. (2009). *Çocuk gelişim psikolojisi*. (Çev. O. Gündüz). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.
- Bener, M. (2011). *Dindarlık-Eş seçimi ilişkisi (SDÜ Örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Bener, Ö. ve Günay, G. (2012). "Gençlerin Evlilik ve Aile Yaşamına İlişkin Tutumları." *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(1): 1–27.
- Bozgeyikli, H., ve Toprak, E. (2013). "Üniversiteli Gençlerin Eş Seçim Kriterlerinin Sıralama Yargılarıyla Ölçeklenmesi." *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1): 68–87.
- Bugay, Aslı ve Tezer, Esin (2008). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Evlenecekleri Eşlerde Aradıkları Özellikler." *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 23: 36-40.
- Buss, D. M. (1994). "The strategies of human mating." *American Scientist*, 82: 238-249
- Çalışkan, Z., Timur T, S., Orhan, İ., Nacar, G., (2015). "Partneri Olan ve Olmayan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi Tercihlerinin Karşılaştırılması." *İnönü Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1): 6-10.
- Çaplı, O. (1992). *Evlenmeye Hazır mısınız?* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Ceylan, F. G. (1994). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimindeki Tercih ve Beklentileri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.
- Creamer, M. ve Campbell, I. M. (1988). "The Role of Interpersonal Perception in Dyadic Adjustment." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 44(3): 424-430.
- Durmazkul, A. (1991). *Cinsiyete Göre Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi Tercihleri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Efe, E. (2013). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçme Eğilimleri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Ersanlı, K ve Kalkan, M. (2008). *Evlilik ilişkilerini Geliştirme*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Farajzadeh, N. (2011). *Türk Ve İranlı Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi İle İlgili Görüşleri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Ekşi, B. (2005). "Evliliğe Hazırlık Aşamasındaki Karı-Koca Adaylarının Evlilik ve Anne-Baba Olma Üzerine Düşünceleri." *Aile ve Toplum Dergisi*, 2(8): 75–85.
- Güngör, H. C., Yılmaz, M. ve Balcı S. Ç. (2011). "Romantizm ve Eş Seçimi Tutum Ölçeğinin Uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması." *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4 (36): 180-188.
- Haskan Avcı Ö. (2014). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Evlilik Öncesi İlişkilerde Problem Yaşadıkları ve Eğitim Almak İstedikleri Konular." *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 15(1): 279-99.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler* (4.Basım). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaya, M. (2002). *Cinsiyetleri Farklı Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi Tercihlerine Göre Denetim Odakları*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

- Keklik, İ. (2011). "Mate Selection Preferences of Turkish University Students." *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 44: 129-148.
- Kılıç, D., Kaygusuz, C., Bağ, B., ve Tortumluoğlu, G. (2007). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimine ve Evliliğe İlişkin Görüşleri." *Sağlık ve Toplum Dergisi*, 17(1): 32-42.
- Köroğlu, T. (2013). *Üniversite Gençliğinin Evlilik, Aile Ve Boşanma Konusundaki Düşünce ve Görüşleri Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Araştırma: Karabük Üniversitesi Örneği*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karabük Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Karabük.
- Lauer, R.H and Lauer, J.C (1991). *Marriage and Family the Quest for Intimacy*, Dubuque, IA: Wm, C. Brown, Publ.
- Medora, NP, Larson, JH, Hortaçsu, N, Dave P, (2002). "Perceived Attitudes Toward Romanticism; a Cross-Cultural Study of American, Asian, and Turkish Young Adults." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33(2): 155-179
- Mermer, Y. (2011). *Genç Kızların Evlilik Kurumuna İlişkin Değer Ve Tutumları*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Möller, A. T. ve Van Zyl, P. (1991). "Relationship Beliefs, Interpersonal Perception and Marital Adjustment." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47(1): 28-33.
- Nazlı, S. (2007). *Aile Danışmanlığı*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Ondaş, B. (2007). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Evlilik ve Eş Seçimiyle İlgili Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Ozansoy Tunçdemir, N., Kekillioğlu, A., Özcan, A., Kahraman, L., Kahraman, A.B., (2015). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algıları." *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(4): 304-322.
- Öngen, B., Aytaç, S., (2013). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutumları ve Yaşam Değerleri İlişkisi." *Sosyoloji Konferansları*, 48: 1-18.
- Özgiraz, A., Arslanel, M.N., Şengül, T., (2016). "Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Aile Kurumuna Bakışı." *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 30(2): 243-268.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (2000). *Evlilik ve Aile Terapisi*. Ankara: Pdrem Yayıncılık.
- Pınar, G. (2008). "Üniversite Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Evliliğe Bakış Açısı." *Aile ve Toplum Eğitim-Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 4(14): 49-60.
- Shipman, A. S. C. (2011). *Mate Selection in Modern India*. ProQuest: Dissertations and Theses.
- Şentürk, Ü. (2012). *Sosyolojik Açısından Parçalanmış Aile ve Çocuk İlişkisi*. İstanbul: Kum Saati Yayınları.
- Türkarlan, N. ve Süleymanov, A. (2010). "Üniversite Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Evlilik Konusundaki Görüş ve Düşünceleri Azerbaycan ve Türkiye karşılaştırması." *Karadeniz Dergisi*, 5: 54-67.
- Türkarlan, N. ve Yurtkuran, S. (2007). "Üniversite Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Evliliğin Kuruluşuna İlişkin Görüş ve Düşünceleri." T.C. Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları Bilim Serisi, Genel Yayın No: 132. Ankara: Afşaroğlu Matbaası.
- Tütengil, O. Cavit (1978). "Aile ve Evlilik Araştırması Sonuçları." *Sosyoloji Konferansları Dergisi*, 3(16): 1-16.

- Tüzmen ve Özdağoğlu (2007). "Doktora Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçiminde Önem Verdikleri Kriterlerin Analitik Hiyerarşi Süreci Yöntemi ile Belirlenmesi." *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(1): 215-232.
- Uraz, G. (1979). *Müstakbel Eşten Beklentiler Üzerine Bir İnceleme*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Uyar, M., Yıldırım Öztürk, E ve Şahin, T.K. (2017). "Bir Tıp Fakültesi Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi, Evlilik, Aile Yaşantısı ve Cinsiyet Rollerini Konularındaki Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi." *Uluslararası Aile Çocuk ve Eğitim Dergisi*, 12: 39-53.
- White, S. G. ve Hatcher, C. (1984). "Couple Complementarity and Similarity: A Review of the Literature." *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 12(1): 15-25.
- Yıldırım, İ. (2007). "Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçme kriterleri." *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3 (27): 15-30.
- Yurtkuran-Demirkan, S., Ersoz, A. G., Şen, R .B., Ertekin, E., Sezgin, O., Turgut, A. M., Şehitoğlu, N. (2009). *Boşanma nedenleri araştırması*. T. C. Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü. Ankara.
- <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/-erken-evlilik-siddeti-pembenar-detay-evlilik-2029594/> erişim tarihi 22.10.2017.