

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Md Hasibul Islam^{1*}, Dr. Asoke Kumar Saha², Hamida Naz³, Shirin Shila⁴,
Ummee Habiba Shithee⁵

ABSTRACT

The objective of the present study was to investigate whether Interpersonal Attraction of Bangladeshi students of Dhaka city varies based on gender, religion, and economic status. A standardized instrument, named Interpersonal Attraction Scale of McCroskey and McCain (1974), was used to collect data by purposive sampling from 300 undergraduate students of different universities of Dhaka city. This scale was divided in three categories- Social Attraction, Physical Attraction, and Task Attraction. By analyzing the results of the present study, it was found that social attraction is significant in $p < .001$ according to economic status that means middle class students were more socially attracted than lower and higher classes students. physical attraction is significant at $p < .05$ according to economic status that means middle class students were more physically attracted than lower and higher classes students. Negative significant difference between Hinduism and Muslim students at $p < .05$ that means Muslim students posse higher mean than Hinduism students in social attraction.

Keywords: *Interpersonal Attraction, Religion, Economic Status*

Interpersonal attraction is positive feelings for others; liking and loving (Feldman, 2013). Interpersonal attraction refers to positive feelings toward another (Wayne Weiten, 2013). Interpersonal attraction is positive attitude held by one person toward another person (John D. Delamater, Daniel J. Myers, Jessica L. Collett, 2015). Interpersonal attraction refers to the evaluations we make of other people- the positive and negative attitudes we form about them (Baron & Branscombe, 2012).

Physical Attractiveness

It's often said that '*beauty is only skin deep.*' But evidence suggests that most people don't really believe that (Fitness, Fletcher, & Overall, 2003). The importance of physical

¹ Graduate Student, Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

² Professor, Department of Psychology, Jagannath University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

³ Lecturer, Ideal College, Dhanmondi, Dhaka, Bangladesh

⁴ Graduate Student, Department of Psychology, Jagannath University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

⁵ Psychologist, Bashundhara Special Children Foundation, Dhaka, Bangladesh

*Responding Author

Received: January 8, 2019; Revision Received: February 6, 2019; Accepted: February 15, 2019

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

attractiveness was shown in a study in which unacquainted men and women were sent off on a “get-acquainted” date (Sprecher & Duck, 1994).

The key determinant of romantic attraction for both sexes, though, was the physical attractiveness of the other person. Consistent with this finding, research has shown, as one might expect, that attractive people of both sexes enjoy greater mating success than their less attractive peers (Rhodes, Simmons, & Peters, 2005). Many other studies have shown the importance of physical attractiveness in the initial stage of dating and have shown that it continues to have influence as relationships evolve (McNulty, Neff, & Karney, 2008; Patzer, 2006).

Weiten (2013) mentioned that the matching hypothesis proposes that males and females of approximately equal physical attractiveness are likely to select each other as partners. The matching hypothesis is supported by evidence that dating and married couples tend to be similar in level of physical attractiveness (Regan, 1998, 2008).

One of most commonly cited factors influencing attraction is physical attractiveness. Not surprisingly, most people show a substantial preference for attractive over unattractive others (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). Perhaps the advantage of good looks is inferences people make when they see a physically attractive person. Studies have shown that when people see an attractive person, they believe that there is more to physical beauty than they see, and they tend to assume certain internal qualities to person, such as kindness, and outgoingness (Barocas & Karoly, 1972; Dion et al., 1972).

Physical attractiveness can have a significant impact on desirability (John D. Delamater, 2015). A great deal of evidence shows that given a choice of more than one potential partner, individuals will prefer the one who is more physically attractive (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). A study of 752 first-year college students, for example, demonstrates that most individuals prefer more attractive persons as dates (Walster [Hatfield], Aronson, Abrahams, & Rottman, 1966). A study of female facial beauty found substantial agreement among male college students about which features are attractive (Cunningham, 1986). Research has also found a high level of agreement among men that certain female body shapes are more appealing than others (Wiggins, Wiggins, & Conger, 1968) and agreement among women about which male body shapes are attractive (Beck, Ward-Hull, & McLearn, 1976). Research consistently finds that we infer that physically attractive people possess more favorable personality traits and are more likely to experience successful outcomes in their personal and social lives (Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Lorenzo et al., 2010). A meta-analysis of more than 70 studies found that attractiveness has a moderate influence on judgments of social competence- how sensitive, kind, and interesting a person is (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991).

Routine Activities

Most relationships begin in the context of routine activities. A study of college students found that relationships began with a meeting in a class, a dorm, or at work (36 percent); with an introduction by a third person (38 percent); or at parties (18 percent) or bars (14 percent). A study of 3,342 adults aged 18 to 59 asked how respondents met their sexual partners (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). We are more likely to develop a relationship with someone who is in close physical proximity to us (John D. Delamater et al., 2015).

