

University Students' Criteria for Choosing a Life Partner: A Case Study on a Hashemite University Student Sample

Khaled Hussein Al-Alwan^{[a],*}; Raja Khaleel Al-Khalili^[b]

^[a]Assistant Professor, Department of Assisted Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.

^[b]Associate Professor, English Department and Culture Studies, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.

*Corresponding author.

Received 24 October 2021; accepted 8 November 2021

Published online 26 December 2021

Abstract

The study aimed to show the attitudes of university students towards the criteria for choosing a life partner by using a sample consisting of (816) male and female students studying at the Hashemite University in Jordan. The study took into account their academic level, academic specialization, place of residence, type of housing for their families, and their family's monthly income. The study contains (18) items that measure the five criteria for choosing a life partner. Then, the data obtained from the sample underwent two types of statistical operations. The first was used to describe the characteristics of students and their attitudes, which included repetitions, ratios, arithmetic mean, and standard deviations. The second was inferential by using Chebyshev's Theorem which showed the effects of the characteristics of students on their attitudes. After confirming the validity and reliability of its tool, the study reached the following conclusions. The most important criterion from the viewpoint of Hashemite University students is the psychological criterion with an arithmetic average (3.32), followed by the religious standard (3.27), then the socio-cultural criterion (3.23), and finally the economic standard (3.02). The implications of these results are important for the design of courses on family planning at universities and for the implementation for counseling in family courts.

Key words: Choosing a spouse; Marriage; Family; Hashemite University students

Al-Alwan, K. H., & Al-Khalili, R. K. (2021). University Students' Criteria for Choosing a Life Partner: A Case Study on a Hashemite University Student Sample. *Canadian Social Science*, 17(6), 56-67. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/12348>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12348>

INTRODUCTION

Choosing a marriage spouse is an important topic for Jordanian youth because it is linked to their future and is emphasized by their Arabic and Islamic culture. Marriage in the Arab Islamic culture reflects the community's recognition of the rights of men and women to create a family which are under religious legislation in both Islamic and Christian communities and which still plays an important role in Jordanian society.

Thus, choosing a partner has societal importance and its criteria should be subject to thorough scientific investigation. The present research sets to understand the attitudes of university students towards the criteria for choosing a spouse and the factors that affect them because these students represent the youth category, "and they are the closest to marriage or to think of it as a stage of stability after finishing their degree" (Merhab 2016). In other words, this study attempts to answer its main question, which says: What are Hashemite University students' attitudes toward the criteria for choosing a spouse, and what are the factors affecting them?

TERMS AND PROCEDURAL DEFINITIONS

The study uses four pivotal terms as identified by Arab scholars. They are:

1-Marriage: The relationship that binds two people on condition that their community recognizes them and one that does not contradict their societal culture and which

also has a legal status (Lotfi, 1977). Marriage for this study is the legitimate relationship between a male and a female and its consequences of forming a family, meeting their sexual instincts, having children, and raising them.

2-The family: a social institution consisting of two people or more, and it has several forms, including the form of the marital family, and its function to satisfy the sexual instinct of its members, to have children, to care for them, to grow and to supply emotional fulfillment for its members, and in which the individual acquires his societal culture (Lotfi, 1977).

3- Marriage compatibility: is the intellectual, sexual, emotional, behavioral, and economic compatibility between spouses, in a way that allows them harmony, which consequently achieves comfort, happiness, and contentment (Kafafi, 1999).

4-Choosing a partner: a process governed by certain criteria whose outcome determines the fundamentals of a conventional marriage, and through which the person wishing to marry decides on a marriage partner (Farhan, 2013).

THEORIES EXPLAINING THE CRITERIA FOR CHOOSING A SPOUSE

Various theories explain the criteria for choosing a life partner which can be classified into two major directions:

1-The sociocultural theories that are represented in the theory of homogeneity and similarity The theory of proximity or spatial convergence and it concludes that the process of choosing a spouse is subject to geographical influences. The theory of value states that the choice is subject to his search for a specific value, which he or she wishes to obtain. The first is the theory of the standard which emphasizes the special criteria or the standard that should be available in a spouse. An example can be seen in a study by Zentner (2015) entitled, "A Socio-cultural Framework for Understanding Partner Preferences of Women and Men: Integration of Concepts and Evidence."

2-The psychological theories, which include many theories including the theory of unconscious which emphasize that there are unconscious factors in a person that interferes with the process of choosing a partner. Moreover, the theory of complementary needs, according to which the choice of a partner stems from a psychological need that the person lacks and desires to be available in life. There is also the theory of personal needs, which holds that the choice of a life partner stems from the personal needs of individuals. The Parenting theory also shows that parents have an important role in that aspect. There is also the theory of the ideal partner and that the individual represents in his mind an ideal picture and chooses a person based on it.

The social researchers' adoption of the above theories contributed to the interpretation and the multiplicity

of their opinions and often their contradictions in their findings. Some of them interpreted the process of choosing a partner from the idea of similarity, meaning that the male or female choose their partners by searching for a similar partner in the attributes, identities, financial conditions, and age. Others found that opposites choose each other in the marriage process.

