

# Hi, My Name is Wealthy: Women's Dating Behaviors in Relation to the Perceived Wealth of Perspective Mates

Hunter, H., Hill, T., Reid, G., Bourgeois, C., Tiller, A., & Fisher, M. L.

Saint Mary's University

---

## ABSTRACT

It has been cross-culturally documented that women exhibit a preference for mates who possess resources or traits that signal potential wealth. The majority of this literature relies on self reported mate preferences. Here we report on two experiments to test whether women's willingness to date men is actually influenced by their perceived wealth. Online dating profiles were created to present photographs of men and information about their current bank account status (Study 1), or to indirectly indicate their level of wealth (Study 2). In Study 1, the faces were presented with alternating high and low bank account balances. We hypothesized that women who viewed men with high bank account values would evaluate them as more desirable than women who viewed men with low bank account values. That is, they would be more likely to engage with him in an online conversation, meet with him for a casual coffee, accept an invitation of a date, consider him for a one-night stand, consider him for a short-term relationship, or consider him for a long-term relationship. It was also hypothesized that women would rate the men with high bank account balances as more physically attractive than the men with the low bank account balances. The results generally do not support the hypotheses. In Study 2, we replaced bank account balances with indirect indicators of wealth. Our results indicate that women were significantly less interested in wealthier men as compared to poorer men, possibly because the wealthy men may be perceived as bragging. Together, these studies suggest men's wealth may not be as important to women as has been previously considered, but further research is needed.

## KEYWORDS

Dating, Wealth, Physical Attractiveness, Mate Preferences, Men

---

There are universal sex differences in mate preferences due to the particular challenges each sex has faced over evolutionary history (Buss, 1989; Li et al.,

---

AUTHOR NOTE: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maryanne L. Fisher, PhD, Department of Psychology, 923 Robie Street, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3, Canada. Contact: [mlfisher@smu.ca](mailto:mlfisher@smu.ca); +1-902-491-6275.

---

2013). Men and women differ in some of the characteristics they value in potential mates, and demonstrate considerable overlap in other preferences, especially for long-term relationships (e.g., Buss, 1989). In terms of differences, the two that are most discussed in the evolutionary psychological literature are men placing a higher premium on youth and attractiveness, and women emphasizing the importance of men's ability to acquire resources (e.g., Buss, 1989; Feingold, 1990). Indeed, these sex difference have been widely studied (e.g., Buss, 1989; Geary, 2010; Sprecher, Sullivan, & Hatfield, 1994). They have been found in a variety of contexts, including (of relevance here) personal advertisements (e.g., Baize & Schroeder, 1995) although the results are not always cleanly along these lines (women advertising wealth Arua, 2017; Strassberg & Holty, 2003).

Men are deemed to possess a greater preference for physically attractive woman because attractiveness is largely reflective of health; it serves as an accurate proxy for a woman's ability to conceive, gestate, and rear children (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Unlike men, whose reproductive success is primarily determined by their frequency of copulation with fecund women, women's reproductive success rests more on their investments of energy and time related to conception, gestation, and post-partum childcare (Campbell, 1999; Trivers, 1972). Due to women's heavy parental investment, they are not always able to secure adequate resources for themselves and/or their children, and as a result they theoretically rely on men's resources and efforts to aid with children. Taken together, past research demonstrates that women are generally choosier than men when selecting a mate (Walters & Crawford, 1994), and prefer men who can provide care, resources, and contribute support for both them and their children (using theory from Andersson, 1994; Trivers, 1972; for a review of criticisms see Fisher, Garcia, & Burch, in press). Indeed, women generally prefer men who possess characteristics related to quality parenting, such as being loving and spending time at home, particularly if considering a long-term relationship (Li, Valentine, & Patel, 2011; see also Lu, Zhu, & Chang, 2015).

Here we empirically examine whether women do prefer men who present themselves as wealthy in a dating context. Past research overwhelming suggests they do. For example, findings indicate that men have an awareness of women's preference for resources given they compete for women by displaying resources, status, and strength (Walters & Crawford, 1994). Further, Buss (1988) found that men, more than women, self-reported that they more frequently display and boast about their resources, display strength, and show off when attempting to attract a potential mate. Indeed, Buss (1989) proposed that one of the most critical signals of male mate quality is the ability to distribute resources, or to show traits related to future resource accrual, such as ambition, industriousness, and being a hard worker. In terms of mate attraction, men often exhibit cross-sex mind-reading and are more likely than women to advertise their resources and traits related to the accrual of resources (e.g., financial stability, owning a large house, being a professional and being intelligent; Wiederman, 1993).

