The History of Matchmaking and the Function of Intermediaries in the Marriage Market

Clara Wollburg

Summary:
Market intermediaries are individuals, organizations, or platforms that facilitate transactions between two or more parties, performing "work that otherwise would be performed by the provider or consumer of a good".[1] Typically, market intermediaries assist with or execute one or more of three essential market functions:[2]
   (1) Searching, i.e. the gathering of information relevant for the transaction
   (2) Matching, i.e. bringing together parties compatible as transaction partners
   (3) Transaction, i.e. the negotiation of the transaction and finalizing of the transaction agreement.[3]
By performing one or more of these functions, a market intermediary can reduce search costs, increase matching quality and advance the connection process.[4]

Market intermediaries play a role in a variety of contexts. In marriage and dating markets, the intermediary acquires information about who is eligible as a potential mate, determines which partners make a good match, and facilitates the process of interaction and relationship formation.[5] Human matchmakers, such as the *shadkhan* in the Jewish tradition[6] or the *sharifas* in ancient Morocco,[7] played a central role in the history of marriage. In modern dating, matchmaking services are often performed by online-dating platforms and apps.[8]

In the labor market, intermediaries, e.g. human resource managers, employment agencies or analytics firms, assist in the recruitment of employees, and the selection and hiring process. By performing these functions, labor market intermediaries have the potential to identify better hiring matches to reduce employee turnover, therefore increasing productivity and lowering hiring and training costs.[9] In recent years, the digitalization of applicant and employee records, combined with new focus on big data in human resources, has enabled new types of computer matchmakers (hiring algorithms, predictive analytics) to be used in the labor market.

---

[1] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992.
[2] Cf. Ibid.
[3] Cf. Ibid.
[4] Cf. Brown/Hagel 2014.
[5] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012.
[6] Cf. Monger 2004.
[7] Cf. Engel 2008.
[8] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012.
[9] Cf. Greenfield 2015.
[10] Cf. Ibid.

Introduction

Marriage intermediaries - often referred to as matchmakers - are individuals, organizations, or platforms that bring two parties together for the formation of marriage. The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the history and evolution of marriage intermediaries, beginning in pre-modern times, and through the 21st century. In section I, I will outline the functions that intermediaries perform in the marriage markets:the *search* for eligible singles, the *matching* of suitable partners, and the facilitation of the *interaction* between the two parties. In section II, I will examine the role of matchmakers in pre-modern times when marriage was primarily a business transaction between families. In particular, I will look at the matchmaking traditions of England, Russia, Ireland, and China, as well as those of Jewish, Islamic, and matrilineal societies. In section III, I will look at how the role of marriage intermediaries changed with the emergence of the "love marriage" between two freely consenting adults. Contrary to the claim that marriage intermediaries are only relevant for traditional, arranged marriages, I will show that the establishment of the love marriage in the US did not eliminate the need for marriage intermediaries, as evidenced by the expansion and re-emergence of matchmaking services which provide essential functions in the marriage market. In section IV, I will look at the most recent form of marriage intermediaries, namely computer-based matchmaking. I will outline how online dating websites and apps function as matchmaking platforms by offering (1) access to a large pool of eligible others, (2) computer-mediated communication between users and (3) matching algorithms to determine compatibility. Referring to psychological research on relationship well being, I will then evaluate how these three functions change the process and quality of matchmaking. I will conclude that while online dating has the potential to dramatically decrease search costs and expedite the connection process, it does not necessarily increase match quality.