Therefore, the theories require a field examination, which is the main justification for this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

On the choice of a life partner, many field studies have been conducted globally and they can be divided according to their geographical dimensions into three types, namely,

Local Studies

There are recent local studies on choosing a life partner

1- A study entitled: "The criteria used by youth in Jordan for choosing a life partner" by Abdul Mahdi Abdullah Al-Soudi (2013). His study aimed to identify the most important criteria that Jordanian youth take in the choice of a marriage partner. He referred to important theories that explain the marital selection process and the variables that affect this process, such as academic specialization, gender, family income, place of residence, etc. utilizing a questionnaire designed for that. His study found that there is a consensus between males and females on the importance of work and employment for both sexes in the selection process. As for preferences, physical beauty came first, religious commitment second, class status, and religious inclination in the last place.

2- A study entitled: "Criteria for choosing a life partner as viewed by Yarmouk University students" (2015) by Hanan Al-Shaqran and others. This study was conducted on a sample of (474) male and female students chosen randomly according to the variables of sex and academic major. An advanced questionnaire consisting of (25) items was distributed according to five criteria. The study concluded that the psychological standard is the criteria for students, as it came in the first place and then the social and cultural standard in the second place, while the economic standard came in the last place.

3-Al-Saeedah et al. (2018) conducted a study, which aimed to find out the level of marital satisfaction and its relationship to some variables among families in Amman. The results showed that there is a high level of marital satisfaction by 66% and that 77% chose their spouses through traditional methods.

4-A study by Khatebeh (2017) was conducted in order to know the most important criteria for selecting Jordanian youth at marriage, and its relationship to some social variables such as gender, family income, place of residence, and college type among students of Yarmouk

University of Jordan. The results concluded that the most important preferred selection criteria are emotional tendencies, beauty and physical attractiveness. And there are no differences attributed to the variable of place of residence, monthly household income, and academic major.

5- The Kharouf study (2013) also sought to identify the criteria that students at the University of Jordan adopt. The most important criteria for males and females are morals and the most important basis is that the age with the partner does not exceed 10 years and they prefer marriage from outside the circle of relatives and the pattern of arranged marriages in the first place.

Arabic World Studies

Several Arab studies were conducted on choosing a life partner, and the most recent of them include:

1-An Algerian study, entitled: "Attitudes of university students towards the criteria for marital selection" (2016) by Maher Mureb. This study was conducted on a sample of (110) male and female university students from the departments of Sociology and Psychology at the University of Algeria. The study sought to answer two major questions: What are the students' attitudes towards marital selection criteria? What are the most preferred marital selection criteria for young people? The study concluded that there is a positive attitude towards the psychological criteria, such as emotions, the similarity in mood, calmness, responsibility, good appearance, and verbal eloquence as basic criteria in choosing a life partner. There is a negative attitude towards the necessity of homogeneity in physical beauty and age, and a positive attitude towards ethical standards such as emphasizing religious commitment, honesty, appreciation, and respect as basic criteria in choosing a life partner. There is also a positive attitude towards class, sharing of social values, academic achievement, and financial considerations as important.

2-A Yemeni study entitled: "The criteria for choosing the life partner of Yemeni university students" (2013) by Al-Iryani. The study was conducted on a sample of (837) male and female students, and the study concluded that males and females focused on the criterion of religious commitment first, followed by physical attractiveness, family status, and economic status.

3- A study conducted by Saed (2015) which sought to identify the criteria for their choices and their impact on achieving marital compatibility in Saudi society. The study showed that marital compatibility held an average of 63%. Moreover, it emphasized that the most important methods of seeking a partner was through parents and relatives, and that the most common selection criteria, respectively, are morals, religiosity, beauty, social status, employment, and the final one was wealth.

4- A study conducted by Qorti (2017) on the criteria for choosing a partner in Algerian society. The study showed that marriage is a family affair, not an individual one.

5- Bin Abdulrahman's study (2017) which deals with choices of women and men about a life partner and reveals the difference between them according to gender and marital status. The study showed that there are positive perceptions among men and women and they do not differ according to gender or marital status.

6- Hariri's study (2019) aimed to identify the method of choosing a life partner for a university student and to what extent the variable influencing the family, college and place of residence, and parents' education on the method of selection. The study was conducted at King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia. The study found that the indicator for choosing to marry a university student is moving from family oriented to a more personal performance.

7- Darwish and Al-Shamsan (2011) study aimed at determining the criteria for choosing a life partner among Saudi and Egyptian university students. It took into account gender differences in the desired traits that individuals sought. The results showed that Saudi and Egyptian youth among both sexes prefer the same personal characteristics, mutual attraction and good manners and morals.

8- Al-Nasser's study (2011) was on the choice of partner according to the vision of Kuwaiti and Omani youth. The study concluded that marital choice preferences are not related to any of the variables of age, college and educational level. Also, males tend to favour personal acquaintance, while females prefer more a traditional approach.

9- The study of Al-Shishani and Murad (2010), which aimed to examine the attitudes of Kuwait University students towards marriage and the customs associated with that. The study found a preference for early marriage, marriage from relatives and polygamy among students of literary colleges. On the other hand, students of scientific colleges prefer freedom of choice and believe in love before marriage.

