

Educational & Social Considerations in Spouse Selection: Preferences of People with and Without Special Needs

Hina Fazil¹
Muhammad Atif²

Abstract

This research study intends to explore the educational and social considerations of spouse selection preferences of people with and without special needs. This study was quantitative in its nature and survey research design was used. The population of the study, was the students from four universities in Lahore city. Total 98 students were selected through convenient sampling. Researchers have used self-developed questionnaire for data collection. Researchers have personally collected the data. Descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. Findings of this study reveals that youngsters prefer to marry in the age of 21-25 years with the age difference of 4-6 years of their spouses. Educational considerations, personality traits and same religious background were the top preferred features of the spouse selection criteria. People with special needs prefer the spouse selection considering the above characteristics plus of disability of the same nature. People without special needs do not prefer the spouse with disability. There is significant difference in the spouse selection preferences between the gender and disability status of the respondents. In Pakistan, there is no comprehensive study about the preferences in spouse selection of males and females so there is need to work more in terms of spouse selection preferences.

Keywords: *Educational considerations, Social considerations, Spouse selection, Special needs people*

Introduction

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan, hinafazil@hotmail.com

² M.Phil Scholar, Department of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan

Society is the title of mutual contracts and this arise from the contracts of the two persons. When the two persons come to be in mutual contracts then the society formation starts. It then known as the sign of vigorous societies that they are all the time permitted for the freedom of choice to their spouse. This permission of free choice provided the strong social strengths to that specific society (Brown, 2009).

It is too much interesting to observe the individual specifically for their choice. Spouse selection is very important decision of each and every life in the every individual. Mate personal wellbeing and self-satisfaction are extremely affected by the qualities of one's mate and life partner. Through marriage two individuals mutually bound to live together for the rest of their whole lives. Matrimonial relations are distinguished from any other kind of relationship in this world. Matrimonial relationship often widens our associations with the social world around us and enhances our emotional attachments with the spouse, family, and friends and with the siblings (Abdullah, 2011).

In Matrimonial relationship the couple confronts with many things and both have responsibilities to amicably manage the situations and made decisions and choices about reproduction with, choosing of, and continue their married life with spouse. The parameters of a good spouse are determined by their physical attributes and personal characteristics. The height, weight, face and body are the prime factors which help us in making judgment and selection of the spouse. With respect to males, economics status contributes. Matrimonial data shows that female preference towards the old age as compared to them. The reason begins this older spouse had enough time to assemble resources, and older spouse also have more dominant (Buss, 1989).

Choice of spouse has pervasive implications for the familial transmission of individual and social differences that have attracted the attention of both the life and social sciences. The literature on mate selection in the two approaches shows little sign of mutual recognition and reveals differences of focus and method. However, whether the causes of parent-offspring transmission are genetic or social, or some combination thereof, the tendency to marry alike ("assortative mating") is expected to have a significant impact on the familial transmission of genetic and environmental risks for disease and on the maintenance and distribution of social behavior because assortative mating increases both the parent-offspring correlation and the population variance for any trait on which assortment is based (Eysenck, 1979; Jencks , 1972). For example, relative to expectations under random mating, assortment allows parents, knowingly or unknowingly, to "corner the market" on behaviors and often times advantages, such as educational attainment, thereby increasing diversity in the population, (i.e., widening the education gap) and increasing the familial transmission of socially important values and characteristics (Mare 2000). Similarity between mates is a widely documented feature of human populations. Typically, the correlations between mates are small for measures of personality such extraversion and neuroticism (Eaves,1999 & Hatemi PK. 2008) and

moderate for physical attributes, IQ, social desirability, psychiatric disorders, and health-related behaviors such as smoking (Agrawal, Heath, Grant, Pergadia, Statham, Bucholz, Martin, & Madden PAF, 2006; Jencks, 1972; Kuo , 2006; Maes, 1998; Pearson & Lee, 1903; Silventoinen , 2003).

However, by far the largest spousal correlations are reported for variables that influence, or depend on, social behavior and organization, including educational attainment, religious behavior and political preference (Kalmijn, 1998; Martin, 1986).

Raza & Hanif (1999) reported that Pakistan is the country of the people where the individuals are not fully permitted regarding the choice of the life partner due to the rigid behavior, caste, creed and the religious sector in Pakistan. This is the first ever study which is specifically designed to find out the preferences of the individuals regarding the selection of the life partner.

The present study was conducted to see educational & social considerations in spouse selection preferences of normal and people with special needs.