I) The Functions of Intermediaries in the Marriage Market

A matchmaker facilitates the process of bringing two parties together, often for romantic reasons and the formation of marriage. Matchmakers thereby act as market intermediaries, performing "work that otherwise would be performed by the provider or consumer of the good."[1] Typically, market intermediaries assist with or execute one or more of three essential market functions: searching, matching, and transaction.[2] In the marriage market, the intermediary can perform these functions by acquiring information about who is eligible as a potential mate (searching), using information about potential mates to determine which mates make a good match (matching), and facilitating a process of interaction and relationship formation (transaction/interaction).[3] By performing one or more of these functions, a market intermediary can reduce search costs, advance the connection process, or assist in finding better matches.[4]

Both the functions performed by the intermediary, as well as the individuals performing those roles, have differed throughout the history of matchmaking, and were often dependent on the purpose that marriage fulfilled. Generally, however, a successful marriage broker needed an understanding of all potential partners and their social and financial backgrounds and the ability to represent all parties involved[5]. Therefore, matchmaker services were often offered by community leaders, religious authorities, or other esteemed members of society.[6] Both men and women provided matchmaking services, though the likelihood of a female matchmaker decreases with increasing geographic distance between the prospective couple.[7] Female matchmakers were often married or widowed, and only very rarely did single women act as marriage intermediaries.[8]

In the following sections, I will examine how market intermediaries assisted in the marriage formation process in the traditional marriage (section II), the love marriage(section III), and in 21st century online dating (section IV).

II) Traditional Matchmaking

Before the 19th century, marriage was first and foremost a business transaction.[9] Its purpose was to consolidate wealth and augment political power (for upper classes) or to acquire new labor for the family enterprise and obtain some form of social security and medical care (for peasants and farmers).[10] Due to the economic and political importance of marriages, matchmaking was seen as a crucial matter for the whole family and not to be left to potential partners and their personal preferences.[11] The use of an intermediary to bring together potential spouses was commonly used. This view is emphasized, for instance, in the musical "Fiddler on the Roof" when Hodel declares that "somebody has to arrange the matches, young people can't decide these things themselves".[12] Apart from facilitating the search and matching process, marriage intermediaries also played an important role in the transaction itself, by, for example, taking part in the property negotiations of a marriage contract.[13]

Jewish Matchmaking Tradition

One of the longest traditions of matchmaking is practiced in Jewish communities.[14] The matchmaker, known as the *shadkhan,* was the head of the community's school.[15] The school was an important establishment for preserving Judaism after the destruction of the second temple in 70 AD and therefore played a crucial role in the life of the community. The head of school was a respected member of the community and his opinion was of great weight.[16] Not only did he have expertise in Jewish traditions but he also possessed knowledge about community members and families and was thus well suited to represent the parties involved in the marriage arrangement. Alongside the head of school, Rabbis also assisted in arranging marriages[17] as they were similarly well-respected and viewed as the religious authorities of the communities. Traditionally, the father was the initiator of the matchmaking process: he was the one requesting the services of a *shadkhan* and consenting to the formation of marriage. Moreover, the fathers of the newlywed couple would usually make a donation to the school or synagogue in return for matchmaking services.[18]

Over the course of time, the *shadkhan* became more professionalized and the matchmaker began traveling around offering his or her services in exchange for a commission of about 2 or 3 percent of the dowry when the marriage formation was successful.[19] But with the development of career matchmakers, the *shadkhan* also gained the reputation of being overly concerned with making profit and deceiving their customers by overselling the attributes of a potential spouse.[20] This image of the *shadkhan* is portrayed, in the musical "Fiddler on the Roof," where in the classic song "Matchmaker, Matchmaker" Zteitel describes ironically how the *shadkhan* Jente oversells an abusive and alcoholic man as "a nice man, a good catch."[21] The theme of the deceptive *shadkhan* is also present in Yiddish folksongs. In one song, for instance, a young bride accuses the matchmaker to have "slaughtered me without pity. A curse on you!"[22]

Irish Matchmaking Tradition

Matchmaking in Ireland has an equally long tradition that continues to present day.[23] Community fairs such as Lisdoonvarna are particularly well known as a way to find a marriage match. Traditionally organized to bring young eligible people together, the fairs enabled members of the Irish peasantry to overcome the geographical disparities in the scattered communities of Ireland.[24] Matchmaking fairs like Lisdoonvarna, were organized to bring together eligible young people and facilitate the search and matching process.[25] Additionally, a matchmaker might be contracted at the fairs themselves, aiding in the search for a marriage partner or initiating the interaction.[26] Such intermediaries could be friends, relatives or official matchmakers, who charged a fee.[27] The official matchmaking position was often passed down through generations and was well respected in the

communities.[28] In some parts of rural Ireland, such matchmakers still practice their profession today.[29]