The significance of men's wealth on their reproductive success has also been studied. Men in the United States with high-incomes and status have more biological children than poorer men or women with high-incomes (Hopcroft, 2006; 2015). Nettle and Pollet (2008) report that for Britain, there exists positive selection

on men's income which is driven by increased childlessness among low-income men. Further, men in positions of supervision over others, and where they control hiring and firing decisions, have more children than men in non-supervisory positions and without the power to hire and fire others (Fielder & Huber, 2012).

Theory suggests women benefit when they have the ability to identify mates who are willing and able to invest resources to them and their (future) children, especially when there may be deficits in their own ability to accrue independent resources (e.g., during pregnancy). Women are therefore thought to pay particular attention to men's ambition, industry, income, status, and generosity, all of which signal his ability and willingness to invest resources (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

### Relationship Duration and Preference for Resources

Schwartz and Hassebrauck (2012) found that women typically prefer long-term partners who are classified as being wealthy, rich, of high status, generous, and pursuing successful careers. They also report that women usually cannot imagine marrying a partner with an education level lower than their own, or a man lacking regular employment.

This trend in women's long-term mate preferences seems to be similarly prevalent in short-term relations. In all types of romantic and/or sexual relationship contexts, including both long-term and short-term mating arrangements, women more so than men demand a higher minimum acceptable earning capacity (Bereczkei, Voros, Gal, & Bernath, 1997). However, the influence of anticipated relationship duration may be in preference for the immediacy of resources being provided. Buss (1991, see also Smuts, 1992) proposes that women seeking short-term relationships desire men with resources that are readily available, while those seeking long-term relationships desire men who show a trajectory of owning future resources. Women in short-term relationships, compared to women in long-term relationships, preferred men who had extravagant lifestyles, enjoyed having money spent on them, and liked to receive gifts early in the relationship, while simultaneously disliking men who showed initial signs of stinginess (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). There is a clear sex difference; Greiling and Buss (2000) found women reported they were significantly more likely than men to receive resources such as jewelry, money, dinners and clothing from short-term mates. At the same time, though, women who are seeking a short-term relationship, or engaging in an extra-pair copulation, place higher demands for a physically attractive mate, given that there is a decreased likelihood of receiving any future resources or commitment (see Kenrick et al. 1993; Scheib, 2001; for a discussion of trade-offs see Gangestad & Simpson, 2000).

### Personal Advertisements and Preferences for Wealth

While there has been empirical work on men's preference for attractive mates (e.g., waist-to-hip ratio, Singh, 1993; hair colour, Lynn, 2009), the majority of evidence in support of women's preference for wealthy mates is survey-based and reliant on self-reported interest (but see Guéguen & Lamy, 2012). For example, Buss' (1989) well-known results are based on women's preference for men with

resources through self-reported surveys about ideal mates, an issue that is found elsewhere (e.g., chapter 3, Townsend, 1998).

A different approach researchers have used to examine mate preferences is to study personal advertisements. Wiederman (1993; see also Waynforth & Dunbar, 1995) reported that men were more likely to offer financial resources and seek attractiveness, whereas women were more likely to offer attractiveness and seek financial resources or qualities linked to acquiring resources. Pawlowski and Koziel (2002) investigated how particular traits influenced responses to personal advertisements. For men, the traits that influenced response rates were, in order, education level, age, height, and offered resources, while for women, weight, height, education and age negatively correlated with responses. The authors conclude that men's resources had only a small positive influence on response rates, but the fact that education was important to women suggests they are relying on objective rather than more subjective traits. Similarly, Baize and Schroeder (1995) found that men's income and education was positively correlated with the number of responses.

The problem with this approach, however, is that it is not possible to control for issues such as physical attractiveness or considerable variation in the writing of the advertisements. Therefore, we designed experiments to directly manipulate men's wealth in the context of personal advertisements for dating partners. We manipulated the financial status men display to potential partners and examined the result on women's receptivity to varying levels of dating (e.g., meet for a coffee versus one-night stand).

### Hypotheses for Current Studies

Based on the previous findings that women are both choosier when selecting mates due to costs of parental investment, and prefer mates who can provide financially for both them and their children (e.g., Walters & Crawford, 1994; Andersson, 1994; Trivers, 1972), our hypothesis is that women will prefer wealthy mates. In Study 1, we predict women will be more likely to engage in dating behaviors when men possess high bank account balances, as compared to when the same men have low bank account balances. Specifically, we predict women will be more likely to engage in online conversation, accept a date, go for a casual coffee and have a one-night stand when men are shown with higher (as compared to lower) financial status. Likewise, in Study 2, we predict women will engage in more activities with wealthier men, as displayed through indirect, implied wealth, as compared to poorer men.