Objectives of the Study

Following were the objectives of the study:

1. To explore spouse selection preferences of normal people.
2. To explore spouse selection preferences of people with special needs.
3. To compare the spouse selection preferences between people with and without special needs.
4. To compare the spouse selection preferences between male and females.
5. To differentiate the spouse selection preferences between the people on the basis of academic qualification.

Research Questions

Following were the research questions of the study:

1. What are spouse selection preferences of normal people?
2. What are spouse selection preferences of people with special needs?
3. What are the comparison in spouse selection preferences between people with and without special needs?
4. What are the comparisons in spouse selection preferences between male and females?
5. What are the differences in spouse selection preferences on the basis of academic qualification?

Research Methodology

The study was aimed to analyze the spouse selection preferences of people with and without special needs. Researchers have completed the present study by taking following steps.

Research Design

The main purpose of the study was to explore the educational and social considerations in spouse selection people with and without special needs. Therefore, descriptive research method was preferred as the investigation method for this study.

Population of the Study

The students with and without special needs studying in different departments in public universities of the Lahore city constitute the population of the research study.

Sample of the Study

Researchers have purposively selected 98 students as the sample of the study. Out of these 98, fifty students without disabilities and forty-eight students with special needs from four well reputed universities of Lahore city namely University of Sargodha Lahore campus, University of Punjab Lahore, University of Gujrat Lahore campus & University of Lahore. The age range of the respondents were from 18 to 38 years. 71.4% respondents were between 22 to 25 years of age, 51% of the respondents were male and the 48% of the respondents were female, 19.4% of the respondents were bachelor degree, 67.3% of the respondents were master degree, 12.2% of the respondents were post graduate and the 1% of the respondents having the other academic qualification. 85.7% of the respondents were single, 6.1% of the respondents were engaged, 4.1% of the respondents were looking for mate and the 2% of the respondents were married in this study, 32.7% of the respondents were physically handicapped, and 17.3% of the respondents were visually impaired and the 50% of the respondents were without special needs.

Table 1. *Sample distribution of the number of respondents from universities*

Name of University	Frequency	Percent
University of Sargodha Lahore Campus	16	16.3
University of the Punjab	34	34.7
University of the Gujrat Lahore Campus	22	22.4
University of Lahore	26	26.5
Total	98	100

Instrumentation

Researchers have used self made close ended questionnaire for the purpose of data collection. Researchers have divided it in three sections. First section is consisted on demographic information like name, age, gender, religion, profession, qualification, marital status, status of disability and institute etc. Second section comprises on five sub divisions as education, physical & mental health, financial prospects, society or social consideration and personality traits and these factors consisted on 45 factors of spouse selection. These factors were developed on four Likert scale 4 = indispensable, 3 = Important, but not, indispensable 2 = Desirable but not very important, 1 = Irrelevant unimportant. Third part was consisted on four questions with 2-point check list “yes” and “no”. The same questionnaire was used for all selected respondents.

Pilot Study

After developing the research instrument, it was pilot tested on five normal students and five with special needs students. It was also sent to the expert for content validation and as a result modifications and adaptations were made in it. As per the opinion of the expert in part 1 item. NO. 2, 11, 12 and 17 were added. Section No. 2 and 3 were merged after pilot testing. Part 2 was also added by researchers to examine the attitude of normal and special persons regarding to spouse selection.

Validation of the Research Tool

After finalizing the items and structure of questions in the questionnaire, It was sent to the experts of the field for its validation. Necessary modifications and adaptations were made in it.

Reliability of Research Instrument

Reliability analysis of the research instrument was found, with the Cronbach's alpha whose value 0.79, this is above 0.7, and it indicates this research instrument has enough internal consistency reliability.

Data Collection

The researchers used the questionnaire as research tool to find out the educational and social consideration of spouse selection preferences of people with and without special needs. The researcher personally visited the sampled universities and collected the data through questionnaire from special and normal students of different departments from four universities in Lahore. Researchers themselves gave all the necessary instructions regarding the research topic and tool to respondents for fill up the questionnaire. Some respondents of different universities who are visually impaired was

filled the questionnaires in soft form because they can easily read the content of tool through software's which are used for blind people. The researchers send the questionnaire through e-mail; they filled with responses and send back to researchers.

Data Analysis

Data collected through questionnaire were first coded given by values to variables like most of the demographic information coded with value "1" and "2". Second part of questionnaire scale coded according to given values 4 = indispensable, 3 = Important, but not indispensable 2 = Desirable but not very important, 1 = Irrelevant unimportant. Third part is four (4) questions with 2 point check list "yes" and "no" and coded with "2" and "1".