Matchmaking in Peasant Russia

Among the peasantry of nineteenth-century Russia, marriage brokers also played an important role. The purpose of marriage for peasantry was often to unite families or acquire new labor for the family enterprise.[30] A good match was therefore determined with regard to property and wealth (for the husband) and physical strength and capacity to work (for the wife). The services of the marriage broker, typically a married woman, were requested by the suitor and his parents as soon as the suitor had decided on a prospective wife.[31] The matchmaker then gathered information on the chosen woman, e.g. her strength and skills, and reported back to the suitor's family. When the suitor confirmed his proposition, the matchmaker informed the bride's family about the financial background and negotiated the terms of the marriage—typically involving the exchange of property between the two parties—to which the the bride's family consented.[32]

Matchmaking in Tudor England

Among the upper classes in Tudor England, matchmakers played an extensive role in the formation of marriages, as suitors requested their services to select potential brides.[33] The matchmaker typically acquired information about social and economic status of a potential mate (matching) and facilitated the communication between potential spouses, for instance by carrying messages and gifts[34] (transaction/interaction). Matchmakers also played an important role in the property negotiations of a marriage contract.[35] The role of matchmaker was often undertaken by relatives or respected members of society.[36] Even if matchmakers acted informally on behalf of the suitor, laws were established concerning the conduct of matchmakers,[37] underscoring the prevalence of their role in marriage formation.

Matchmaking in Muslim Societies

In many Muslim countries, strict laws govern the formation of marriages. It is traditional Muslim practice to prohibit women and men to meet before the marriage is arranged.[38] A matchmaker was therefore an important part of the marriage arrangement and still assists in the marriage foundations in some Muslim societies today, e.g. in rural Egypt.[39] Here, the search process is typically initiated by the groom and his family.[40] A female relative of the groom often acts a matchmaker and approaches the father of the prospective bride to initiate the transaction.[41] The fathers of both families will then have a meeting to evaluate the proposal, assessing the other's social and economic background and financial standing.[42] It is only then that the couple will meet for the first time while the family is present.[43] Up to this day, matchmakers still arrange marriages in Morocco, particularly in areas with strong Islamic traditions where men and women rarely interact before marriage.[44] The mother of the groom searches for a suitable bride for her son—a healthy, respectful and obedient young woman—and thereby acts as an intermediary for the matching process.[45] An official matchmaker will then visit the family of the prospective bride to assess the girl's qualities, her financial background and the family's attitude towards the match. In Morocco, the role of official matchmakers is often performed by *sharifas*, women from holy lineages of high social status, who have the authority to assist in the marriage negotiations.[46] While female matchmakers, i.e. the mother and *sharifas*, play crucial roles in searching, matching, and transaction, the male leaders of the family approve the property transfers and finalize the agreement.[47]

Matchmaking in Traditional and Modern China

Traditionally, a Chinese wedding was arranged by the families of the prospective couple.[48] The parents of the groom, searched for a suitable wife for their son, ideally of the same social and financial status[49], acting as go-betweens for both searching and matching for their children. When a

suitable match was found, the interaction between the two families was facilitated by a spokeswoman, who would propose the match to the bride's family, praising the features of the groom and his family.[50] If the woman's family agreed to the match, the compatibility of the couple had to be confirmed by a fortunetelling master, who would compare the "eight numbers" of the couple—the birthdates of the man and woman. If the fortuneteller found that the couple's horoscopes matched, the marriage formation proceeded with the groom's family sending gifts to the bride and a fortuneteller proposing a propitious date for the marriage.[51]