10- A study of Qamar (2019) sought to examine the relationship of marital compatibility with criteria for choosing a life partner for a sample of families in Mecca in Saudi Arabia. It found that the level of consensus among families was an average of 41%, and that the most important criterion for selection was the criterion of personality and the priority of compatibility in morals.

11- A study of Hawassa (2014) which attempted to uncover the method of choosing a life partner among students of Guelma University in Algeria. The study revealed that the changes taking place in society, such as the spread of individualism, financial independence and the presence of women in the work force, gave students greater freedom to choose their marriage according to their desires without the intervention of parents.

12- Al-Issa study (2018) aimed at identifying the qualities of the suitor mentioned in the Holy Quran and the authentic Sunnah and their educational implications

on family in Saudi society. These include moral, social, economic, health and physical characteristics.

13- Abdul Sattar's study (2015) was on choosing a life partner and the desirable characteristics of a partner in Kuwaiti society. And its results showed that religiosity, morals and beauty were ranked the highest, and there were no differences between the sexes regarding those criteria.

14- Salameh's study (2018) aimed to identify the appropriate methods for choosing a partner from the point of view of those who are about to marry in light of the variables of sex, housing, age and college for students of Al-Quds Open University in Palestine. The results of the study showed that the appropriate methods of selection came with the religious dimension at the forefront, and that there were no differences according to the gender, housing and college variables.

15- Ben Al-Sayeh's study (2018) found out that the most important criteria for marital selection for students from both sexes at the University of Laghouat in Algeria were the psychological criterion, followed by the social and materialistic criteria, then the physical characteristics, and the last one was ethics and religiosity.

International Studies

There are many international studies on choosing a life partner, the most recent of which are:

1-The first is a much-cited study by (Buss & Barnes, 1986 and Kenrick, 1994). One of the general results of these two studies is that women prefer rich men while men prefer beautiful women, and that education and work are among the desirable and desired qualities in a life partner, and that people in the sample marry those they love.

2-The second is a study by (Buss & Barnes, 1986) that revealed that there are three basic characteristics preferred by both males and females were: affection, love, mutual understanding, intelligence, and an attractive personality. However, females placed more importance on education and wealth.

3-The third is a study by (Buss, 1989) that has been applied to (10047) participants in (37) countries, and has reached five basic criteria for choosing a life partner: financial considerations, ambition and insistence on success in work, youth and vitality, and attractiveness. The study revealed that females have higher estimates than males regarding the importance of the criterion of economic status for a life partner, while males emphasized youth, vitality, and physical attractiveness.

4-Fourth is a study by (Rauch, Cohen & Johnson, 2009) aimed to reveal individual preferences for choosing a life partner. The study sample consisted of (248) individuals, and the results of the study showed a statistically significant correlation between the individual's cultural and social background and the marital selection criteria, and that the life partner is associated with a set of common criteria between males and females, including social and ethnic compatibility

and religion. However, the results indicated that there are statistical differences between males and females in terms of cultural preferences as there is no problem for males to have a relationship with a person from another culture.

The importance of this study comes from the interest in the topic based on previous local, Arabic, and international studies. The current study is distinguished from its predecessors in several factors, perhaps the most important factor is its novelty in terms of date conducted, theoretical and practical dimensions, and methodology that emphasize the environmental analytical nature of the factors affecting the choice of an individual for his life partner.

STUDY JUSTIFICATIONS

1- The absence of recent studies concerned with the field examination in choosing a life partner at certain geographical places in Jordan as the Hashemite University which lies in Al-Zarqa.

2- The lack of a scientific approach in reviewing and developing policies for choosing a life partner in Jordanian society. In recent years Jordanian society has witnessed a rise in divorce rates and this requires reducing it through the preventive interventions approach, which is based on the criteria for choosing a life partner.

3-The absence of knowledge in the process of choosing a life partner in the Arab world in general and Jordanian society in particular, which can be found through the results and conclusions of this study.

4-The practical importance as confirmed by the statistics and programs implemented by The Ministry of Social Development and also Ministry of Endowments and Islamic Affairs and Holy Sites who seek to establish programs, plans, and training courses for young university students who seek marriage after graduation. Thus, much needed statistical data is needed in revealing the orientations of Jordanian youth in the process of choosing a life partner.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study can be summarized in the following:

1-To identify the most important criteria for choosing a life partner from the viewpoint of some Hashemite University students

2-To identify the differences in the criteria for choosing a life partner for some Hashemite University students with different variables of gender, academic specialization, academic level, type of housing, place of residence, and income level.

STUDY QUESTIONS

The study has two questions

1- What are the attitudes of Hashemite university students towards the criteria for choosing a life partner?

2- Are students' attitudes towards psychological, social, cultural, religious, and economic criteria affected by the choice of a life partner, their gender, academic level, educational specialization, place of residence, type of housing, and the amount of monthly income for their families?

The study has its determinants: its spatial determinant is the Hashemite University in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, while its temporal determinant is the academic year (2019/2020), and its human determinants are the Hashemite University students, and its methodological determinants are its society, sample, procedural instrument and research methods, which will be explained later in the method of study and procedures.