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Proximity

In classroom settings, seating patterns are an important influence on the development of friendships. One study (Byrne, 1961a) varied the seating arrangements for three classes of about 25 students each. In one class, they remained in the same seats for the entire semester (14 weeks). In the second class, they were assigned new seats halfway through the semester. In the third class, they were assigned new seats every 3½ weeks. The relationships among students were assessed at the beginning and at the end of the semester. Few relationships developed among the students in the class where seats were changed every 3½ weeks. In the other two classes, students in neighboring seats became acquainted in greater numbers than students in non-neighboring seats. Moreover, the relationships were closer in the class where seat assignments were not changed. Similar positive associations between physical proximity and friendship have been found in a variety of natural settings, including dormitories (Priest & Sawyer, 1967), married student housing complexes (Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1950), and business offices (Schutte & Light, 1978). We are more likely to develop friendships with persons in close proximity because such relationships provide interpersonal rewards at the lowest cost. Interaction is easier with those who are close by. It costs less time and energy to interact with the person sitting next to you than with someone on the other side of the room (John D. Delamater et. al., 2015).

Frequency of exposure

The increase in liking as a function of frequency of exposure is greater for stimuli that are presented subliminally, of which the person is not consciously aware (Bornstein, 1992). Research shows that homogamy is characteristic of all types of social relationships from acquaintance to intimate (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Interviews with 832 students attending the same (all White) high school obtained data on their romantic/sexual relationships (Bearman, Moody, & Stovel, 2004). The students' relationships were homophilous on IQ, family socioeconomic status (SES), getting drunk, sexual activity, and college plans. A survey of 3,342 adults assessed the extent to which partners in relationships were similar on the following dimensions (Laumann et al., 1994): 75 to 83 percent were homophilous (similar) by age, 82 to 87 percent by education, 88 to 93 percent by race/ethnicity, and 53 to 72 percent by religion.

Social Norms

Potential dates are single persons (of the opposite sex) who are of similar age, class, ethnicity, and religion. Same-sex couples are less likely to be homogeneous on race/ethnicity, age, and education, perhaps due to the limited availability of partners (Schwartz & Graf, 2007). Norms that define appropriateness influence the development of relationships in several ways. First, each of us uses norms to monitor our own behavior. We hesitate to establish a relationship with someone who is defined by norms as an inappropriate partner. Thus, a low-status person is unlikely to approach a high-status person as a potential friend. For example, the law clerk who just joined a firm would not discuss his hobbies with the senior partner (unless she asked). Second, if one person attempts to initiate a relationship with someone who is defined by norms as inappropriate, the other person will probably refuse to reciprocate. If the clerk did launch into an extended description of the joys of restoring antique model trains, the senior partner would probably end the interaction. Third, even if both persons are willing to interact, third parties often enforce the norms that prohibit the relationship (Kerckhoff, 1974). In 2010, only 9.5 percent of married couples were interracial; of these, 38 percent were White-Hispanic, 8 percent were Black-White, and the rest were White other (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010). The norm of homogamy remains especially strong on this dimension

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

(Blackwell & Lichter, 2004). Research on interracial romantic relationships found that non-White males reported more disapproval from their White female partners' family and friends than any other race/gender combination (Miller, Olson, & Fazio, 2004). Research shows that homogamy is characteristic of all types of social relationships from acquaintance to intimate (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Interviews with 832 students attending the same (all White) high school obtained data on their romantic/sexual relationships (Bearman, Moody, & Stovel, 2004).

Familiarity

Familiarity can account for why we gradually come to like the faces of strangers if we encounter them more often (Moreland & Beach, 1992). In contrast, when something familiar seems different, people feel uncomfortable. For example, people do not usually like mirror reversals of photos of their own or other faces (Mita et. al. 1977)

Hogg and Vaughan (2010) mentioned that as we become more familiar with a stimulus (even another person), we feel more comfortable with it and we like it more. Robert Zajonc (1968) found that familiarity enhances liking just as repeatedly presenting stimuli increases liking for them- the basic mere exposure effect as used by advertisers to have us feel familiar with new products.

A phenomenon such as mere exposure effect suggests that people come to hold more positive attitudes toward familiar stimuli than toward novel, unfamiliar ones (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). This propinquity effect has also been found to play a critical role in eliciting attraction between people. Studies have found that when participants were repeatedly presented with faces of different individuals, participants rated faces they saw more frequently as more attractive (Peskin & Newell, 2004; Rhodes et al., 2001).

Social matching

Studies of dating across ethnic or cultural groups reveal a complex interplay of factors involving similarity of culture that influence attraction (Liu, Campbell & Condie, 1995). The sociologist George Yancey (2007) compared the ethnic choices of White, Black, Hispanic and Asian contributors to the Internet site Yahoo Personals. Willingness to meet with partners of different race varied: women were less likely than men to date interracially, while Asians were more likely than Whites or Hispanics to date Blacks. Significantly, interracial dating was lower among those who were conservative politically or high in religiosity (the religious right).

The similarity hypothesis is further supported by several well-validated studies (e.g., Feingold, 1988), which indicate a strong correlation between married couples and similarities in education and socioeconomic status, but also equal levels of physical attractiveness (Murstein & Christy, 1976; Feingold, 1988).

Social Rewards

In social psychology, reinforcement theory states that people are more likely to repeat behaviors for which they receive some reward or benefit. As such, this theory would predict that people like others who benefit them or make them feel good. For example, longitudinal study of 38 dating couples showed a positive correlation between couple's longevity and continuing exchange of resources and rewards (Berg & McQuinn, 1986). In addition, studies have revealed that people experience higher levels of attraction toward others not only when

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

they receive favor, but when they simply receive praise (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). Yet, a study by Drachman et al. suggests that reward-attraction theory is not so simple after all. According to the study, one's consistent agreement to another produces a liking effect only when the person is not dependent on the target. This finding suggests that, although praise and compliments may increase liking, if they seem baseless, then they would instead create suspicion of ingratiation (Drachman et al., 1978).