Today, the family still plays an important role in searching a match for their children, though in urban areas this role has been considerably diminished. People's Square Park in the heart of modern Shanghai, for instance, turns into a marriage market each weekend, where parents try to arrange dates and potential marriage matches for their children.[52] Often, young individuals accept their parent's help when they are constrained by work demands[53], however in some cases, such matchmaking assistance is unwelcome. Due to the great sex ratio imbalance in China, unmarried women over 27 are increasingly put under societal and parental pressure to find a mate.[54] Such women, often professionals who do not wish to marry, have been labeled "leftover women" and are publicly shamed for their decision to stay single.[55] Their parents often take part in the People's Square Park matchmaking markets.[56]

Matchmaking in Matrilineal Societies

The Minangkabau, an ethnic group indigenous to the island of Sumatra, Indonesia, is the largest existing matrilineal society, in which women are the main owners of property, the heads of the family[57] and the heirs of land and property.[58] Men are the leading figures in politics and religion.[59] In the formation of marriage, the family of the bride plays a leading role in initiating and arranging the marriage.[60] Traditionally, it is the mother of a bride that consents to the marriage of her daughter, while the father's opinion is seen as less weighty.[61] In addition, the mother's brother, who is called mamak, often acts as a matchmaker for the bride.[62]

Similar to the Minangkabau, the Mosou people, who reside in the Yunnan and Sichuan provinces of China, also have a long matrilineal tradition: Mosou women are the family leaders, heirs of property and land, and economic decision makers.[63] Political decision-making is mostly a male enterprise.[64] The Mosou marriage tradition differs from most marriages in patriarchal countries, as the Mosou practice what they call "walking marriages", in which men and women do not marry but have different romantic relationships over their lifetime, often living in serial monogamy. [65] The children resulting from those "walking marriages" are raised by the mother's family with fathers having very little responsibility for their offspring.[66] Even though the marriage tradition differs, Mosou relationships are often arranged with the help of a matchmaker, who will deliver gifts and thereby assist in the connection process. [67]

III) Matchmaking and the Love Marriage

The idea of a love-based, companionate marriage emerged in 19th century Europe[68], parallelling the intellectual movement of the Enlightenment, which questioned the authoritative structure of society and opposed the notion that a marriage partner was to be chosen by parents or society.[69] Nevertheless, marriage remained an economic unit often entered into because of societal or economic pressure, especially considering the economic dependency of women, their legal subordination, and the unreliability of birth control which preserved many aspects of traditional marriage.[70] It was only in the 1970s that such constraints gradually diminished in most of Europe and the United States and marriage could be a "personal relationship between two freely consenting adults".[71]

The transformation of marriage into a love relationship also reshaped the role of marriage intermediaries. Traditionally, a matchmaker was a facilitator of a business contract, bringing together more than just two individuals, but often whole families or dynasties.[72] With the evolution of the love

marriage, a matchmaking intermediary came to facilitate a "love match," rather than a relatively straightforward economic one. While some argue that matchmaking is now outdated and often linked to the notion of denying individuals the free choice over their marriage partners[73], market intermediaries still play an important role in facilitating modern, love-based marriages. In fact, along with the increasing economic independence of women and the transformation of marriage in the 1970s, there was a great expansion in matchmaking services in the US:[74] Social introductory services, a form of commercialized matchmaking, increased dramatically in the years 1979 to 1991 and single ads and matchmaking television shows gained social acceptability in US-American society.[75]

This expansion can be explained by two factors: firstly, the decision to marry was no longer purely driven by economic necessity, replaced by the expectation of "emotional and intellectual gratification"[76] in a relationship. Singles therefore exhibited greater selectivity in their search for a partner and for that reason requested the services of marriage intermediaries for finding the perfect match.[77] At the same time, the average marrying age increased; individuals looking for a partner were often past their college years and therefore restricted by work demands or travel.[78] This led to a decrease in dating opportunities and the need for intermediaries who offer access to a greater pool of eligible partners.[79] Thus, marriage intermediaries were still needed to perform the market functions of searching (finding eligible others) and matching (acquiring information about potential partners in order to determine compatibility). However, new forms of marriage intermediaries have evolved in the late 20th century, aided by technological advances such as the telephone, the video medium, and the internet. Single ads, for instance, in which individuals introduce themselves as eligible singles in a newspaper advertisement, increased dramatically in the late 1970s and became a regular part of most major newspapers.[80] Social introductory services capitalized on video technology to further their matchmaking techniques.[81] After answering questions about themselves on tape, singles would send the video to a group of other clients, preselected based on written profiles and pictures.[82] If two individuals who had seen the videos of one another both agreed to meet, they would be given each other's phone number.[83]