Data were entered in to the computer by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and then analyzed. The study was designed to analyze the educational and social considerations in spouse selection preferences of normal and people with special needs. Two types of statistics descriptive and inferential were used to analyze the data. Frequency distribution of the responses was used to analyze the opinions of the respondents. Descriptive statistics was also used in terms of mean, standard deviation and range for the analysis of the opinion of the respondents. Independent sample t-test was used to find out the differences among the respondents on the basis of gender, employment status, educational background and age in the study.

Data Analysis, Interpretation and Findings

The study was designed to analyze the educational and social considerations in spouse selection preferences of normal and people with special needs. Two types of statistics descriptive and inferential were used to analyze the data. Frequency distribution of the responses was used to analyze the opinions of the respondents. Descriptive statistics was also used in terms of mean, standard deviation, and range for the analysis of the opinion of the respondents. Independent sample t-test was applied to find out the differences among the respondents on the basis of gender, employment status, educational background and age.

Table 2: *Whom would you prefer to be older?*

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Self	51	52
Spouse	47	48
Total	98	100

Table 2 shows that 52% of the respondent's responded self and the 48% of the respondents responded spouse to the statement "Whom would you prefer to be older".

Table 3: *At what you will prefer to be marry?*

Age (Years)	Frequency	Percent
15-20 Years	4	4.1
21-25 Years	52	53.1
26-30Years	36	36.7
31-35 Years	6	6.1
Total	98	100

Table 3 shows that 4.1% of the respondents responded 15-20 years, 53.1% of the respondents responded 21-25 years, 36.7% of the respondents responded 26-30 years and the 6.1% of the respondents responded 31-35 years to the statement "at what age you will prefer to be married".

Table 4: *What age difference would you prefer between you and your spouse?*

Years	Frequency	Percent
1-3 Years	43	43.9
4-6 Years	44	44.9
7-9 Years	7	7.1
10-12 Years	4	4.1
Total	98	100

Table 4 shows that 43.9% of the respondents responded to 1-3 years, 44.9% of the respondents responded 4-6 years, 7.1% of the respondents responded 7-9 years and 4.1% of the respondents responded 10-12years to the statement "what age difference would you prefer between you and your spouse".

Table 5: *What qualification would you prefer for your spouse?*

Qualification	Frequency	Percent
Matric	5	5.1
Graduation	23	23.5
Master	42	42.9
M.Phil/Ph.D.	28	28.6
Total	98	100

Table 5 shows that 5.1% of the respondents responded matric, 23.5% of the respondents responded graduation, 42.9% of the respondents responded master degree, 28.6% of the respondents responded M.Phil. /PhD.

Table 6: Educational Considerations for spouse selection

Sr. No.	Item	Indispensable f(%)	Important f(%)	Desirable f(%)	Irrelevant f(%)	Total f(%)
Overall	Educational Considerations for spouse selection	37(38.27%)	33(34%)	20(20.2%)	8(7.46%)	98(100%)
1	Educated	59(60.2%)	33(33.7%)	5(5.1%)	1(1%)	98(100%)
2	Similar Educational background	27(27.6%)	32(32.7%)	30(30.6%)	10(9.2%)	98(100%)
3	Same profession	25(25.5%)	15(15.3%)	37(37.7%)	21(21.4%)	98(100%)
4	Intelligent	50(51%)	34(34.7%)	12(12.2%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
5	Well aware about educational prospects	31(31.6%)	40(40.9%)	23(23.5%)	4(4.1%)	98(100%)
6	Well aware about information technology (Cell, pc, social media)	33(33.7%)	46(46.9%)	12(12.2%)	7(7.1%)	98(100%)

Table 6 describes that 38.27% of the respondents responded indispensable, 34% responded important, 20.2% responded desirable and 7.46% responded irrelevant to the educational characteristics of spouse. Above table also shows that 60.2% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “educated”, 32.7% of the respondents responded important to the statement “similar educational background”, 37.7% of the respondents responded desirable to the statement “same profession”, 51% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “intelligent”, 40.9 % of the respondents responded important to the statement “well aware about educational prospects”, and 46.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “well aware about information technology (cell, PC)”.

Table 7 shows that 34.6% of the respondents responded indispensable, 44% responded important, 17.6% responded desirable, and 4% responded irrelevant to the physical and mental health characteristics of the spouse. Above table also shows that 44.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “good looking”, 45.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “physically attractive”, 49% of the respondents responded important to the statement “groom personality”, 43.8% of the respondents responded important to the statement “good heredity”, 42.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “heighted”, 45.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “fair color” and 38.8% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “emotional stability”.