STUDY APPROACH

The study used the method of the survey with the intentional purposive sample, which consisted of (816) male and female students studying at the Hashemite University in Jordan, who distributed a questionnaire that included two axis. The first contained characteristics as represented by their gender, educational level, their academic specialization, place of residence, type of residence of their families, and the amount of monthly income for their families, while the second axis contained (18) items that measure the five criteria for choosing a life partner.

THE STUDY SAMPLE

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the study sample individuals, which indicate that most of the sample are female students, are enrolled in scientific colleges, the majority are first-year students, a big percentage are urban communities residents, most live with their families who own their homes, and the majority have families whose monetary income exceeds (600) dinars per month.

Table 1
Distribution of study sample individuals according to some of their characteristics

Characteristics	Characteristic level	Frequency	Ratio
Sex	Male	248	30.4%
	Female	568	69.6%
	Total	816	100%
Academic Major	Scientific Colleges	488	59.8%
	Humanities Colleges	328	40.2%
	Total	816	100%
Academic Level	First-year	232	28.4%
	Second-year	192	23.5%
	Third-year	216	26.5%
	Fourth-year	176	21.6%
	Total	816	100%

To be continued

Continued

Characteristics	Characteristic level	Frequency	Ratio
Type of Housing	Private ownership	696	85.3%
	Rented	120	14.7%
	Total	816	100%
Place of Residence	City	704	86.3%
	Village	64	7.9%
	Badia	24	2.9%
	Refugee Camps	24	2.9%
	Total	816	100%
Family Income (Jordanian Dinar)	Less than 300	80	9.8%
	300-400	160	19.6%
	400-500	120	14.7%
	500-600	168	20.6%
	More than 600	288	35.3%
Total	816	100%	

Indications of validity and reliability of the tool:

To verify the validity of the tool, the researchers presented the tool to a group of experts that consists of (7) faculty members specializing in Sociology at the University of Jordan, the Hashemite University, and Al Al-Bayt University. They were asked to judge the appropriate study tool for study purposes, the linguistic formulation of the paragraphs in terms of their suitability, and to make any comments or suggestions they deemed appropriate. Therefore some language changes were modified according to their suggestions. A standard (80%) was adopted on their agreement to amend or accept the clauses of the tool.

As for checking the stability of the scale, the stability of the internal consistency was verified by using the Alpha Cronbach equation, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Results of checking the stability of the internal consistency of the scale

Standard	Cronbach Alpha
Social and cultural	0.70
Economic	0.75
Religious	0.73
Psychological	0.71
Total value	0.79

RESULTS

The current study aimed to show the attitudes of university students towards the criteria for choosing a life partner and some of the factors affecting them. The study achieved this goal by answering their two questions, namely:

The first question: What are the attitudes of Hashemite university students towards the criteria for choosing a life partner?

To answer this question, arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the responses of the study sample individuals to the tool were calculated, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
The mean and standard deviations for the criteria for choosing a life partner

Standard	Average	Standard deviation	Rank
Psychological	3.32	0.44	1
Religious	3.27	0.83	2
Social and Cultural	3.23	0.49	3
Economic	3.02	0.73	4

Table 3 shows that the most important criterion for choosing a life partner from the viewpoint of Hashemite University students is the psychological criterion with an arithmetic average of (3.32), followed by the religious standard with average arithmetic (3.27), and the socio-cultural criterion with an arithmetic mean (3.23), and in

the last place was the economic criterion with an average score of 3.02.

The students' preference for the psychological standard over the rest of the other criteria for choosing a life partner may be attributed to their university academic environment that allows for affection and a move away from arranged marriages. Population and Family Health Surveys results confirmed the decline in the marriage rates of relatives in Jordan from 60% in 2004 to 30% in 2018.

As to the second question which was about the students' attitudes towards the psychological, social, cultural, religious, and economic criteria affected by the choice of the life partner, gender, educational level, academic specialization, place of residence, the type of housing for their families, and the amount of monthly income for their families. The researchers also used arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the responses of the study sample individuals, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Arithmetic averages (AVG) and standard deviations (SD) for the criteria for choosing a life partner according to the study variables

Variable	Level	Social and cultural		Economic		Religious		Psychological	
		AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
Sex	Male	3.31	0.39	2.91	0.83	3.64	0.76	3.22	0.45
	Female	3.20	0.52	3.07	0.68	3.11	0.81	3.36	0.42
Academic Major	Scientific colleges	3.25	0.49	3.03	0.78	3.34	0.77	3.26	0.46
	Humanities Colleges	3.21	0.49	3.02	0.66	3.17	0.91	3.39	0.39
Academic level	First Year	3.31	0.41	3.00	0.63	3.39	0.77	3.31	0.42
	Second Year	3.05	0.55	3.18	0.77	3.12	0.76	3.39	0.51
	Third Year	3.26	0.55	2.97	0.85	3.35	0.90	3.23	0.37
	Fourth Year	3.30	0.36	2.96	0.65	3.18	0.87	3.34	0.44
Type of Housing	Private ownership	3.22	0.51	3.06	0.75	3.29	0.86	3.38	0.43
	rented	3.34	0.33	2.82	0.58	3.13	0.62	2.96	0.25
Place of Residence	city	3.28	0.46	2.99	0.73	3.25	0.82	3.31	0.45
	VILLAGE	3.07	0.37	3.33	0.75	3.68	0.70	3.35	0.35
	Badia	2.46	0.91	3.11	0.57	2.16	0.24	3.47	0.27
	Refugee Camp	3.13	0.34	3.22	0.64	3.83	0.63	3.28	0.20
Income Level (Jordanian Dinars)	300Less than	3.20	0.31	3.53	0.45	3.60	0.73	3.51	0.43
	300-400	3.19	0.57	3.06	0.77	3.47	0.81	3.43	0.33
	400-500	3.13	0.68	3.04	0.86	2.86	0.94	3.08	0.23
	500-600	3.19	0.43	3.06	0.77	3.16	0.60	3.30	0.50
	More than 600	3.35	0.38	2.84	0.62	3.30	0.86	3.30	0.47