Research on this form of video dating reveals that the videos used to introduce singles allowed clients to obtain a more accurate, authentic picture of the other than through a written profile or pictures.[84] This might be explained by the fact that relationship success depends in great parts on the quality of interaction,[85] which might be better estimated by seeing the other person communicate their ideas and answering questions about themselves. Video technology thereby facilitates a higher quality of matching. However, since social introductory services offered access to a great amount of information on eligible singles, this often led to less elaborate decision-making strategies, which studies show can reduce the quality of the decision. For example, Lenton et al. (2008) find that when presented with a larger number of potential dates, individuals were more susceptible to memory errors when they were asked to recall information they had been given about the dates. Yang and Chiou (2011) found that larger choice sets of potential dates frequently lead to decisions that align less with individual's stated preferences than smaller choice sets.[86] This can potentially decrease the quality of matchmaking through video dating.

Apart from these new forms of marriage intermediaries, the tradition of human matchmakers continues into the 21st century.[87] Such matchmakers are often professionalized and sought by the singles themselves rather than by their parents.[88] Clients of such matchmakers report that a central motive for them to use human matchmakers is relationship counseling:[89], with modern intermediaries expanding their services accordingly to offer emotional support, reassurance or dating tips.[90]

IV) Online Dating and Computer-Based Matching

With the proliferation of computers and the Internet, new forms of marriage and dating market intermediaries have emerged. Most prominently, a vast number of commercial online dating websites, such as Match, eHarmony, and OkCupid, now assist a great number of eligible individuals in their search

for a partner.[92] In the United States, 15% of adults stated to have used online dating, with the number of users likely to increase.[93] Moreover, apps such as Tinder or Grindr, which give information about singles in the vicinity, are widely used to bring people together.[94] Such matchmaking intermediaries typically perform two or all three market functions of formal marriage intermediaries. Firstly, they provide users access to a large pool of potential romantic partners[95] thereby increasing the likelihood of finding a match (searching). Secondly, online dating platforms offer different forms of computer-mediated communication (CMC) through which users can interact with potential partners before meeting them face-to-face (interaction, searching).[96] Thirdly, dating websites offer computer-based matching, i.e. the use of a "mathematical algorithm to select potential partners for users"[97] (matching).

How do computer-based marriage intermediaries change the matchmaking process and romantic outcomes? With respect to searching, online dating platforms have the potential to connect its users to two billion people, providing access to an unprecedentedly large pool of potential partners.[98] This increases the likelihood of finding a partner and reduces search costs, especially for those who are constrained by work demands. However, the large pool of potential partners can also lead to worse decision-making and choice overload, "in which individuals avoid making any decision,"[99] decreasing the user's readiness to commit to one of the potential partners in the online pool.[100] Moreover, several studies show that a larger choice set in dating partners leads to less cognitively demanding, and thus less elaborate, comparison and decision strategies, which potentially decreases the quality of mating decisions.[101] Some online dating intermediaries therefore deliberately limit the number of singles that users have access to. The dating app "Once", for example, recommends only one match per day.[102] Moreover, some online dating websites limit the choice set by giving access to specific subpopulations, such as a certain age group (e.g. SeniorPeopleMeet), religious background (e.g. JDate), education (e.g. HarvardSingles), or specific hobbies (e.g. Vampire-Lovers).[103]

Computer-mediated communication can also decrease search cost and expedite the connection process as it allows users to evaluate the compatibility with other users before meeting face-to-face.[104] However, attractiveness and long-term compatibility cannot be determined purely by CMC.