We note that this hypothesis is coupled with women's willingness to respond to the documentation of immediately available resources. While research by Bereczkei, Voros, Gal, and Bernath (1997) suggests that women in both short-term and long-term relationships prioritize resource accrual when selecting a mate, other researchers have found that women in short-term relationships are more likely to pursue mates who can provide immediate resources and to avoid those who display initial signs of stinginess (e.g., Buss, 1991; Smuts 1992; Buss & Schmitt, 1993). To investigate these findings, we explore women's willingness to engage in both short-term and long-term relationships with only the wealthy men (for completeness we also examine the same relationship differences in the less wealthy men). Due to the

inconsistency in the literature as to whether resources are most preferred in short-term relationships, or both short and long-term relationships, we did not have a prediction, and therefore these comparisons are performed solely for interest.

A secondary aim was to explore the interaction of wealth and evaluations of physical attractiveness. Research by Webster and Driskell (1983) suggests that status influences attractiveness in different ways. Firstly, individuals overlook ugliness in dating partners if they possess financial resources. Status also influences attractiveness through setting contemporary beauty standards; this includes the funds to afford fashion accessories, clothing, and hairstyles (Webster & Driskell, 1983). Congruent with findings that suggest women consider perspective mates with the ability to accrue high levels of resources more desirable (e.g., Buss 1988; Buss 1989; Trivers, 1972; Webster & Driskell, 1983), we hypothesize for Study 1 and Study 2 that women will view men as more physically attractive when they are perceived as being wealthy.

### STUDY 1

#### Methods

##### Participants

Eighty-three heterosexual women between the ages of 18 and 31 ( $M = 20.39$ ,  $SD = 2.78$  years) were recruited through a university's research participant pool. The university is a mid-sized public university in Eastern Canada. Participants were granted a small course credit in exchange for their participation. The experiments were approved by the university research ethics board. We asked about romantic relationship status given that it may impact on one's willingness to date; no participant was currently or ever married, engaged, common-law, widowed, divorced, or separated.

##### Measures and Procedure

Participants completed demographic information and were then presented with a series of men's online dating profiles advertising a standardized photograph of a potential mate, his demographics (*i.e.*, name, age, hometown) and a "Fun Fact About Me" section. Information about the potential mate's financial status (via a high versus low bank account balance) was stated in this section. For example, in the high account balance condition, Brett, 25, from Halifax wrote a fun fact stating: "What would you like for dinner tonight? Thai, Italian, Mexican? I have \$14,126.25 to spend on the date of your dreams." The same image and demographic details appeared for the low account balance condition, except the fun fact stated: "My cooking skills are A+. The \$43.09 in my bank account won't cover fine dining, but I can whip up a dinner that will be sure to please!"

The six photographs used in this study were gathered from various online sources. The models all were Caucasian (reflecting the majority of participants'

ethnicity based on prior samples from this population), approximated to be around 22 to 24 years of age, and portrayed slightly positive facial expressions. Only full face and head images were used, such that the model was facing the camera directly. No model had jewelry, and backgrounds were of dark grey tones.

Dating profiles were separated into high account balances and low account balances. In the high account condition, the bank account averaged \$14,000, while in the low account condition, the bank account averaged \$100. The amounts used in the profiles were generated from over 300 actual ATM receipts gathered by the researchers. (We note that these receipts were collected from garbage bins located near ATMs around our university and city; no other information was provided to indicate whose bank account balance is being reported.) The lowest values (but above zero; some receipts showed a deficit and were omitted) and highest values were used in the study. The account balances, therefore, represented real account balances of those living in, or at least visiting, the participants' geographic area.

Each profile was shown individually and participants rated each man using Likert-type scales for physical attractiveness (*i.e.*, 1 = very unattractive, 7 = very attractive). Participants also reported their likeliness to engage in a series of dating behaviors with each man (*i.e.*, 1 = unlikely to engage, 7 = very likely to engage); the behaviors included: (a) engage in online conversation (b) accept a date (c) go for a casual coffee (d) have a one-night stand (e) have a short-term relationship, or (f) have a long-term relationship with this man.