Attitudes

According to the 'law of attraction' by Byrne (1971), attraction towards a person is positively related to the proportion of attitudes similarity associated with that person. Clore (1976) also raised that the one with similar attitudes as yours was more agreeable with your perception of things and more reinforcing she/he was, so the more you like him/her. Based on the cognitive consistency theories, difference in attitudes and interests can lead to dislike and avoidance (Singh & Ho, 2000; Tan & Singh, 1995) whereas similarity in attitudes promotes social attraction (Byrne, London & Reeves, 1968; Singh & Ho, 2000). Miller (1972) pointed out that attitude similarity activates the perceived attractiveness and favor-ability information from each other, whereas dissimilarity would reduce the impact of these cues.

The studies by Jamieson, Lydon and Zanna (1987, 1988) showed that attitude similarity could predict how people evaluate their respect for each other, and social and intellectual first impressions which in terms of activity preference similarity and value-based attitude similarity respectively. In intergroup comparisons, high attitude similarity would lead to homogeneity among in-group members whereas low attitude similarity would lead to diversity among in-group members, promoting social attraction and achieving high group performance in different tasks (Hahn & Hwang, 1999). Although attitudinal similarity and attraction are linearly related, attraction may not contribute significantly to attitude change (Simons, Berkowitz & Moyer, 1970)

Others social and cultural aspects

Byrne, Clore and Worchel (1966) suggested people with similar economic status are likely to be attracted to each other. Buss & Barnes (1986) also found that people prefer their romantic partners to be similar in certain demographic characteristics, including religious background, political orientation and socio-economic status.

Researchers have shown that interpersonal attraction was positively correlated to personality similarity (Goldman, Rosenzweig & Lutter, 1980). People are inclined to desire romantic partners who are similar to themselves on agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, emotional stability, openness to experience (Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997), and attachment style (Klohn & Luo, 2003).

Activity similarity was especially predictive of liking judgments, which affects the judgments of attraction (Lydon, Jamieson & Zanna, 1988). Lydon and Zanna (1987, 1988) claimed that high self-monitoring people were influenced more by activity preference similarity than attitude similarity on initial attraction, while low self-monitoring people were influenced more on initial attraction by value-based attitude similarity than activity preference similarity. According to the post-conversation measures of social attraction, tactical similarity was positively correlated with partner satisfaction and global competence ratings, but was uncorrelated with the opinion change and perceived persuasiveness measures (Waldron & Applegate, 1998).

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

While checking similar variables, they were also seen as more similar on a number of personality characteristics. This study found that the length of the average relationship was related to perceptions of similarity; the couples who were together longer were seen as more equal. This effect can be attributed to the fact that when time passes by couples become more alike through shared experiences, or that couples that are alike stay together longer (Zajonc et al., 1987).

Similarity has effects on starting a relationship by initial attraction to know each other. It is shown that high attitude similarity resulted in a significant increase in initial attraction to the target person and high attitude dissimilarity resulted in a decrease of initial attraction (Gutkin, Gridley & Wendt, 1976; Kaplan & Olczak, 1971). Similarity also promotes relationship commitment. Study on heterosexual dating couples found that similarity in intrinsic values of the couple was linked to relationship commitment and stability (Kurdek & Schnopp-Wyatt, 1997).

Social homogamy refers to "passive, indirect effects on spousal similarity" (Watson et al., 2004, p.1034). The result showed that age and education level are crucial in affecting the mate preference. Because people with similar age study and interact more in the same form of the school, propinquity effect (i.e., the tendency of people to meet and spend time with those who share the common characteristics) plays a significant impact in spousal similarity. Convergence refers to an increasing similarity with time. Although the previous research showed that there is a greater effect on attitude and value than on personality traits, however, it is found that initial assortment (i.e., similarity within couples at the beginning of marriage) rather than convergence, plays a crucial role in explaining spousal similarity.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

At the University of Michigan, Theodore Newcomb (1961) studied two groups of 17 unacquainted male transfer students. After 13 weeks of boardinghouse life, those whose agreement was initially highest were most likely to have formed close friendships. One group of friends was composed of 5 liberal arts students, each a political liberal with strong intellectual interests. Another was made up of 3 conservative veterans who were all enrolled in the engineering college.

Since Backman and Secord (1959) published their landmark study, scholars have explored the reciprocity effect- the tendency for people to be attracted to others who like them. This emphasis on the reward potential of being liked by others was underscored by interdependence theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and social exchange theory (Homans, 1961, p. 129), with Homans asserting that the social approval of others is a *generalized reinforce*. In one set of studies, Walster and colleagues (1973) sought to demonstrate that men tend to be attracted to women who *play hard to get* (an effect that could have contradicted the reciprocity effect), but their conclusion based upon six studies was that men are attracted to women who are easy for them to get but hard for other men to get (Finkel & Eastwick, 2009b). These findings suggest that people tend to be attracted to others who like them, but only if this liking makes them feel special. A subsequent speed-dating study yielded compatible conclusions: Speed-daters were Interpersonal Attraction 10 especially attracted to partners who liked them more than those partners liked other people, but they were not attracted to partners who indiscriminately liked everybody (Eastwick, Finkel, Mochon, & Ariely, 2007; Eastwick & Finkel, 2009). Similarly, classic research suggests that people tend to be more attracted to others who grow to like them over time than to others who have

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

always liked them, who have always disliked them, or who have grown to dislike them over time (Aronson & Linder, 1965). This effect appears to derive from the tendency for people to experience a self-esteem boost from having discerning others like them as they get to know them better. Indeed, people tend to be sufficiently eager for evidence that others like them that they even tend to be attracted to others who ingratiate themselves to win favor (Gordon, 1996; Vonk, 2002).