Table 4 shows that there are apparent differences in the arithmetic averages of the responses of the study sample individuals on the questionnaire of criteria for choosing a life partner according to the gender variable, academic

specialization, academic level, type of housing, place of residence, income level, and to find out the significance of these differences, variance analysis was used MANOVA as shown in Table 5

Table 5
Results of the effect of some characteristics of students on their attitudes towards choosing a life partner according to the socio-cultural standard.

Standard	Variable	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value of p	Significance level
	Sex	0.196	1	0.196	0.927	0.33
	Academic specialization	1.426	1	1.426	6.755	0.01
	Academic level	4.691	3	1.564	7.408	0.00
Social and cultural	Type of housing	0.413	1	0.413	1.965	0.16
	Place of residence	10.594	3	3.531	16.731	0.00
	Income level	4.748	4	1.187	5.623	0.00
	Error	169.281	802			
	Corrected total	197.785	815			

Table 5 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the

socio-cultural criterion for choosing a partner due to the academic specialization variable, where the value

of P (6.755) is statistically significant, and by reference to Table 4 it turns out that the mean for students of scientific colleges (3.25) was higher than for students of the Humanities (3.21). This is because students in the scientific colleges have obtained high grades on their High School exam, which confirms the value of education and its impact on their social mobility and its reflection on their marital desires.

As can be seen from Table 5, there are no statistically significant differences in the socio-cultural criterion for partner selection due to gender and housing type variables, where P values were not statistically significant. This is because each sex, according to the type of their housings, has mutual desires and needs in choosing a life partner.

Table 6
Results of the Chebyshev's Theorem test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the academic level

Variable	Level	Average	First-year	Second-year	Third-year	Fourth-year
Academic Year	First Year	3.31		0.26		
	Second Year	3.05	0.26-		0.21-	0.25-
	Third Year	3.26		0.21		
	Fourth Year	3.30		0.25		

From Table 6 we can detect that there are statistically significant differences in the socio-cultural standard due to the variable of the academic level. As the arithmetic mean for the first-year, the third-year, and fourth-year students was higher than that for second-year students, because

Likewise, from Table 5, there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the socio-cultural criterion for partner selection due to the variables of the academic level, place of residence, and income level, where the values of P (7.408, 16.731, 5.623) are all of them are statistically significant values. This indicates the impact of the students' socio-economic environment on their criteria for choosing a life partner.

To find out the significance of the differences in the socio-cultural criterion according to the variable of the educational level, the place of residence, and the level of income, Chebyshev's Theorem was tested for dimensional comparisons, as shown in Table 6.

the sample was taken from students who were studying elective subjects and most of them are first, third, and fourth-year students, whereas the second year students do not take elective courses and instead take courses in their specialization.

Table 7
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the place of residence variable

Variable	Level	Average	City	Village	Badia	Refugee camp
Place of residence	city	3.28		0.21	0.82	
	village	3.07	0.21-		0.61	
	Badia	2.46	0.82-	0.61-		0.67-
	Refugee camp	3.13			0.67	

Table 7 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the socio-cultural standard due to the Place of Residence variable. Moreover, the mean of the students who live in the city was higher than that of the students living in the village and the Badia. Also, the mean for the students who live in the village was higher than that for the students who live in the Badia. We can also notice that

the mean for students who live in the camp is higher than for students who live in the Badia. These differences may be attributed to the multiplicity of subcultures of students and their lifestyles; also it reflects the ability of urban students to socialize and also openness to others more than their student counterparts residing in villages, the Badia, and the camps.

Table 8
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the income level

Variable	Level	Average	300 or less	300-400	400-500	500-600	600 More than
Income Level	300 and less	3.53		0.47	0.49	0.47	0.69
	300-400	3.06	0.47-				0.22
	400-500	3.04	0.49-				0.20
	500-600	3.06	0.47-				0.22
	600 or more	2.84	0.69-	0.22-	0.20-	0.22-	

Table 8 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the socio-cultural criterion due to the income level variable. As the arithmetic average for students whose income level is less than 600 dinars was higher than for students whose income level is more than 600 dinars. This may be due to the disadvantaged students

'view of the social and cultural determinants who want to raise their social and economic levels through the choice of a marriage partner.

Second: The economic criterion for choosing a life partner and some of the factors affecting it.