Table 7: Physical & Mental Health

Sr. No.	Item	Indispensable f(%)	Important f(%)	Desirable f(%)	Irrelevant f(%)	Total f(%)
Overall	Physical & Mental Health	34(34.6%)	43(44%)	17(17.6%)	4(4%)	98(100%)
1	Good looking	42(42.9%)	44(44.9%)	10(10.2%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
2	Physically attractive	37(37.8%)	45(45.9%)	15(15.3%)	1(1%)	98(100%)
3	Groom personality	38(38.8%)	48(49%)	12(12.2%)	0(0%)	98(100%)
4	Good heredity	31(31.6%)	43(43.8%)	20(20.4%)	4(4.1%)	98(100%)
5	Heighted	27(27.6%)	42(42.9%)	20(20.4%)	9(9.2%)	98(100%)
6	Faire color	23(23.5%)	45(45.9%)	24(24.5%)	6(6.1%)	98(100%)
7	Emotional stability	38(38.8%)	36(36.7%)	20(20.4%)	4(4.1%)	98(100%)

Table 8: Financial Prospects of the spouse

Sr. No.	Item	Indispensable f(%)	Important f(%)	Desirable f(%)	Irrelevant f(%)	Total f(%)
Overall	Financial Prospects of Spouse	30(30.6%)	33(33.7%)	21(21.4%)	14(14.2%)	98(100%)
1	Strong financial background	26(26.5%)	38(38.8%)	16(16.3%)	18(18.4%)	98(100%)
2	Job	38(38.8%)	23(23.5%)	21(21.4%)	15(15.3%)	98(100%)
3	Own business	19(19.3%)	33(33.7%)	26(26.5%)	20(20.4%)	98(100%)
4	Similar social status	23(23.5%)	32(32.7%)	27(27.6%)	16(16.3%)	98(100%)
5	Ambitious (motivated)	29(29.6%)	36(36.7%)	27(27.6%)	6(6.1%)	98(100%)
6	Industrious (hardworking)	45(45.9%)	35(35.7%)	11(11.2%)	7(7.1%)	98(100%)

Table 8 shows that 30.6% of the respondents responded indispensable, 33.7% responded important, 21.4% responded desirable, and 14.2% responded irrelevant to the financial prospects of the spouse. Above table also shows that 38.8% of the respondents responded important to the statement “strong financial background”, 38.8% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “job”, 33.7% of the respondents responded important to the statement “own business”, 32.7% of the respondents responded important to the statement “similar social status”, 36.7% of the respondents responded important to the statement “ambitious (motivated)” and 45.9% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “industrious (hardworking).

Table 9: Society or Social Considerations

Sr. No.	Item	Indispensable f(%)	Important f(%)	Desirable f(%)	Irrelevant f(%)	Total f(%)
Overall	Society or Social Considerations	32(32.2%)	20(20.3%)	19(19.2%)	27(27.5%)	98(100%)
1	Similar religious background	62(63.2%)	22(22.4%)	7(7.1%)	7(7.1%)	98(100%)
2	Similar political background	23(23.4%)	15(15.3%)	29(29.6%)	31(31.6%)	98(100%)
3	Same area	19(19.4%)	15(15.3%)	29(29.6%)	35(35.7%)	98(100%)
4	Same city	18(18.4%)	18(18.4%)	25(25.5%)	37(37.8%)	98(100%)
5	Same sector	22(22.4%)	11(11.2%)	27(27.6%)	38(38.8%)	98(100%)
6	Same cast	32(32.6%)	19(19.4%)	11(11.2%)	36(36.7%)	98(100%)
7	Same country	29(29.6%)	23(23.5%)	23(23.5%)	23(23.5%)	98(100%)
8	Similar cultural background	33(33.7%)	38(38.8%)	15(15.3%)	12(12.2%)	98(100%)
9	Noble family	55(56.1%)	29(29.6%)	4(4.1%)	10(10.2%)	98(100%)

Table 9 shows that 32.2% of the respondents responded indispensable, 20.3% responded important, 19.2% responded desirable, and 27.5% responded irrelevant to the society and social consideration for the selection of the spouse. Above table also shows

Educational & Social Considerations In Spouse Selection

that 63.2% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “similar religious background”, 31.6% of the respondents responded irrelevant to the statement “similar political background”, 35.7% of the respondents responded irrelevant to the statement “same area”, 37.8% of the respondents responded irrelevant to the statement “same city”, 38.8% of the respondents responded irrelevant to the statement “same sector”, 29.6% of the respondents responded indispensable to “same country”, 38.8% of the respondents responded important to the statement “similar cultural background” and 56.1% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “noble family”.