Attraction effect inspired, at least in part, by others helping one meet one's self-esteem needs is the pratfall effect. People are more attracted to appealing others (but not to unappealing others) who have committed a pratfall, such as spilling coffee on themselves, than to appealing others who have not (Aronson, Willerman, & Floyd, 1966). The effect seems to occur because although people like appealing others, this attraction is bolstered to the degree that those others do not make them feel inferior by social comparison (Herbst, Gaertner, & Insko, 2003).

At two of Hong Kong's universities, Royce Lee and Michael Bond (1996) found that roommate friendships flourished over a six-month period when roommates shared values and personality traits, but more so when they perceived their roommates as similar. As so often happens, reality matters, but perception matters more.

People like not only those who think as they do but also those who act as they do. Subtle mimicry fosters fondness. Have you noticed that when someone nods their head as you do and echoes your thoughts, you feel a certain rapport and liking? That's a common experience, report Rick van Baaren and his colleagues (2003a, 2003b), and one result is higher tips for Dutch restaurant servers who mimic their customers by merely repeating their order. Natural mimicry increases rapport, note Jessica Lakin and Tanya Chartrand (2003), and desire for rapport increases mimicry.

When Peter Buston and Stephen Emlen (2003) surveyed nearly 1,000 college aged people, they found that the desire for similar mates far outweighed the desire for beautiful mates. Attractive people sought attractive mates. Wealthy people wanted mates with money. Family-oriented people desired family-oriented mates. Studies of newlyweds reveal that similar attitudes, traits, and values help bring couples together and predict their satisfaction (Gaunt, 2006; Gonzaga & others, 2007; Luo & Klohnen, 2005). That is the basis of one psychologist founded Internet dating site, which claims to match singles using the similarities that mark happy couples (Carter & Snow, 2004; Warren, 2005).

Rationale of the study

In our social and cultural trend, adult members of the family choose partner for the younger one. But recent trend of tendency to choose partner in accordance to own choice and this tendency most probably seen in case of university students. That's why, the present study will be helpful to find out real scenario of university students whether they select their own partner by their own drive or not.

Objective of the Study

- To investigate whether interpersonal attraction of Bangladeshi students of Dhaka city varies based on gender, religion, and economic status.

METHODOLOGY

Design

A cross-sectional survey design was used in the present study. This design indicates that all data were collected at a single point of time. For collecting our data we took 8 academic days.

Sampling

The target population was only the people who are involved in university education. The sample consisted of 300 university students of both public and private, with 149 male students and 151 female students and 150 was from Hinduism and 150 was from Muslim religion, who were purposively selected from various universities of Dhaka city, partly from Jagannath University, Asia Pacific University; and World University, Bangladesh. No restrictions on age, gender, health, or socio-economic status on the selection of the respondent's status were placed for participating in this study. Mean age of the respondents was 21.68 years (range from 17 to 28 years) and standard deviation was 1.71.

Measuring Instruments

Personal information Form (PIF): Personal information of the participants, such as age, religion, educational qualification, economic status, etc. was collected through this paper.

Interpersonal Attraction Scale

To measure interpersonal attraction of the universities students, adopted Bengali version of 15 items Interpersonal Attraction Scale was used. McCroskey and McCain (1974) created the Interpersonal Attraction Scale (IAS) by first generating 30 items thought to measure the Social, Task, and Physical dimensions of attraction. Next, 215 undergraduate students completed the questionnaire with an acquaintance in mind. A series of factor analyses revealed a 15-items, three-factor solution accounting for 49% of the total variance. The three factors were: Social Attraction, Task Attraction, and Physical Attraction. The authors suggested that these subscales are related but are independent of one other. The IAS was designed as a self-report measure. Respondents report their attraction toward another by using Likert type scales ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The scale takes less than 10 minutes to complete.

Reliability

McCroskey and McCain (1974) reported internal reliabilities for the IAS-item scale as follows: Social Attraction, .84; Task Attraction, .81; and Physical Attraction, .86. Various researchers have reported similar results (Ayres, 1989; Brandt, 1979; Duran & Kelly, 1988; Wheelless, Frymier, & Thompson, 1992). Split-half reliability was reported as .90 for Social, .87 for Task, and .92 for Physical Attraction (McCroskey, Richmond, Daly, & Cox, 1975).

Validity

The IAS has been used rather extensively across the communication discipline and to a lesser extent in related fields. Attraction has been positively associated with a host of communication behaviors and perceptions, providing ample evidence of construct validity. For example, some researchers reported a positive relationship between attraction and interpersonal competence (Brandt, 1979; Canary & Spitzberg, 1987; Duran & Kelly, 1988; Johnson, 1992), while others investigated the role of attraction in initial interactions (Clatterbuck, 1979; Sunnafrank, 1990).