To minimize confounding factors, the photographs of six men were used in both the high account balance condition and the low account balance condition. Altogether, 12 different dating profiles were created. Thus, two versions of the study were administered. The two dating profiles (high and low condition) for each man were identical in content, photograph, and format, differing only in the "Fun Fact About Me" blurb, which was where account balance was integrated. Each of the six men differed in terms of the "Fun Fact About Me" section, as well as the other information, to make it appear as close as possible to an actual online dating advertisement.

Participants were randomly selected to complete one of the two versions of the profiles. Each participant ultimately received, in a random presentation, three dating profiles of men who had mention of a high account balance incorporated into their profile, and three dating profiles of men who had a low account balance mentioned in their profile.

Data analysis was performed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.

## Results

The data were collapsed across the faces, such that the average rating for the two bank account conditions (herein labeled as "wealthy" for the high balance and "poor" for the low balance) were calculated for each of the seven dependent variables (six dating behaviors and physical attractiveness). We performed two-tailed paired-samples *t*-tests to examine differences due to the bank account balance, with an *a priori* significance criterion of  $p \leq .05$ .

The comparisons showed no significant difference between the wealthy versus poor advertisements except for one-night stand item, where the men with the lower versus higher bank account were more preferred. Likewise, contrary to our prediction, the men with the lower versus higher bank account were considered more attractive. See Table 1 for the complete listing of descriptive findings, *t*-test results, and Cohen's *d* effect sizes.

To explore whether women express a preference to engage in short-term relationships versus long-term relationships with the wealthier men, we again performed paired-samples *t*-tests but for only the items of: have a one-night stand, have a short-term relationship, or have a long-term relationship with this man. For the wealthy condition, there was no significant difference between ratings for one-night stand and short-term relationship,  $t(82) = .68, p = .50, \text{Cohen's } d = .005$ , one-night stand and long-term relationship,  $t(82) = .75, p = .46, d = .009$ , or short-term and long-term relationship,  $t(82) = .45, p = .66, d = .004$ . For the poor condition, there was no significant difference between ratings for one-night stand and short-term relationship,  $t(82) = 1.68, p = .10, d = .151$ , or short-term and long-term relationship,  $t(82) = 1.25, p = .22, d = .102$ . However, women expressed a significantly higher likelihood to engage with the poor men for a one-night stand than for a long-term relationship,  $t(82) = 1.99, p = .050, d = .248$ .

### Discussion

In the present study, women were hypothesized to express an interest in dating men and rate them as more attractive when they were perceived to be wealthy, as compared to men who were perceived to have little or no money. Our findings do not support our hypotheses.

Recall that the same faces were used in the two conditions, meaning that the only factor that differed was the listed bank account balance in the personal advertisement. We found, contrary to our prediction, that men with a lower bank account balance were considered more attractive, and women rated themselves as more likely to consider them for a one-night stand, relative to the same man when he had a higher bank account balance.

The fact that there is a trend toward finding someone attractive and then considering them as a candidate for a one-night stand is not surprising. For example, Kenrick, Groth, Trost, and Sadalla (1993) report that women's criteria for attractiveness are highest for one-night stands. What is surprising, though, is that men with the lower bank accounts were considered more attractive than the same men with the higher bank accounts. It could be that men providing a high bank account balance in their advertisements were seen as bragging, which may have led to negative first impressions (e.g., Scott & Ravenscroft, 2017) and led them to be seen as less attractive due to a halo effect.

However, it must be noted that women showed no difference in their desire to engage in short-term versus long-term relationships with wealthy men. This observation contradicts Buss and Schmitt's (1993) finding that women in short-term relationships displayed greater preference for the wealth of perspective mates than did women in long-term relationships. Our finding that women were more likely to consider a poorer man for a one-night stand than the same man when he was

described as having a higher bank account balance does partially indirectly support the conclusion of Schwartz and Hasebrauck (2012), who documented that women prioritized wealth in their long-term partner.

We recognize a potential limitation of the study is that one rarely sees actual bank account information in personal advertisements. Anecdotal evidence from online dating websites suggests men are aware of the importance of wealth within a dating context, given the high prevalence of men who feature material resources in their profile photographs or report on their employment. In Study 1, we attempted to remove any ambiguity from merely showing wealth and instead state it directly, but such statements may have been negatively perceived. Thus, we created Study 2 where indirect proxies for wealth were used, rather than an explicit statement of one's bank account balance.

Another limitation is that we collected data from undergraduate students. It remains unknown how women outside of the university climate will respond to men's wealth, and the importance it has in terms of their mate choice. We address this issue in Study 2 by relying on a sample from Reddit which is self-defined as a social news aggregating, web content rating, and discussion website. Reddit is the third most visited website in the United States (Nguyen, 2018).