Concerning the quality of the matches generated by mathematical algorithms, evidence suggests that they can be of limited value when looking at long-term relationship success. Most matching algorithms are based on personality variables of users, e.g. their interest, hobbies, cultural beliefs.[105] In the case of eHarmony, which claims to use a "science-based" matching system,[106] the user takes a 436-question personality survey to match him or her with other users.[107] However, such compatibility matching is limited for two reasons: Firstly, it relies on self-reported data, which is problematic when users portray a distorted image of themselves, either intentionally to increase the likelihood of an attractive match or unintentionally.[108] Secondly, personality variables do not necessarily predict long-term relationship success. A study by Dyrenforth et al. (2010) examined a large sample of married couples in the UK, Australia, and Germany and found that each partner's personality accounted for 6% of the variance in relationship satisfaction and for about 1% to 3% of the variance in their partner's relationship satisfaction.[109] Moreover, they found that partner similarity only accounts for 0.5% of relationship satisfaction.[110] Therefore the success of matching algorithms based on personality variables is limited when searching for a compatible, long-term love match.[111] In fact, it is difficult to predict long-term compatibility of two partners without having data on their face-to-face interaction. This is because relationship satisfaction and longevity is explained in great part by the quality of interaction between partners—i.e. how a couple communicates and resolves conflicts, how partners support each other and how they interpret each other's behavior.[112] Furthermore, how a relationship develops is highly dependent on circumstances surrounding the couple, such as their social and family network, and further exacerbated by external stressors such as a job loss or sudden illness.[113] While algorithms could measure some of these factors, e.g. a person's financial background, future external influences cannot be predicted in advance.[114]

Due to the limits of personality variables in predicting relationship success and the problem of inaccurate, self-reported data, new matching algorithms have evolved. Kang Zhao from the University of Iowa has suggested using a collaborative filtering method for online dating, not unlike the techniques used by Amazon or Netflix.[115] Collaborative filtering works by collecting data on the behavior of users, i.e. who they write to and the responses they receive, and based on this data generates sets of similar users.[116] Similarity is assessed with respect to *taste*, grouping together users who write the same individuals as having similar tastes, and *attractiveness*, grouping together users who receive messages from the same individuals as being similarly attractive.[117] The algorithm then recommends matches without having to rely on potentially inaccurate self-reported data, similar to Amazon recommending books that similar users bought.[118] Research on the collaborative filtering method in online dating suggests that it outperforms many of the algorithms currently used by online dating websites.[119] Further research on collaborative filtering and its implementation appears a promising next step toward improving the quality of intermediaries in matchmaking cyberspace.

Conclusion

I have outlined the history of marriage intermediaries from the pre-modern times of traditional marriage to the emergence of the love marriage and online-dating era in the 21st century. I have argued that the role of marriage intermediaries varied depending on the purpose of marriage in that specific time. For most of its history, marriage was a business arrangement to bolster fortunes or political power, and a matchmaker's primary function was therefore to facilitate such business arrangements. For that reason, intermediaries needed to possess information on eligible households and represent the parties involved in the transaction (e.g. by having access to eligible households), and often held positions of prestige in the community. When marriage modernized to become a loving, companionate relationship, matchmaking became an enterprise more focused on the needs and personal preferences of the individuals themselves. Matchmaking intermediaries therefore needed a psychological understanding of their clients in order to identify which partners make a good match. With technological advances such as print advertisements, video technology, and the internet, new matchmaking intermediaries developed. Online dating websites are particularly prevalent in the world of modern dating. They offer access to an unprecedentedly large number of potential partners and therefore dramatically decrease search costs. Their matchmaking algorithms, however, are only of limited value.

References:

Adelman, A.C. & Ahuvia, M.B. (1991): "Mediated channels for mate seeking: A solution to involuntary singlehood?", in: *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, No. 8, pp. 273–289.

Adelman, A.C. & Ahuvia, M.B (1992): "Formal intermediaries in the marriage market: A typology and review", in: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, No. 54, pp. 452–463.