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Burgoon and associates studied the impact of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of attraction. Burgoon, Coker, and Coker (1986) reported that differential gaze behavior (constant, normal, and aversion) resulted in different levels of perceived attraction. Conversational involvement (Burgoon, Newton, Walther, & Baesler, 1989) and immediacy (Burgoon & Hale, 1988) were also linked to perceptions of attraction. Still others reported on the negative consequences of reticence and apprehension on perceptions of attraction (Ayres, 1989; Burgoon & Koptor, 1984; Hawkins & Stewart, 1991; McCroskey et al., 1975; Richmond, 1978) and on the positive relationship between attraction and cognitive complexity (Powers, Jordan, Gurley, & Lindstrom, 1986).

Interpersonal attraction was investigated in a variety of contexts. For example, Rubin and McHugh (1987) noted that people can become socially attracted to TV characters. In the organizational context, Wheelless and Reichel (1990) reported that supervisor versatility, assertiveness, and responsiveness led to subordinates' perceptions of their task attractiveness. Also, Andersen and Kibler (1978) found evidence that physical and social attractiveness influences voter preferences.

Comments about the scale

The IAS has received a generous amount of attention in the literature, yet some studies question the factor structure of the scale. For example, Hill and Courtright (1981) conducted a factor analysis and found that the IAS was uni-dimensional rather than multidimensional. Warfel (1984) also concluded that the items on the Attraction scale did not load as expected. Users of the IAS should factor-analyze the scale and employ the resulting subscales rather than rely on the factor structure originally provided by the authors.

Tardy (1988) summarized many of the strengths and weaknesses of attraction measures and concluded that the IAS "may be too general to actually detect differences among individuals who have known each other for a long period of time. In other words, items may have a ceiling over which increased attraction cannot be measured (p. 272). For this reason, as well as to increase the reliability of the Interpersonal Attraction Scale, McCroskey and Richmond (1979) substantially modified the McCroskey and McCain (1974) measure. The new version of the scale is a 18-item instrument that employs a seven-interval response option.

Procedure

For collecting data went to various departments of the universities. We took the permission for collecting data through acknowledging the authority about our purpose of data collection. We selected them randomly especially who was free on the mean time.

At the beginning the respondents were requested to fill up the personal information carefully and then they asked to respond the statements without wasting time. The respondents had completed their task according to the instruction. Then the questionnaires were collected from them. In this way data were collected from students.

RESULTS

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether the Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction. Obtained data were analyzed using t-Test and one-way ANOVA. The findings are presented in the following table-

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Table 1 Mean, SD and t of Social attraction Score of the Male and Female students

Gender	N	M	SD	df	t
Male	149	19.51	3.79	298	-1.47
Female	151	20.17	4.00		

Table 1 indicates that mean difference in Social attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = -1.47$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 1 that the mean scores obtained by the female students (20.17) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the male students (19.51).

Table 2 Mean, SD and t of Physical Attraction Score of the Male and Female students

Gender	N	M	SD	df	t
Male	149	18.10	2.84	298	.41
Female	151	17.97	2.59		

Table 2 indicates that mean difference in Physical Attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = .41$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 2 that the mean scores obtained by the male students (18.10) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the female students (17.97).

Table 3 Mean, SD and t of Task Attraction Score of the Male and Female students

Gender	N	M	SD	Df	t
Male	149	16.40	2.17	298	-.84
Female	151	16.61	2.10		

Table 3 indicates that mean difference in Task attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = -.84$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 3 that the mean scores obtained by the female students (16.61) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the male students (16.40).

Table 4 One Way Analysis of Variance of Social Attraction Score according to economic status of the students

Source of variance	SS	Df	MS	F
Economic Status	270.52	2	135.26	9.38***
Error	4285.12	297	14.43	
Total	122683	300		

*** $p < .001$

Table 4 shows that the Social attraction scores of students according to their economic status is significant ($F = 9.38$, $df = 2$, $p < .01$).

Table 5 One Way Analysis of Variance of Physical Attraction Score according to Economic Status of the students

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F
Economic Status	51.00	2	25.50	3.52*
Error	2153.60	297	7.25	
Total	99801.00	300		

* $p < .05$

Table 5 shows that the Physical attraction score of students according to their economic status is significant ($F = 3.52$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$).

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Table 6 One Way Analysis of Variance of Task Attraction Score according to Economic Status of the students

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F
Economic Status	4.81	2	2.40	.53
Error	1360.18	297	4.58	
Total	83106.00	300		

Table 6 shows that the Social attraction score of students according to their economic status is not significant ($F = .53$, $df = 2$).

Table 7 Mean, SD and t of Social attraction Score of the Hinduism and Muslim students

Religion	N	M	SD	df	T
H	150	19.39	4.17	298	-2.01*
M	150	20.29	3.57		

* $p < .05$

Table 7 indicates that mean difference in Social Attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is significant ($t = -2.01$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 2 that the mean scores obtained by the Muslim students (20.29) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the Hinduism students (19.39).