## STUDY 2

The goal of Study 2 was to expand on the findings of Study 1 using a more general (*i.e.*, less student-biased) sample of women, and to see if the finding replicated when personal advertisements indirectly contained information pertaining to wealth (rather than bank account balances).

### Methods

#### Participants

A total of 188 self-identifying heterosexual women (age in years,  $M = 25.06$ ,  $SD = 6.60$ ,  $Md = 24$ ) were recruited from Reddit (using subreddits of research, psychology, women). The study was advertised as being about mate preferences and heterosexual women over 18 were asked to volunteer by clicking on the provided Qualtrics link. The participants reported various romantic relationship statuses: 65 (34.6%) were dating one person in a committed relationship; 46 (24.4%) were single and not looking, 34 (18.0%) were married or common-law, 28 (14.9%) were single and seeking, 20 (13.9%) were dating casually, and the remainder selected other or prefer not to say.

#### Measures and Procedure

The same dating profile format, images, names, and hometowns were used as in Study 1. However, the "Fun Fact About Me" section contained information that indirectly suggested one's level of wealth (see Appendix A). The same study design was employed, with the exception that we used four faces, rather than six, given



that we wanted to create a shorter survey to maximize the efforts of the sample of volunteers from Reddit who were participating.

All items and rating scales remained the same as Study 1. However, we removed the item related to meeting for a casual coffee; in retrospect this item was ambiguous because it could signal friendship and not necessarily romantic interest.

### Results

We repeated the statistical approach of Study 1. The data were collapsed across the faces, yielding a wealthy condition and poor condition for each of the six dependent variables (physical attractiveness, likelihood to: engage in online conversation, accept a date, have a one-night stand, have a short-term relationship, or have a long-term relationship with this man). We performed two-tailed paired-samples *t*-tests to examine differences due to the level of implied wealth, with an *a priori* significance criterion of  $p \leq .05$ .

There were significant differences for each dependent variable. Contrary to our hypothesis, the poorer men were selected as more attractive, and participants were significantly more interested in engaging in an online conversation, accepting an invitation for a date, having a short-term relationship, and having a long-term relationship with them. They were significantly more likely to consider the wealthy men for a one-night stand, in contrast to the findings of Study 1 (see Table 2 for descriptives and analyses).

We also examined within each condition whether women express a preference to engage in short-term relationships versus long-term relationships with wealthier men, we performed paired-samples *t*-tests but for only the items of: have a one-night stand, have a short-term relationship, or have a long-term relationship with this man. For the wealthy condition, women expressed significantly more interest in a one-night stand than short-term relationship,  $t(187) = 3.23, p = .001, d = .23$ , and as compared to a long-term relationship,  $t(187) = 4.29, p = .000, d = .27$ . There was no significant difference for short versus long-term relationship,  $t(187) = .620, p = .54, d = .035$ . For the poor condition, there was a significant difference with favoring short-term relationship over one-night stand,  $t(187) = 2.54, p = .012, d = .18$  but no difference between one-night stand and long-term relationship,  $t(187) = 1.22, p = .22, d = .10$ . There was also no significant difference between short and long-term relationship,  $t(187) = 1.89, p = .06, d = .087$ .

### Discussion

Our findings cast a shadow on the literature that points to women's interest in men with resources. We failed to support our hypothesis that women would favor men when they were described in a way that implied wealth; instead, women preferred men when they described themselves as less wealthy. It is entirely possible that the advertisements of for the poor men contained desirable traits; for example, the men stated that they took public transit (as opposed to owning a luxury vehicle), or cooked meals at home (rather than eating at a posh restaurant). Thus, these men may be indicating that they are interested in sustainability, which may signal altruism (Griskevicius, Tybur, & Van den Bergh, 2010), or that they care

enough about their dates that they will cook a home-based meal (DeBacker & Fisher, 2012).

An alternative, but not mutually exclusive possibility is that men who directly state their wealth via material goods are considered to be boasting or bragging about themselves. While people may self-promote to fulfill the goal of creating a positive image, excessive self-promotion runs the risk of being seen as a braggart. Braggarts are generally viewed negatively and are less likeable (Scopelliti, Loewenstein, & Vosgerau, 2015). Women's views of men who state their resources (whether it be via a bank account balance or in terms of what they own) needs to be further researched. Perhaps there is a balancing point: women prefer men with resources unless they are seen as bragging about them.