Table 10: Other Personality traits

Sr. No.	Item	Indispensable f(%)	Important f(%)	Desirable f(%)	Irrelevant f(%)	Total f(%)
Over all	Other Personality Traits	51(52%)	32(32.7%)	11(11.2%)	3(3%)	98(100%)
1	Respect	75(76.5%)	22(22.4%)	1(1%)	0(0%)	98(100%)
2	Love/ Caring	63(64.3%)	32(32.7%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	98(100%)
3	Social ability	53(54%)	37(37.8%)	6(6.1%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
4	Understanding	60(61.2%)	33(33.7%)	5(5.1%)	0(0%)	98(100%)
5	Mutual attraction	56(57.1%)	34(34.7%)	6(6.1%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
6	Kind	55(56.1%)	34(34.7%)	9(9.2%)	0(0%)	98(100%)
7	Good natured	61(62.2%)	31(31.6%)	4(4.1%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
8	Good tempered	57(58.1%)	27(27.6%)	13(13.3%)	1(1%)	98(100%)
9	Being each other match	49(50%)	28(28.6%)	19(19.4%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
10	Trustworthy	63(64.3%)	29(29.6%)	5(5.1%)	1(1%)	98(100%)
11	Handsome	38(38.8%)	44(44.9%)	14(14.3%)	2(2%)	98(100%)
12	Neatness	48(49%)	38(38.8%)	7(7.1%)	5(5.1%)	98(100%)
13	Good cook	35(35.7%)	23(23.5%)	29(29.6%)	11(11.2%)	98(100%)
14	Easygoing	35(35.7%)	39(39.8%)	19(19.4%)	5(5.1%)	98(100%)
15	Creative & artistic	34(34.7%)	26(26.5%)	28(28.6%)	10(10.2%)	98(100%)
16	Good housekeeper	37(37.8%)	32(32.7%)	18(18.4%)	10(10.2%)	98(100%)
17	Desire for home & children	56(57.1%)	30(30.6%)	10(10.2%)	2(2%)	98(100%)

Table 10 shows that 52% of the respondents responded indispensable, 32.7% responded important, 11.2% responded desirable and 3% responded to the general preferences for the selection of the spouse. Above table also shows that 76.5% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “respect”, 64.3% of the

respondents responded indispensable to the statement “love/caring”, 54% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “social ability”, 60.1% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “understanding”, 57.1% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “mutual attraction”, 56.7% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “kind”, 62% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “good natured”, 58.1% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “good tempered being each other” and 64.3% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “trustworthy”. Table 4.20 shows that 44.9% of the respondents responded important to the statement “handsome”, 49% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “neatness”, 35.7% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “good cook”, 35.7% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “easy going”, 34.7% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “creative & artistic”, 37.8% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “good housekeeper” and 57.1% of the respondents responded indispensable to the statement “desire for home and children”.

Table 11: *Frequency distribution of the responses*

Part III

Sr. No.	Item	Yes f(%)	No f(%)	Total f(%)
1	Do you want to marry with special person? If you are normal person.	46(46.9%)	52(53.1%)	98(100%)
2	Do you want to marry with normal person? If you are special person.	69(70.4%)	29(29.6%)	98(100%)
3	If you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having same disability?	44(44.9%)	54(55.1%)	98(100%)
4	If you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having different disability?	73(74.5%)	25(25.5%)	98(100%)

Table 11 shows that 53.1% of the respondents responded negative to the statement “do you want to marry with special person? If you are normal person”, 70.4% of the respondents responded yes to the statement “do you want to marry with normal person? If you are special person”, 55.1% of the respondents responded no to the statement “if you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having same

Educational & Social Considerations In Spouse Selection

disability”, and 74.5% of the respondents responded yes to the statement “if you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having different disability”.

Table 12: Descriptive analysis of the responses in respect of educational Considerations

Sr. No.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Educated	98	3.53	.645	3
2	Similar Educational background	98	2.80	.943	3
3	Same profession	98	2.46	1.10	3
4	Intelligent	98	3.31	.78	3
5	Well award about educational prospects	98	3	.863	3
6	Well aware about information technology (Cell, pc, social media)	98	3.06	.864	3

Table 12 shows that mean for the educated, similar education background, same profession, intelligent, well aware about educational prospects, and well aware about the information technology was 3.53, 2.80, 2.46, 3.31, 3 and 3.05 respectively. Above table also shows that standard deviation for the educated, similar education background, same profession, intelligent, well aware about educational prospects, and well aware about the information technology was 0.645, 0.943, 1.10, 78, 0.863 and 0s.864 respectively.