Table 8 Mean, SD and t of Physical Attraction Score of the Hinduism and Muslim students

Re	N	M	SD	df	T
H	150	17.98	2.77	298	-.36
M	150	18.09	2.67		

Table 8 indicates that mean difference in Physical attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is not significant ($t = -.36$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 8 that the mean scores obtained by the Muslim students (18.09) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the Hinduism students (17.98).

Table 9 Mean, SD and t of Task Attraction Score of the Hinduism and Muslim students

Re	N	M	SD	df	t
H	150	16.54	2.03	298	.27
M	150	16.47	2.25		

Table 9 indicates that mean difference in Task Attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is not significant ($t = .27$) at .05 level. But it is evident from table 9 that the mean scores obtained by the Hinduism students (16.54) is slightly higher than the mean scores obtained by the Muslim students (16.47).

Table 10 Desired partner's economic status of respondents

Class	Number of People
Lower Class	14
Middle Class	221
Higher Class	65

In table 10, Number of respondents desired 14, 221, and 65 respectively from lower class, middle class, and higher class as their partner.

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

1. Mean difference in Social Attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = -1.47$) at .05 level.
2. Mean difference in Physical Attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = .41$) at .05 level.
3. Mean difference in Task Attraction Score of male and female students is not significant ($t = -.84$) at .05 level.
4. *Social attraction score of students according to their economic status is significant ($F = 9.38, df = 2, p < .01$).*
5. *Physical attraction score of students according to their economic status is significant ($F = 3.52, df = 2, p < .05$).*
6. Social attraction score of students according to their economic status is not significant ($F = .53, df = 2$).
7. *Mean difference in Social Attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is significant ($t = -2.01$) at .05 level.*
8. Mean difference in Physical attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is not significant ($t = -.36$) at .05 level.
9. Mean difference in Task Attraction Score of Hinduism and Muslim students is not significant ($t = .27$) at .05 level.
10. Number of respondents desired 14, 221, and 65 respectively from lower class, middle class, and higher class as their partner.

DISCUSSION

The objectives of the present study were to investigate whether Interpersonal Attraction of Bangladeshi students of Dhaka city varies based on gender, religion, and economic status. A standardized instrument was used to collect data from 300 undergraduate students of Jagannath University; University of Dhaka; Asia Pacific University; World University Bangladesh, among them 149 Male and 151 was female and there were 150 Hinduism students and 150 Muslim students. There were 23 from lower class 261 from middle class, and 16 from lower class.

To collect data, we used IPA scale of McCroskey and McCain (1974). There were 15 items in the scale and this scale was divided in three categories- Social Attraction, Physical Attraction, and Task Attraction. The score of the scale was counted separately. To analyze the data, we used t-test and ANOVA with SPSS v.21. In the table 4, it was found that social attraction is significant in $p < .001$ according to economic status that means middle class students were more socially attracted than lower and higher classes students. In the table 5 it was found that social attraction is significant in $p < .005$ according to economic status that means middle class students were more physically attracted than lower and higher classes students.

In table 7 found negative significant difference between Hinduism and Muslim students at $p < .05$ that means Muslim students posse higher mean than Hinduism students in social attraction. Table 10 shows the desired partner's economic status from where respondent's partner will come. Results indicate that 221 respondents desired that they will select any male or female as their partner if he or she come from middle class economic status.

Our results are supported by the previous studies (Kerckhoff, 1974; Murstein & Christy, 1976; Feingold, 1988).

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

Limitations

The present study had some limitations, which should be addressed;

1. Respondents were only from Dhaka city;
2. This scale does not adopt in our country;
3. Only undergraduate students were taken as respondent.

REFERENCE

- Aronson, E., & Linder, D. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1*, 156-172.
- Aronson, E., Willerman, B., & Floyd, J. (1966). The effect of a pratfall on increasing interpersonal attractiveness. *Psychonomic Science, 4*, 227-228.
- Barocas, R., & Karoly, P. (1972). Effects of physical appearance on social responsiveness. *Psychology Reports 3*, 772-781.
- Baumeister, R.F., & Bushman, B. (2008). *Social Psychology and Human Nature (1st Edition)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bearman, P., Moody, J., & Stovel, K. (2004). Chains of affection: The structure of adolescent romantic and sexual networks. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*, 44-91.
- Beck, S. B., Ward-Hull, C. I., & McLearn, P. M. (1976). Variables related to women's somatic preferences of the male and female body. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 1200-1210.
- Beckmann, C. W., & Secord, P. F. (1959). The effect of perceived liking on interpersonal attraction. *Human Relations, 12*, 379-384.
- Berg, J., & McQuinn, R. (1986). Attraction and Exchange in Continuing and Non-continuing Dating Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50 (5)*, 942-952.
- Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 193-281). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Blackwell, D., & Lichter, D. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *Sociological Quarterly, 45*, 719-737.
- Bornstein, R. (1992). Subliminal mere exposure effects. In R. Bornstein & T. Pittman (Eds.), *Perception without awareness: Cognitive, clinical, and social perspectives* (pp.101-210). New York: Guilford Press.
- Botwin, M. D., Buss, D. M., and Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality, 65(1)*, 107-136.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(3)*, 559-570.
- Buston, P. M., & Emlen, S. T. (2003). Cognitive processes underlying human mate choice: The relationship between self-perception and mate preference in Western society. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 100*, 8805-8810.
- Byrne, D. (1961a). The influence of propinquity and opportunities for interaction on classroom relationships. *Human Relations, 14*, 63-69.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D., Clore, G. L. J., & Worchel, P. (1966). "Effect of economic similarity-dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4(2)*, 220-224.