This criterion includes several economic indicators such as income, profession, social class, type and location of housing, type of job, geographical region, ability to afford marriage expenses, and vehicle ownership.

Table 9
Results of the effect of some characteristics of students on their attitudes towards choosing a life partner according to the economic standard

Standard	Variable	Sum of squares	degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value P	Significance level
Economics	Sex	1.227	1	1.227	2.451	0.11
	Academic Major	0.123	1	0.123	0.245	0.62
	Academic Level	1.878	3	0.626	1.250	0.29
	Type of Housing	4.148	1	4.148	8.283	0.00
	Place of Residence	3.216	3	1.072	2.141	0.09
	Income Level	21.739	4	5.435	10.854	0.00
	Error	401.583	802	0.501		
	Total corrected	444.627	815			

Table 9 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the economic criterion for choosing a partner due to the type of housing variable, where the value of P (8,283) is statistically significant, and by reference to Table 4 it turns out that the average Arithmetic mean among students who live in an owned house (6.06) was higher than that of students who live in a rented house (2.82), which indicates the effect of possession of the house on marriage expectations. Table 8 indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in the economic criterion for partner selection due to gender, academic

specialization, academic level, and place of residence where all P values were not statistically significant.

Also, it appears from Table 8 that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the economic criterion for partner selection due to the income level variable, where the values of P (10.854) and all of them are statistically significant. To find out the significance of the differences in the economic criterion according to the variable of the income level, a Chebyshev's test was conducted for the dimensional comparisons, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the income level

Variable	Level	Average	300 or less	300-400	400-500	500-600	600 or more
Income Level	300 or less	3.20					0.15-
	300-400	3.19					0.16-
	400-500	3.13					0.22-
	500-600	3.19					0.16-
	600 or more	3.35	0.15	0.16	0.22	0.16	

Table 10 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the economic criterion due to the income level variable. As the arithmetic average for students whose income level is less than 300 dinars was higher than that for students whose income level is more than 300 dinars. The arithmetic mean for students whose income level is less than 600 dinars was higher than that for students whose income level is more than 600 dinars. That is, the lower the monthly income of the students'

families, the more members of both sexes get married according to economic considerations, to improve their class status.

The third is the religious criteria for choosing a life partner and some of the factors affecting it.

This standard includes several religious indicators, including acts of worship, having good morals, and adherence to religious- social norms and values in daily transactions and dress codes.

Table 11
Results of the effect of some characteristics of students on their attitudes towards choosing a life partner according to the religious standard

Standard	Variable	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value P	Significance level
Religious Standard	Sex	42.735	1	42.735	78.203	0.00
	Academic Major	3.919	1	3.919	7.172	0.00
	Academic level	4.538	3	1.513	2.768	0.04
	Type of Housing	4.513	1	4.513	8.259	0.00
	Place of Residence	20.298	3	6.766	12.381	0.00
	Income Level	27.678	4	6.919	12.662	0.00
	Error	438.260	802	0.546		
	Total corrected	570.510	815			

Table 11 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the religious criterion for partner selection due to the gender variable, where the value of P (78.203) is statistically significant, and by reference to Table 4 it turns out that the arithmetic mean among male students (3.64) was higher than that of female students (3.11). This is due to the cultural heritage of the Jordanian society regarding cultural ideas concerning honor, chastity, and reputation which are issues connected to females more than males.

From Table 11, one can observe that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the religious criterion for choosing a partner due to the academic specialization variable, where the value of P (7.172) is statistically significant, and by reference to Table 4 it turns out that the average of students of scientific colleges (3.34) is higher than that of students of human colleges (3.17), and this may be since students of scientific colleges deal with abstract issues.

Table 12
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the academic level

Variable	Level	Average	First-year	Second-year	Third-year	Fourth-year
Academic level	First-year	3.39		0.27		0.21
	Second-year	3.12	0.27-		0.23-	
	Third-year	3.35		0.23		0.17
	Fourth-year	3.18	0.21-		0.17-	

Table 12 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the religious standard attributable to the variable of the academic level. As the arithmetic mean for first and third-year students was higher than for second

It is clear from Table 11 that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the religious criterion for partner selection due to the type of housing variable, where the value of P (8.259) is statistically significant, and by reference to Table 4 it is found that the average of students who live in an owned house (3.29) was higher than that of students who lived in a rented house (3.13), and this may be due to the role of religion in affirming the financial capacity of the future husband as measured by his possession of an owned residence. It is also clear from Table 10 that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the religious criterion for partner selection due to the variable of the educational level, place of residence, and income level where the values of P (2.768, 12.381, 12.662) are all statistically significant.

and fourth-year students, this may be due to study plans related to university requirements on the one hand and the religious background of students on the other hand.

Table 13
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the place of residence variable

Variable	Level	Average	City	Village	Badia	Refugee camps
Place of Residence	City	3.25		0.43-	1.09	0.58-
	Village	3.68	0.43		1.052	
	Badia	2.16	1.09-	1.052-		1.67-
	Refugee Camps	3.83	0.58		1.67	

Table 13 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the religious standard attributable to the variable of the place of residence. As the arithmetic mean for students who live in the camp and village was

higher than for students who live in the city and the desert(Badia), because of the religious upbringing that is more common in non-urban areas than in urban areas.