Table 13: Descriptive analysis of the responses Physical & Mental Health

Sr. No.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Good looking	98	3.29	0.732	3
2	Physically attractive	98	3.17	.0728	3
3	Groom personality	98	3.27	0.670	2
4	Good heredity	98	3.03	0.839	3
5	Heighted	98	2.89	0.918	3
6	Faire color	98	2.87	0.845	3
7	Emotional stability	98	3.09	0.867	3

Table 13 shows that the mean for good looking, physically attractive, groom personality, good heredity, heighted, faire color and emotional stability was 3.29, 3.17, 3.27, 3.03, 2.89, 2.87 and 3.09 respectively. Above table also shows that the standard deviation for good looking, physically attractive, groom personality, good heredity, heighted, faire color and emotional stability was 0.732, 0.728, 0.670, 0.839, 0.918, 0.845 and 0.867 respectively.

Table 14: Descriptive analysis of the responses Financial Prospects

Sr. No.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Strong financial background	98	2.73	1.056	3
2	Job	98	2.87	1.105	3
3	Own business	98	2.49	1.016	3
4	Similar social status	98	2.59	1.005	3
5	Ambitious (motivated)	98	2.89	0.900	3
6	Industrious (hardworking)	98	3.20	0.909	3

Table 14 shows that the mean for strong financial background, job, own business similar social status, ambitious (motivated), and industrious (hardworking) was 2.73, 2.87, 2.49, 2.59, 2.89 and 3.20 respectively. Above table also shows that the standard deviation for strong financial background, job, own business similar social status, ambitious (motivated), and industrious (hardworking) was 1.056, 1.105, 1.016, 1.005, 0.900 and 0.909 respectively.

Table 15: Society or Social Considerations

Sr. No.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Similar religious background	98	3.41	0.913	3
2	Similar political background	98	2.24	1.138	3
3	Same area	98	2.16	1.15	3
4	Same city	98	2.17	1.13	3
5	Same sector	98	2.14	1.15	3
6	Same cast	98	2.45	1.28	3
7	Same country	98	2.56	1.14	3
8	Similar cultural background	98	2.94	0.993	3
9	Noble family	98	3.32	0.959	3

Table 15 shows that the mean for similar religious background, similar political background, same area, same city, same sector, same cast, same country, similar cultural background, and noble family was 3.41, 2.24, 2.16, 2.17, 2.14, 2.45, 2.56, 2.94, and 3.32 respectively. Above table also shows that the standard deviation for similar religious background, similar political background, same area, same city, same sector, same cast,

same country, similar cultural background, and noble family was 0.913, 1.138, 1.15, 1.13, 1.28, 1.14, 0.993 and 0.959 respectively.

Table 16: *Other Personality Traits*

Sr. No.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Respect	98	3.76	0.455	2
2	Love/ Caring	98	3.60	0.587	3
3	Social ability	98	3.43	0.707	3
4	Understanding	98	3.56	0.595	3
5	Mutual attraction	98	3.46	0.710	3
6	Kind	98	3.45	0.665	3
7	Good natured	98	3.54	0.678	3
	Good tempered	98	3.42	0.762	3
8	Being each other match	98	3.26	0.845	3
9	Trustworthy	98	3.57	0.642	3
10	Handsome	98	3.20	0.759	3
11	Neatness	98	3.32	0.820	3
12	Good cook	98	2.84	01.04	3
13	Easygoing	98	3.06	0.871	3
14	Creative & artistic	98	2.85	1.01	3
15	Good housekeeper	98	2.99	0.995	3
16	Desire for home & children	98	3.41	0.765	3

Table 16 shows that the mean for respect, love/ caring, social ability, understanding, mutual attraction, kind, good natured, good tempered, being each other match, trustworthy, handsome, neatness, good cook, easygoing, creative & artistic, good housekeeper and desire for home & children was 3.76, 3.60, 3.43, 3.56, 3.46, 3.45, 3.54, 3.42, 3.26, 3.57, 3.20, 3.32, 2.84, 3.06, 2.85, 2.99, and 3.41 respectively. Above table also shows that the standard deviation for respect, love/ caring, social ability, understanding, mutual attraction, kind, good natured, good tempered, being each other match, trustworthy, handsome, neatness, good cook, easygoing, creative & artistic, good housekeeper and desire for home & children was 0.455, 0.587, 0.707, 0.595, 0.710, 0.665, 0.678, 0.762, 0.845, 0.642, .759, .820, 1.04, 0.871, 1.01, 0.995 and 0.765 respectively.