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

- Byrne, D.; London, O.; Reeves, K. (1968). "The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and attitude similarity on interpersonal attraction". *Journal of Personality*, 36(2), 259–271.
- Carter, S., & Snow, C.(2004). Helping singles enter better marriages using predictive models of marital success. *Presented to the American Psychological Society Convention*.
- Cunningham, M. R. (1986). Measuring the physical in physical attractiveness: Quasi-experiments on the sociobiology of female facial beauty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 925–935.
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *J. Pers Soc. Psychol.* 24, 285-90.
- Drachman, D., DeCarufel, A.,& Insko, C. (1978). The Extra Credit Effect in Interpersonal Attraction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14,458-469.
- Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but . . . : A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 109–128.
- Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2009). Reciprocity of liking. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relations* (pp. 1333-1336). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eastwick, P. W., Finkel, E. J., Mochon, D., & Ariely, D. (2007). Selective versus unselective romantic desire: Not all reciprocity is created equal. *Psychological Science*, 18, 317-319.
- Feingold, A. (1988). Matching for attractiveness in romantic partners and same-sex friends: a meta-analysis and theoretical critique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 104, 226-235.
- Feldman, Robert S. (2013). *Essentials of understanding psychology*. 10th ed., The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. W. (1950). *Social pressures in informal groups*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Finkel, E. J., & Eastwick, P. W. (2009b). Hard-to-get phenomenon. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relations*(pp.788-790). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitness, J., Fletcher, G., & Overall, N. (2003). Interpersonal attraction and intimate relationships. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gaunt, R.(2006). Couple similarity and marital satisfaction: Are similar spouses happier? *Journal of Personality*, 74, 1401–1420.
- Goldman, J. A., Rosenzweig, C. M., Lutter, A. D. (1980). Effect of similarity of ego identity status on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 9(2), 153–162.
- Gonzaga, G. C., Campos, B., & Bradbury, T. (2007). Similarity, convergence, and relationship satisfaction in dating and married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 34–48.
- Gordon, R. A. (1996). Impact of ingratiation on judgments and evaluations: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 54-70.
- Gutkin, T. B., Gridley, G. C., and Wendt, J. M. (1976). The effect of initial attraction and attitude similarity-dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction. *Cornell Journal of Social Relations*, 11(2),153–160.
- Hahn, D.; Hwang, S. (1999). "Test of similarity-attraction hypothesis in group performance situation". *Korean Journal of Social & Personality Psychology* 13 (1): 255–275.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1989). Research on love: Does it measure up? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 784–794.

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1992). *Liking, loving, and relating* (2nd Ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole.
- Henley, J., Danziger, S., & Offer, S. (2005). The contribution of social support to the material well-being of low-income families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 122–140.
- Herbst, K. C., Gaertner, L., & Insko, C. A. (2003). My head says yes but my heart says no: Cognitive and affective attraction as a function of similarity to the ideal self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1206-1219.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Jamieson, D. W., Lydon, J. E., Zanna, M. P., Zanna, M. P., & Mark P. (1987). Attitude and activity preference similarity: Differential bases of interpersonal attraction for low and high self-monitors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1052–1060.
- John, D., DeLamater, Daniel, J., Myers, Jessica, L., & Collett. (2015). *Social psychology*. Eighth edition, McGraw-Hill Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020.
- Kaplan, M. F., & Olczak, P. V. (1971). Attraction toward another as a function of similarity and commonality of attitudes. *Psychological Reports*, 28(2), 515–521.
- Kerckhoff, A. C. (1974). The social context of interpersonal attraction. In T. Huston (Ed.), *Foundations of interpersonal attraction* (pp. 61–78). New York: Academic Press.
- Klohnen, E. C., & Luo, S. (2003). Interpersonal attraction and personality: What is attractive – self similarity, ideal similarity, complementarily, or attachment security?". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 709–722.
- Kurdek, L. A. & Schnopp-Wyatt, D. (1997). Predicting relationship commitment and relationship stability from both partners' relationship values: Evidence from heterosexual dating couples". *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(10), 1111–1119.
- Lakin, J. L., & Chartrand, T. L. (2003). Using nonconscious behavioral mimicry to create affiliation and rapport. *Psychological Science*, 14, 334-339.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, R. Y-P., & Bond, M. H. (1996). How friendship develops out of personality and values: A study of interpersonal attraction in Chinese culture. *Unpublished manuscript, Chinese University of Hong Kong*.
- Liu, J. H., Campbell, S. M., & Condie, H. (1995). Ethnocentrism in dating preferences for an American sample: The in-group bias in social context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 95–115.
- Lorenzo, G. L., Biesanz, J. C., & Human, L. J. (2010). What is beautiful is good and more accurately understood: Physical attractiveness and accuracy in first impressions of personality. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1777–1782.
- Luo, S., & Klohnen, E. C. (2005). Assortative mating and marital quality in newlyweds: A couple-centered approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 304–326.
- Lydon, J. E.; Jamieson, D. W.; Zanna, M. P. (1988). "Interpersonal similarity and the social and intellectual dimensions of first impressions". *Social Cognition*, 6(4), 269–286.
- McNulty, J. K., Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2008). Beyond initial attraction: Physical attractiveness in newlywed marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(4), 135–143.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444.