Table 14
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the household income level

Variable	Level	Average	300 or less	300-400	400-500	500-600	600 or more
Family income	300 or less	3.60			0.74	0.44	0.30
	300-400	3.47			0.61	0.31	0.17
	400-500	2.86	0.74-	0.61-		0.30-	0.44-
	500-600	3.16	0.44	0.31-	0.30		0.14-
	600 or more	3.30	0.30	0.17-	0.44	0.14	

Table 14 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the religious standard attributable to the variable of the family's income level. As the arithmetic average for students whose income level is less than 300 dinars and whose income level is between 300-400 dinars was higher than for students with other income levels.

This result is only explained by the poor students who are more religious beliefs than their counterparts, which may prompt them after graduation to obtain employment opportunities to marry quickly.

Fourth: The psychological criterion for choosing a life partner and some of the factors affecting it.

This standard contains several indicators, including personal preferences, good knowledge of a life partner, mutual love, serenity, personality style, formal, aesthetic,

and emotional qualities, the desire to build a family, have children, respect marital life, and succeed in work.

Table 15
Results of the effect of some characteristics of students on their attitudes towards choosing a life partner according to the psychological standard

Standard	Variable	Sum of squares	degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value P	Significance level
Psychological	Sex	0.392	1	0.392	2.427	0.12
	Academic Major	0.287	1	0.287	1.774	0.18
	level Academic	1.851	3	0.617	3.819	0.01
	Type of Housing	11.228	1	11.228	69.506	0.00
	Place of Residence	0.786	3	0.262	1.623	0.18
	Income Level	6.103	4	1.526	9.444	0.00
	Error	129.559	802	0.162		
	Total corrected	158.836	815			

Table 15 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the psychological criterion for partner selection due to the type of housing variable, where the value of P (69.506) is statistically significant, and this may be due to psychological stability and thus affects emotional relationships and ways by choosing a life partner. Referring to Table 4, it turns out that the average score for students who owned their homes for their families (3.38) was higher than that for their peers who did not own their homes for their families (2.96). Table 15 shows that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the psychological criterion

for partner selection due to gender variable, academic specialization, and place of residence, where all values of P were not statistically significant.

Likewise, from Table 15, one can observe that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the psychological criterion for partner selection due to the variable of the academic level, and the income level where the values of P (3.819, 9.444) are statistically significant, and to know the significance of the differences in the psychological criterion according to the variable of the academic level, place of residence, and income level, the Chebyshev's test was used for dimensional comparisons, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of the academic level

Variable	Level	Average	First-year	Second-year	Third-year	Fourth-year
Level Academic	First-year	3.31				
	Second-year	3.39			0.16	
	Third-year	3.23		0.16-		0.11-
	Fourth-year	3.34			0.11	

Table 16 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the psychological standard due to the variable of the academic level. As the arithmetic mean for the second and fourth-year students was higher than for the first and third-year students, due to the perceptions

of students related to their age, first-year students do not have a clear vision of the life partner, but after that, they engage on campus and create social relationships and friendships they get to know the opposite sex, and thus have a clear picture of the life partner.

Table 17
Results of the Chebyshev's test for dimensional comparisons according to the variable of household income level.

Variable	Level	Average	300 or less	300-400	400-500	500-600	600 or more
Family income	300 or less	3.51			0.43	0.21	0.21
	300-400	3.43			0.35	0.13	0.13
	400-500	3.08	0.43-	0.35-		0.22-	0.22-
	500-600	3.30	0.21-	0.13-	0.22		
	600 or more	3.30	0.21-	0.13-	0.22		

Table 17 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the psychological criterion due to the income level variable. As the arithmetic average for students whose income level is less than 300 dinars was higher than that for students whose income level is more. This result is explained by the compensation factor, which may increase among the poor more than their non-poor counterparts.

psychological standard over the rest of the other criteria related to choosing a life partner, and the influence of the process of choosing a life partner following social, cultural, economic, religious, and psychological criteria with some individual and family factors. Furthermore, the study in its first result supports the validity of psychological theories associated with the choice of marriage, more than it supports the validity of social and cultural theories. The second result of the study supports

The results of the study revealed the prevalence of the

the validity of the environmental analysis approach, which refers to the process of choosing a life partner due to its multiple factors such as individual, family, and societal factors.

Also, the study in its results relates the primacy of the psychological standard over the rest of the other criteria for choosing a life partner, and is consistent with some of its predecessors represented in the studies of Al-Soudi (2013) and Al-Shaqran (2015) and Murab (2016), and differs with some of the previous studies represented in the study of the Iranian study (2013) and the one conducted by (Barness, 1986) and (Kenrick, 1994).

As for the agreement or difference of the study with its predecessors regarding the individual and family factors affecting the life partner selection process, it has not been possible to explain it, due to the absence of a systematic similarity between the current study and its previous ones.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that:

1-University students prefer to choose a life partner according to psychological considerations rather than social, cultural, economic, and religious factors.