Table 17: Frequency distribution of the responses
Part III

Sr.	Item	N	Mean (M)	S.D	Range
1	Do you want to marry with special person? If you are normal person.	98	1.51	.503	1
2	Do you want to marry with normal person? If you are special person.	98	1.32	.470	1
3	If you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having same disability?	98	1.51	.503	1
4	If you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having different disability?	98	1.72	.454	1

Table 17 shows that mean for do you want to marry with special person? if you are normal person, do you want to marry with normal person? if you are special person, if you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having same disability and if you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having different disability was 1.51, 1.32 , 1.51, and 1.72 respectively. Above table also shows that the standard deviation for do you want to marry with special person? if you are normal person, do you want to marry with normal person? if you are special person, if you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having same disability you are disable would you prefer to marry with a person having different disability was 0.503, 0.470, 0.503 and 0.454 respectively.

Table 18: Comparison of selection of the respondents towards the spouse selection on the basis of gender

Gender	N	M	df	t	Sig
Male	51	153.58	96	2.43	0.017
Female	47	143.44	95.32		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

Table 18 shows that there is a significant difference in the spouse selection criteria on the basis of gender. It can be concluded that the male respondents are more conscious in the selection of spouse.

Table 19: Comparison of selection of the respondents towards the spouse selection on the basis of status of the respondents

Gender	N	M	df	t	Sig
Student	94	21.15	96	0.189	0.850
Employee	4	24.89	3.19	0.163	

*P < 0.05 Level of Significance

Table 19 shows that there is no significant difference in the spouse selection criteria on the basis of the status of the respondents. It can be concluded that there is no difference in the selection of spouse whatever the status they are recently.

Table 20: Comparison of selection of the respondents towards the spouse selection on the basis of Academic Qualification

Gender	N	M	df	t	Sig
Bachelor	19	156	83	1.65	0.103
Post Graduate	66	147.48	31.58	1.74	

*P <0.05 Level of Significance

Table 20 shows that there is no significant difference in the spouse selection criteria on the basis of academic qualification of the respondents. The results show that people with different qualifications have same preferences for spouse selection.

Table 21: Comparison of selection of the respondents towards the spouse selection on the basis of age of the respondents

Gender	N	M	df	t	Sig
15-30	15	151.86	83	0.661	0.511
30 and above	70	148.05	23.58	0.745	

*P <0 .05 Level of Significance

Table 21 shows that there is no significant difference in the spouse selection criterion the basis of age the respondents. All males and females having different ages have same requirements for their spouses.

Table 22: Comparison of selection of the respondents towards the spouse selection on the basis of disability status of the respondents

Gender	N	M	df	t	Sig
Normal	49	144.24	s96	-2.132	0.036
With Special Needs	49	153.20	84	-2.132	

*P <0 .05 Level of Significance

Table 22 shows that there is significant difference in the spouse selection preferences on the basis of disability status the respondents. The results show that considerations of males and females are different from each other for their spouses.

Conclusions

Following conclusions were drawn on the basis of findings:

The purpose of this study was to examine the educational and social considerations of spouse selection preferences of students with and without special needs. Findings of this study reveals that youngster prefer to marry in the age of 21-25

years with the age difference of 4-6 years of its spouse. This study concluded that academic qualification, similar educational background, same profession, well awarded about educational prospectus and level of intelligence was the preferred ingredient of the spouse Selection criteria.

Good looking, groom personality, physically attractive, good heredity, heightened, fair color and the emotional stability was the top preferred features of the spouse selection criteria. Financial prospects were considered very important in the selection of life partners in terms of strong financial background, job, own business, ambitious (motivated), industrious. Social and religious components of the process of selection of the life partner had much more important for the youngsters in the form of similar religious background, similar political background, same area, same city, same country, same sector, similar cultural background and noble family. Personality traits consideration had much more important for the youngster like respect, love caring, social ability, understanding, mutual attraction, kind, good natured, trust worthy, handsome, neatness, creative & artistic and desire for home and children.