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

- Miller, A. G. (1972). "Effect of attitude similarity-dissimilarity on the utilization of additional stimulus inputs in judgments of interpersonal attraction". *Psychonomic Science*, 26(4), 199–203.
- Miller, S., Olson, M., & Fazio, R. (2004). Perceived reactions to interracial romantic relationships: When race is used as a cue to status. *Group Processes and Inter-group Relations*, 7, 354–369.
- Mita, Theodore H., Dermer, Marshall.,and Knight, Jeffrey (1977). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(8), 597-601.
- Moreland, Richard L., &Beach, Scott R. (1992). Exposure effects in the classroom: The development of affinity among students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28(3), 255-276.
- Murstein, B. & Christy, P. (1976). Physical attractiveness and marriage adjustment in middle-aged couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34,537-542.
- Newcomb, T. M.(1961). *The acquaintance process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Peskin, M., & Newell, F. (2004). Familiarity breeds attraction: Effects of exposure on the attractiveness of typical and distinctive faces. *Perception*, 33,147-157.
- Priest, R. T., & Sawyer, J. (1967). Proximity and peership: Bases of balance in interpersonal attraction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 72, 633–649.
- Regan, P. C.(1998). What if you can't get what you want? Willingness to compromise ideal mate selection standards as a function of sex, mate value, and relationship context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1294–1303.
- Regan, P. C.(2008). *The mating game: A primer on love, sex, and marriage*(2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rhodes, G., Halberstadt, J., & Brajkovich, G. (2001). Generalization of mere exposure effects to averaged composite faces. *Social Cognition*, 19, 57-70.
- Rhodes, G., Simmons, L. W., & Peters, M.(2005). Attractiveness and sexual behavior: Does attractiveness enhance mating success? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26,186–201.
- Robert A. Baron, Nyla R. Branscombe (2012). *Social psychology*. 13th ed., Pearson Education, Inc., United States of America.
- Schutte, J., & Light, J. (1978). The relative importance of proximity and status for friendship choices in social hierarchies. *Social Psychology*, 41, 260–264.
- Schwartz, C., & Graf, N. (2007). *Attractive matching among same-sex and different-sex couples in the United States*. 1990–2000 (Working paper No. 2007–21). Madison, WI: Center for Demography and Ecology.
- Simons, H. W., Berkowitz, N. N., &Moyer, R. J. (1970). "Similarity, credibility, and attitude change: A review and a theory". *Psychological Bulletin*, 73(1), 1–16.
- Singh, R., & Ho, S. Y. (2000). Attitudes and attraction: A new test of the attraction, repulsion and similarity-dissimilarity asymmetry hypotheses. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(2),197–211.
- Sprecher, S., & Duck, S.(1994). Sweet talk: The importance of perceived communication for romantic and friendship attraction experienced during a getacquainted date. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20,391–400.
- Tan & Singh, (1995). Attitudes and Attraction: A Developmental Study of the Similarity-Attraction and Dissimilarity-Repulsion Hypotheses *Pers. Soc Psychol Bull.* 21, 975-986.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Households and families: 2010 Census brief*. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students

- van Baaren, R. B., Holland, R. W., Karremans, R. W., & van Knippenberg, A.(2003a). Mimicry and interpersonal closeness. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Nijmegen*.
- van Baaren, R. B., Holland, R. W., Steenaert, B., & van Knippenberg, A.(2003b). Mimicry for money: Behavioral consequences of imitation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*,393–398.
- Vonk, R. (2002). Self-serving interpretations of flattery: Why ingratiation works. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 515-526.
- Waldron, V. R.; Applegate, J. L. (1998). Similarity in the use of person-centered tactics: Effects on social attraction and persuasiveness in dyadic verbal disagreements. *Communication Reports, 11*(2),155–165.
- Walster, Hatfield, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). The importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 508–516.
- Warren, N. C.(2005, March 4). Personal correspondence from founder of eHarmony.com.
- Watson, D., Klohnen, E. C., Casillas, A., Nus, S. E.; Haig, J., & Berry, D. S. (2004). "Match makers and deal breakers: Analyses of Assortative mating in newlywed couples..*Journal of Personality, 72*(5), 1029–1068.
- Wiggins, J. S., Wiggins, N., & Conger, J. C. (1968). Correlates of heterosexual somatic preference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*, 82–90.
- Yancy, G. (2007). Homogamy over the net: Using internet advertisements to discover who interracially dates. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*, 913–930.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9*, 1–27.
- Zajonc, R. B., Adelman, Pamela K., Murphy, Sheila T., Niedenthal, Paula M., (1987). Convergence in the physical appearance of spouses. *Motivation and Emotion, 11*(4),335-346.

Acknowledgements

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed in ensuring this paper is in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be able to be mentioned.

Conflict of Interest

The authors carefully declare this paper to bear not conflict of interests

How to cite this article: Islam. M.H, Saha. A, Naz. H, Shirin. S, & Shithee. U.H (2019). Effect of Gender, Economic status, Religion, Partner's Economic Status on Interpersonal Attraction among the University Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 7*(1), 337-353. DIP:18.01.039/20190701, DOI:10.25215/0701.039