### GENERAL DISCUSSION

We failed to support our hypothesis that women would prefer men with advertised resources, or find wealthy men most attractive. Our results must be interpreted with caution, as they do not allow us to entirely rule out the possibility that a mate's resource acquisition ability is important to women. It is possible that the way wealth is advertised is key; men who wear expensive clothing or accessories (see Guéguen & Lamy, 2012) may be more successful in advertising their financial standing than men simply listing their bank account balances or that they visit posh restaurants and receive VIP treatment, for example.

More investigation into the relationship between attractiveness and wealth is also needed. Women may cognitively connect wealth and resources with the overall attractiveness of a mate. If women prefer mates who have an ability to accrue wealth, acquire resources, and contribute support for her and her children, it would suggest that resources serve as a cue to certain personality traits. Specifically, men's resources and financial security may indicate an underlying responsible and intelligent disposition, signaling he is able to provide paternal care. According to Buss (1989), intelligence not only serves as a genetic benefit for any resulting children but is also linked to resource acquisition and positive parenting skills. Research by Fielder and Huber (2007) links education and intelligence to income, which in turn, increases reproductive success for men. Indeed, as reviewed earlier, wealthy men have a greater number of mates and are more likely to be successful in producing children than poor men (Betzig, 1983). Our results, especially those from Study 2, contradict this research by showing that women consider poorer men as viable mates over wealthier men.

Many avenues for future research exist. For example, it would be interesting to see how women distinguish between social resources and financial resources. Although social resources and economic status are connected (Campbell, Marsden, & Hurlbert, 1986), they are distinct and it may be advantageous to explore each aspect individually.

In addition, the role of women's access to their own resources remains to be studied. Fielder and Huber (2012) report a curvilinear relationship for women for the variables of income and number of children in US census data. They propose this relationship indicates that women may strive for access to resources commonly

associated with advancement, rather than status. If accurate, then women could be attempting to maximize access to acquiring their own resources, potentially freeing them from relying on men.

Further, the desirability of women possessing resources is also not well studied. Arua (2017) reports on sex differences in the content of newspaper personal advertisements in Nigeria. Results indicated that more women than men offer and seek financial security. Likewise, Strassberg and Holty (2003) created four personal advertisements that varied in content, and found the most popular female-seeking-male advertisement was a woman who described herself as financially independent, successful and ambitious. This advertisement led to 50% more responses than the next most popular advertisement where the woman described herself as very attractive and slim (but see also Strassberg & English, 2015).

It may also be the case that preferences for wealth vary dramatically across cultures. Nettle and Pollet (2008) report that positive selection has occurred (and continues to occur) for men's income and reproductive success, mostly due to low-income men being childless. They further report that the selection gradient appears to be weakest in industrial cultures and strongest in subsistence societies with high levels of polygyny. Our results address women in Western societies, and further research is needed to examine how generalizable our findings are in relation to other cultures.

Last, as mentioned, the influence of men's bragging needs to be more closely studied in terms of its impact on mate attraction. Women may immediately dismiss potential mates simply because they are seen as less likable, due to boasting about their resources (Scopelliti, Loewenstein, & Vosgerau, 2015).

While we cannot rule out the possibility that women have a preference for men possessing resources, our results indicate the preference is not as clear-cut as past researchers have claimed. Future directions for research were presented, with an emphasis on the need for empirical and cross-cultural studies.

## REFERENCES

- Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual selection*. Princeton, NJ: University Press.
- Arua, A. E. (2017). Gender differences in printed personal advertisements in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Gender Studies*, 7(2), 165-185.
- Baize, H., & Schroeder, J. (1995). Personality and mate selection in personal ads: Evolutionary preferences in a public mate selection process. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10(3), 517-536.
- Bereczkei, T., Voros, S., Gal, A., & Bernath, L. (1997). Resources, attractiveness, family commitment: Reproductive decisions in human mate choice. *Ethology*, 103(8), 681-699.
- Betzig, L. L. (1983). *Despotism and differential reproduction: A Darwinian view of history*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(4), 616.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(1), 1-14.
- Buss, D. M. (1991). Do women have evolved mate preferences for men with resources? A reply to Smuts. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 12, 401-408.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100(2), 204-232.
- Campbell, A. (1999). Staying alive: Evolution, culture, and women's intrasexual aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(2), 203-214.
- Campbell, K. E., Marsden, P. V., & Hurlbert, J. S. (1986). Social resources and socioeconomic status. *Social Networks*, 8(1), 97-117.
- DeBacker, C., & Fisher, M. (2012, April). *Sex differences in meal preparation motives*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North Eastern Evolutionary Psychology Society, Plymouth, NH.
- Feingold, A. (1990). Gender differences in effects of physical attractiveness on romantic attraction: A comparison across five research paradigms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 981-993.
- Fielder, M., & Huber, S. (2012). An evolutionary account of status, power, and career in modern societies. *Human Nature*, 23(2), 191-207.
- Fisher, M., Garcia, J., & Burch, R. (in press). Evolutionary psychology: Thoughts on integrating feminist perspectives. In L. Workman, W. Reader, & J. Barkow (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of evolutionary perspectives on human behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral Brain Science*, 23, 675-687.
- Geary, D. (2010). *Male, female: The evolution of human sex differences* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Greiling, H., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of extra-pair mating. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(5), 929-963.
- Griskevicius, V., Tybur, J. M., & Van den Bergh, B. (2010). Going green to be seen: Status, reputation, and conspicuous conservation. *Journal of Personality and*