2- The process of choosing a life partner according to its social, cultural, economic, religious, and psychological criteria is affected by some individual and family factors for those involved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its results, the study recommends the following:

1. The Sharia courts and their church counterparts in various countries prepare guidance on the criteria for choosing a life partner for distribution to young people about to marry.

2. Universities in Jordan to review and develop elective courses on family development and which includes the psychological criterion for choosing a life partner.

3. Repeating the same study on other samples from undergraduate students to verify the remainder of the impact of the characteristics of these students on their attitudes towards choosing a life partner.

4. Conducting a study on the extent of the actual change in the criteria for choosing a life partner in Jordanian society at large.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Sattar, R. (2015). Choosing a life partner. *Journal of Middle East Research*, 36, 293-352. Ain Shams University, Egypt.
- Al-Iryani, I. (2013). The choice of life partner for Yemeni university students. *Journal of Human and Community Sciences*, 8, 225-296. Algeria, University of Biskra.

- Al-Issa, I. (2018). Characteristics of the fiancé and the fiancée in light of the sources of Islamic education and their educational implications on family building. *Al-Jouf University Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(4), 127-174
- Al-Kharouf, A. (2013). The Preferred Standards and Characteristics of the University of Jordan Students in Shrek, the Partner, and the Factors Affecting it: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Studies and Research*, 12, 119-134317-334. University of Djelfa.
- Al-Nasser, F. (2011). Marital selection criteria for youth in the Gulf society: a comparative study between Kuwaiti and Omani youth. *Journal of Gulf and Arabian Peninsula Studies*, 33(127). Kuwait.
- Al-Saeedah, K., et al. (2018). Marital satisfaction and its relationship with the method of choosing a life partner and some variables among a sample of married couples in Amman. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Research and Educational and Psychological Studies*, 21(7), 91-101.
- Al-Shaqran, H., et al (2015). Criteria for choosing a life partner as viewed by Yarmouk University students. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Humanitarian and Social Research*, 35, 59-82.
- Al-Shishani, B., & Murad, S. (2010). Attitudes of Kuwait University male and female students towards marriage and its customs. *Journal of Gulf and Arabian Peninsula Studies*, 36(139), 97-145. Kuwait.
- Al-Soudi, A. (2013) The criteria used by youth in Jordan to choose a life partner. *Jordanian Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 71-88.
- Ben Al-Sayeh, A., & Masouda, M. (2018). Marital choice among students of the University of Laghouat in Algeria. *Arab Journal of Literature and Human Studies*, 10, 307-326
- Bin Abdulrahman, A. (2017) Woman and man's perceptions of a life partner. *Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 30, 391-398. Qasidi University Merbah, Algeria.
- Buss, D. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences. Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 12, 1-49.
- Buss, D., & Barness, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 559-570.
- Darwish, Z., & Al-Shamsan, M. (2011). The criteria for choosing a life partner and its relationship to some psychological and demographic variables among a Saudi and Egyptian sample of university students. *King Saud's University Magazine*, 2(3), 122-147. Saudi Arabia.
- Farhan, M. (2013). *Sociological analysis of the marital choice system in the Arab Society*. Dar Amna, Amman, Jordan.
- Gamrah, H. (2019). Marital compatibility and its relationship to life partner selection criteria. *Reading and Knowledge Magazine*, 2015, 311-336. Ain-Shams University.
- Hariri, A. (2019). Choosing a life partner for a university student: a field study on a sample of female students at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah. Saudi Arabia. *Modern Literature Association*, 127, 299-333.

- Hawassa, J. (2014). The way of choosing a life partner among university students: A field study at Qalamah University. *Social Sciences Journal*, 18. Setif 2, Algeria, Mohamed Dabbaghine University.
- Jordan Department of Statistics (2018). *Population and Family Health Survey in Jordan*.
- Kafafi, A. (1999). *Family counseling and psychotherapy* (1st ed.). Cairo, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, Egypt.
- Kenrick, D. (1994). Evolutionary social psychology: From sexual selection to social cognition. *Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 75-121.
- Khatayba, Y. (2017). The relationship of some social variables to the criteria for choosing a partner in the view of Jordanian youth: a field study on a sample of Yarmouk University students. *Journal of Studies*, (59), 1-14. University of Ammar Thalji in Laghouat.
- Lotfi, A. (1977). *Sociology* (7th ed.). Arab Renaissance House.
- BeirutMerhab, M. (2016). University students' attitudes toward marital choice standards. *University of Sharjah Journal for Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 203-220. University of Sharjah, Emirates.
- Qurti, F. (2017). The Reality of Individual Choice of a Life Partner. *Journal of Cultural Dialogue*, 7(1), 207-219.
- Rauch, K. & Johnson, P. (2009). Human male selection: An exploration of associative mating preferences. *Journal of Marriage*, 1, 188-215.
- Salamah, K. (2018). Among students of Al-Quds Open University in Jericho, appropriate methods of choosing a partner from the point of view of those who are about to marry. *Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Research and Educational and Psychological Studies*, 45(1), 201-214. Palestine.
- Sayed, A. (2015). *Criteria for choosing a life partner and their impact on achieving marital compatibility* (1st ed.). Al-Mawaddah Association for Family Development. Mecca . Saudi Arabia.