Brown, J.S. & Hagel, J. (2013): "The Power of the Business Matchmaker", in: *Fortune* http://fortune.com/2013/01/03/the-power-of-the-business-matchmaker/ (visited on 06/20/2016).

Brozovsky, L. & Petricek, V. (2010): "Recommender System for Online Dating Service", https://www.researchgate.net/publication/1960858_Recommender_System_for_Online_Dating_Service (visited on 06/20/2016).

Britannica.com (2012): "The Minangkabau People",
http://www.britannica.com/topic/Minangkabau (visited on 06/20/2016).

Coontz, S. (2008): "The Future of Marriage", in: *Cato Unbound – A Journal of Debate*,
http://www.cato-unbound.org/2008/01/14/stephanie-coontz/future-marriage (visited on
06/20/2016).

Dyrenforth, P. S., Kashy, D. A., Donellan, M. B., & Lucas, R. E. (2010): "Predicting
relationship and life satisfaction from personality in nationally representative samples from three
countries: the relative importance of actor, partner, and similarity effects", in: *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology*, No. 99, pp. 690–702.

Engel, B., A. (2008): "Marriage Brokers", in: *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World
History*,http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195148909.001.0001/acref-
9780195148909-e-657?rskey=meYHaQ&result=651 (visited on 06/20/2016).

Fincher, L.H. (2012): "China's 'Leftover' Women", in: *The New York Times*
http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/12/opinion/global/chinas-leftover-women.html (visited on
06/20/2016).

Finkel, E. J, Eastwick, P.W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T. & Sprecher, S. (2012): "Online Dating:
A Critical Analysis From the Perspective of Psychological Science", in: *Psychological Science in
the Public Interest*, No. 13, pp. 3–66.

Gottlieb, L. (2006): "How do I love thee?", in: *The Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 58-70,
http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2006/03/how-do-i-love-thee/304602/ (visited on
06/20/2016).

Junus, (1968): "Some Remarks on Minangkabau Social Structure" in: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-,
Land- en Volkenkunde*, Leiden, No.120, pp. 293-326.

Lee, K. C. (1999): *A Fragile Nation: The Indonesian Crisis*, Singapore: World Scientific.

Monger, G. P. (2004): *Marriage Customs of the World: An Encyclopedia of Dating Customs and
Wedding Traditions*, Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

McGrane, S. (2015): "A Matchmaker and A Festival Keep An Irish Tradition Alive", in: The New
York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/04/world/europe/a-matchmaker-and-a-festival-
keep-an-irish-tradition-alive.html (visited on 06/20/2016).

Rubens, P. (2014): "Is big data dating the key to long-lasting romance?", in: *BBC News*,
http://www.bbc.com/news/business-26613909 (visited on 06/20/2016).

Warner, D. (2010): „Shanghai's marriage market: Bridal bliss or marital mayhem?", in: *CNN
Travel,* http://travel.cnn.com/shanghai/play/sausage-fest-2020-future-shanghai-marriage-market-
086672/ (visited on 06/20/2016).

Yu, K. (2015): "China's 'Leftover' Women", in: *Aljazeera*,
http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2015/10/china-leftover-women-151029141452444.html
(visited on 06/20/2016).

www.china.org (2009): "Preserving matrilineal traditions"
http://www.china.org.cn/china/features/content_17936990.htm (visited on 06/20/2016).

www.pewinternet.org (2016): "15% of American Adults Have Used Online Dating Sites or Mobile Dating Apps"
http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/02/11/15-percent-of-american-adults-have-used-online-dating-sites-or-mobile-dating-apps/ (visited on 08/19/2016)

www.metrolyrics.com (2016): "Matchmaker, Matchmaker"
http://www.metrolyrics.com/matchmaker-lyrics-fiddler-on-the-roof.html. (visited on 06/20/2016).

www.mosuoproject.org (2006): "Matriarchal/Matrilineal Culture"
http://www.mosuoproject.org/matri.htm, (visited on 06/20/2016).