- Social Psychology*, 98(3), 392-404.
- Guéguen, N., & Lamy, L. (2012). Men's social status and attractiveness: Women's receptivity to men's date requests. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 71, 157-160.
- Hopcroft, R. L. (2015). Sex differences in the relationship between status and number of offspring in the contemporary U.S. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 36(2), 146-151.
- Hopcroft, R. L. (2006). Sex, status, and reproductive success in the contemporary United States. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27(2), 104-120.
- Kenrick, D. T., Groth, G. E., Trost, M. R., & Sadalla, E. K. (1993). Integrating evolutionary and social exchange perspectives on relationships: Effects of gender, self-appraisal, and involvement level on mate selection criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 951-969.
- Li, N. P., Valentine, K. A., & Patel, L. (2011). Mate preferences in the US and Singapore: A cross cultural test of the mate preference priority model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 291-294.
- Li, N., Yong, J., Tov, W., Sng, O., Fletcher, G., Valentine, K., & Simpson, J. A. (2013). Mate preferences do predict attraction and choices in the early stages of mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(5), 757-776.
- Lu, H. J., Zhu, X. Q., & Chang, L. (2015). Good genes, good providers, and good fathers: Economic development involved in how women select a mate. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 215-228.
- Lynn, M. (2009). Determinants and consequences of female attractiveness and sexiness: Realistic tests with restaurant waitresses. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38(5), 737-745.
- Nettle, D., & Pollet, T. V. (2008). Natural selection on male wealth in humans. *The American Naturalist*, 172(5) 658-666.
- Nguyen, C. (2018). Reddit beats out Facebook to become the third-most-popular site on the web. Retrieved September 15 2019 from <https://www.digitaltrends.com/computing/reddit-more-popular-than-facebook-in-2018/>
- Pawlowski, B., & Koziel, S. (2002). The impact of traits offered in personal advertisements on response rates. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23(2), 139-149.
- Scheib, J. (2001). Context-specific mate choice criteria: Women's trade-offs in the contexts of long-term and extra-pair mateships. *Personal Relationships*, 8(4), 371-389.
- Schwarz, S., & Hassebrauck, M. (2012). Sex and age differences in mate-selection preferences. *Human Nature*, 23(4), 447-466.
- Scopellett, I., Loewenstein, G., & Vosgerau, J. (2015). You call it "self-exuberance"; I call it "bragging": Miscalibrated predictions of emotional responses to self-promotion. *Psychological Science*, 26(6), 903-914.
- Scott, G. G., & Ravenscroft, K. (2017). Bragging on Facebook: The interaction of content source and focus in online impression formation. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 20(1).

- Singh, D. (1993). Adaptive significance of female physical attractiveness: Role of waist-to-hip ratio. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 293-307.
- Smuts, B. (1992). Male aggression against women. *Human Nature*, 3(1), 1-44.
- Sprecher, S., Sullivan, Q., & Hatfield, E. (1994). Mate selection preferences: Gender differences examined in a national sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(6), 1074-1080.
- Strassberg, D. S., & English, B. L. (2015). An experimental study of men's and women's personal ads. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44(8), 2249-2255.
- Strassberg, D. S., & Holty, S. (2003). An experimental study of women's Internet personal ads. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32(3), 253-260.
- Townsend, J. M. (1998). *What women want – what men want: Why the sexes still see love and commitment so differently*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trivers, R. (1972). *Parental investment and sexual selection*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Walters, S., & Crawford, C. B. (1994). The importance of mate attraction for intrasexual competition in men and women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 15(1), 5-30.
- Waynforth, D., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (1995). Conditional mate choice strategies in humans: Evidence from 'lonely hearts' advertisements. *Behaviour*, 132(9-10), 755-779.
- Webster Jr, M., & Driskell Jr, J. E. (1983). Beauty as status. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(1), 140-165.
- Wiederman, M. (1993). Evolved gender differences in mate preferences: Evidence from personal advertisements. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 14(5), 331-351.