People with special needs prefer the spouse selection considering the above characteristics plus of disability of the same nature. Normal people not prefer the spouse with the disability. There is significant difference in the spouse selection preferences between the gender and disability status of the respondents. Male are more conscious regarding the selection of the life partner as compared to the female whereas, on the other hand people with special needs more conscious because of their disability so that the compatibility can be make sure in the type of disability. There is no significant difference in the spouse selection preferences due to the difference in academic qualification, difference in age and the status of the people.

Recommendations

Following recommendations were drawn on the basis of conclusions:

1. This study reveals that there should not be any specific criteria for spouse selection. The special persons should not be degraded in this regard by considering them a living human they should be preferred as normal ones are.
2. Academic qualification, similar educational background should be considered important but is should be biasness free and ethical level of morality in consideration of spouse selection in the case of special need persons.
3. During the selection of the life partner youngster should have to make sure enough all the potentials before made the final decision rather than just looking the high socio-economic status and the apparent beauty either special of normal ones.
4. People who are providing the services in this area like marriage bureau workers (spouse selection) please they should have to follow these important ethical considerations preferences during the selection of spouse either in the case of special persona or normal one.

5. Curriculum developer should include the curriculum about this aspect of spouse selection either special person or normal at college and university level and should also include the hidden curriculum about spouse selection considering important aspects of morality.
6. This research was conducted in the four universities; this size of demographic may not provide the actual scenario of the perception of the people, for the better understanding. It should have to extent the area for the next researches in near future.

References

- Abdullah H.S., Li L.P., David A.P.V., Gender differences in mate selection criteria among Malaysian undergraduate students, *SARJANA*, 26(2), 33-50, 2011.
- Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job controls as a moderator of emotional dissonance and emotional intelligence outcome relationships. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134 (2), 169-184.
- Ackerman, P. L. (2009). Personality and intelligence. In P. J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 162-174). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Aprillia, K., & Ritandiyono. (2007). *Relationship between the emotional intelligence and aggressive behavior in adolescent*. Gunadarma University.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2006). *Amos 7.0 User's Guide*. Chicago: SPSS Bailey, K. D. (1987). *Methods of social research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bastiaens, L. J. (2006). *Youth aggression: Economic impact, causes, prevention, and treatment*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychiatrictimes.com/articles/youth-aggression-economic-impact-causes-prevention-and-treatment>
- Barry, T. D. (2004). *Aggression in adolescents: Strategies for parents and educators*. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/resources/principals/nasp_aggression.pdf
- Bierman, A., Fazio, E. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). A multifaceted approach to the mental health advantage of the married: Assessing how explanations vary by outcome measure and unmarried group. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 554-582.
- Blair, J., Mitchell, D., & Blair, K. (2005). *The psychopath: Emotion and the brain*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Blow, A. J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31(2), 233-277.
- Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 964-980.
- Brown, The Marriage Problem: How to Choose? *Parabola*, 45(2), 2009.
- Borgerhoff Mulder, M. (1987). On cultural and reproductive success: Kipsigis evidence. *American Anthropologist*, 88, 617-634.
- Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.
- Buss, D. (2013). Mate Preferences Questionnaire. Measurement Instrument Database for the Social
- Canabal, M. E. (1990). An economic approach to marital dissolution in Puerto Rico. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 515-530.
- Capaldi, D. M., & Patterson, G. R. (1994). *Interrelated influences of contextual factors on antisocial behavior in childhood and adolescence for males*. New York: Springer Publishing Company
- Choi, S. (2010). The effects of fatherhood experiences on men's psychological wellbeing. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 71.
- Ciarrochi, J. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 7, 1105-1119.

- DeNeve, K.M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 197–229.
- Craig, I. W. (2007). *The importance of stress and genetic variation in human aggression*. Retrieved from http://www.bioforensics.com/conference07/DNA_and_behavior/Aggression_Review.pdf
- Cready, C. M., Fossett, M. A., Kiecolt, K. J. (1997). Mate Availability and African American Family Structure in the U.S. Nonmetropolitan South, 1960–1990. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59:192–203.
- Cornwell, R.E., & Perrett, D.I. (2008.) Sexy sons and sexy daughters: the influence of parents' facial characteristics on offspring. *Behavior*. 76, 1843–1853.
- Cronk, L. (1991). Wealth, status and reproductive success among the Mukogodo. *American Anthropologist*, 93, 345–360.
- Csatho, A., Bereczkei, T. (2003). Effect of males' status and facial attractiveness on direct childcare. *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology*, 1(2), 123- 130.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1991). A reply to Gelles: Stepchildren are disproportionately abused, and diverse forms of violence can share causal factors. *Human Nature*, 2, 419-426.