---

[1] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 454.
[2] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 454.
[3] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 454.
[4] Cf. Brown/Hagel 2013.
[5] Cf. Brown/Hagel 2013.
[6] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012
[7] Cf. Engel 2008.
[8] Cf. Engel 2008.
[9] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[10] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[11] Engel 2008.
[12] http://www.metrolyrics.com/matchmaker-lyrics-fiddler-on-the-roof.html.
[13] Cf. Engel 2008.
[14] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192.
[15] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192
[16] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192
[17] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192.
[18] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192.
[19] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192.
[20] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192.
[21] http://www.metrolyrics.com/matchmaker-lyrics-fiddler-on-the-roof.html.
[22] Cf. Freeze 2002.
[23] Cf. McGrain 2015.
[24] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 192f.
[25] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 193.
[26] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 193.
[27] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 193.
[28] Cf. McGrain 2015.
[29] Cf. McGrain 2015.
[30] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[31] Cf. Engel 2008.

[32] Cf. Engel 2008.
[33] Cf. Engel 2008.
[34] Cf. Engel 2008.
[35] Cf. Engel 2008.
[36] Cf. Engel 2008.
[37] Cf. Engel 2008.
[38] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[39] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[40] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[41] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[42] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[43] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 111.
[44] Cf. Engel 2008.
[45] Cf. Engel 2008.
[46] Cf. Engel 2008.
[47] Cf. Engel 2008.
[48] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 65.
[49] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 65.
[50] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 65.
[51] Cf. Monger 2004: p. 65.
[52] Cf. Warner 2010.
[53] Cf. Warner 2010.
[54] Cf. Fincher 2012.
[55] Cf. Fincher 2012.
[56] Cf. Yu 2015.
[57] Cf. Britannica.com 2012.
[58] Cf. Monger 2007: p. 470.
[59] Cf. Monger 2007: p. 470.
[60] Cf. Choy 1999: p. 261.
[61] Cf. Choy 1999: p. 261.
[62] Cf. Junus 1964: p. 312.
[63] Cf. www.mosuoproject.org
[64] Cf. www.mosuoproject.org
[65] Cf. www.mosuoproject.org
[66] Cf. www.mosuoproject.org
[67] Cf. China.org
[68] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[69] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[70] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[71] Coontz 2008.
[72] Cf. Coontz 2008.
[73] Cf. Engel 2008.
[74] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.
[75] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.
[76] Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.
[77] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.

[78] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.

[79] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.

[80] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 453.

[81] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 457.

[82] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 457.

[83] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 457.

[84] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 457.

[85] Cf. Dyrenforth 2010: p. 1.

[86] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 457.

[87] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 458.

[88] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 458.

[89] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelmann 1992: p. 459.

[90] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelman 1992: p. 458.

[91] Cf. Ahuvia/Adelmann 1992: p. 459.

[92] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 8.

[93] Cf. pewinternet.org

[94] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 8.

[95] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 6.

[96] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 6.

[97] Finkel et al. 2012: p. 6.

[98] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 4.

[99] Finkel et al. 2012: p. 32.

[100] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 3.

[101] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 33.

[102] Cf. www.getonce.com

[103] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 11.

[104] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 3.

[105] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 3.

[106] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 11.

[107] Cf. Gottlieb 2006.

[108] Cf. Rubens 2014.

[109] Cf. Dyrenforth 2010: p. 1.

[110] Cf. Dyrenforth 2010: p. 1.

[111] Yet, there is strong evidence suggesting that some personal characteristics, such as neuroticism, correlate negatively with relationship success. Matching algorithms could therefore function as a screening service for such characteristics.

[112] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 41.

[113] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 41f.

[114] Cf. Finkel et al. 2012: p. 41.

[115] Cf. Rubens 2014.

[116] Cf. Rubens 2014.

[117] Cf. Rubens 2014.

[118] Cf. Rubens 2014.

[119] Cf. Brozovsky/Petricek 2010: p. 1.