## APPENDIX A

### Stimuli Statements Indicating Wealth for Study 2

#### Pair 1

Wealthy: I'm a very outdoorsy guy who is happy to do almost anything! I love to spend my weekends in the sun relaxing at my beach house. It also has an awesome wrap-around deck for star-gazing. I'm a bit of a minimalist and like to live simply, but my cashflow is good and allows me to have fun. I like to go to events and travel.

Poor: I'm a very outdoorsy guy who is happy to do almost anything! I admit that I have to keep costs low right now because of cash flow, so I've become more of a minimalist and like to do free events and live simply. I love to spend my weekends tenting under the stars and having campfires.

#### Pair 2

Wealthy: I like luxury and that I have a salary that lets me splurge on cool things. Because I'm able to eat out a lot, I've become a major foodie. I will never say no to an evening of fine dining and a bottle of good French wine, or a good road trip to a luxury place.

Poor: I like luxury but lately I've been keeping things on the practical side. I don't eat out very much because of my salary but I really enjoy good food and consider myself a foodie. I wouldn't say no to ordering a cheesy pizza or a road trip to somewhere local for fun!

#### Pair 3

Wealthy: Hi! I like to hang out and am looking for a special someone to watch movies with or go to the private beach near my beach house. I also like to work on cars and have a pretty good collection of luxury sports cars. I've got my feet on the ground financially and things have really worked out.

Poor: Hi! I like to hang out and am looking for a special someone to watch movies with, or go to the beach. I also like to work on cars, but I don't have a car right now because I'm still trying to get on my feet financially but know things will work out.

#### Pair 4

Wealthy: I enjoy treating a girl right and promise to treat you like a queen. I come from a big famous family that you've heard of, and know my way around the best restaurants and clubs (I always get VIP service). I'll pick you up in my Lamborghini

and we can drive around town, stopping at the best places. Money really does have its perks.

Poor: I enjoy treating a girl right and promise to treat you like a queen. I come from a big family so I have lots of connections at restaurants and clubs. I'll pick you up in my car and we can drive around town, stopping at some of the cool places. Money can't buy happiness.



APPENDIX B

**Table 1.** Study 1 Paired-Samples t-tests for Mean Responses to the Perceived Wealth of Perspective Mates ( $n = 83$ ,  $df = 81$ ).

	High Account Balance		Low Account Balance		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Engage in online conversation	4.54	1.44	4.74	1.33	1.44	.155	.144
Meet for a casual coffee	4.34	1.50	4.60	1.42	1.63	.107	.178
Accept an invitation for a date	4.30	1.51	4.56	1.41	1.56	.123	.178
Consider him for a one-night stand	3.36	1.68	3.73	1.79	2.08	.041*	.213
Consider him for a short-term relationship	3.28	1.56	3.48	1.51	1.22	.225	.130
Consider him for a long-term relationship	3.22	1.50	3.33	1.42	0.63	.528	.075
Physical attractiveness	4.37	1.32	4.81	1.25	2.31	.023*	.342

*Note.* \* indicates  $p < .05$ ; *d* refers to the effect size measure of Cohen's *d*

APPENDIX C

**Table 2.** Study 2 Paired-Samples t-tests for Mean Responses to the Perceived Wealth of Perspective Mates ( $n = 188$ ,  $df = 186$  or  $187$ ).

	Wealthy		Poor		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Engage in online conversation	3.59	1.74	4.15	1.66	-4.94	.000***	.329
Accept an invitation for a date	3.59	1.75	3.98	1.75	-3.17	.002**	.170
Consider him for a one-night stand	3.15	1.80	2.85	1.72	2.28	.024*	.213
Consider him for a short-term relationship	2.74	1.66	3.15	1.60	-3.26	.001***	.251
Consider him for a long-term relationship	2.68	1.57	3.01	1.56	-2.68	.008**	.211
Physical attractiveness	3.33	1.84	4.84	1.16	-9.73	.000***	.982

*Note.* \* indicates  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ ; *d* refers to the effect size measure of Cohen's *d*