

LOOKING THROUGH ROSE COLORED GLASSES:  
THE MEDIA'S INFLUENCE ON PERCEPTIONS OF ROMANCE AND MARRIAGE

by

BRIANNE NICOLE STRAUB  
B.S. University of Florida, 2004

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
in the Nicholson School of Communications  
in the College of Arts and Sciences  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term  
2006

© 2006 Brianne Nicole Straub

## **ABSTRACT**

This study examined the relationship between different media and expectations about romantic relationships and marriage. Participants were asked to complete a survey that measured different romantic constructs and the types of media exposures on a daily and weekly basis. The variables were measured to determine the effect the media play in a person's perceptions on romantic relationships and marriage. The results of the study concluded that although general television viewing does not predict perceptions about romance and marriage, the romantic genre of television programs as well as magazines do have a role in predicting romantic perceptions.

For Mom, Dad, Jeff, Ricky and Joe.

Thank you for your support and love; I would not have been able to finish without it. A special thanks to my parents for everything you have provided me for the past 24 years. Mom and Dad, you have guided me to success, both academically and professionally, and I appreciate all the pushes and shoves along the way. Without you both, I would have been lost.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Special thanks to my advisor and mentor, Dr. Steven Collins, for his commitment and encouragement of this project, which would not have been the same without his support and suggestions of improvement. Also I would like to thank the person who has stressed with me, cried with me, worked with me and been “tortured” with me throughout the past year and half. Heather, it wouldn’t have been the same without you. Thanks for the friendship and the shoulder.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Television Content .....	7
Magazine Content .....	11
Theories of Love .....	13
The Meaning of Love.....	15
Theoretical Linkage .....	20
Cultivation Theory .....	20
Genre-Specific Cultivation Effects .....	28
Social Cognitive Theory .....	31
Hypotheses .....	39
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....	42
Procedures.....	42
Measures .....	42
Hypothesis 1.....	44
Hypothesis 2.....	45
Hypothesis 3.....	45
Hypothesis 4.....	47
Hypothesis 5.....	47
Hypothesis 6.....	48

Hypothesis 7.....	48
Hypothesis 8 and 9.....	49
Hypothesis 10 and 11.....	51
Hypothesis 12.....	51
Hypothesis 13.....	52
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	53
Hypothesis 1.....	56
Hypothesis 2.....	56
Hypothesis 3.....	57
Television Perception Scale and Cultivation Effects.....	57
Hypothesis 4.....	58
Hypothesis 5.....	58
Hypothesis 6.....	60
Hypothesis 7.....	60
Television Perception Scale and Genre-Specific Cultivation Effects.....	61
Hypothesis 8.....	61
Hypothesis 9.....	61
Hypothesis 10.....	62
Hypothesis 11.....	62
Hypothesis 12.....	63
Hypothesis 13.....	64
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION.....	116
Cultivation Results.....	116

Genre-Specific Cultivation Results.....	118
Social Cognitive Theory Results .....	120
Limitations .....	122
Implications.....	123
Future Research .....	124
APPENDIX A: SURVEY.....	127
APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL .....	143
REFERENCES .....	146



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Percentages of demographic data. ....	67
Table 2: Percentages of demographic data related to romance.....	68
Table 3: Mean and standard deviation for age.....	69
Table 4: Means and standard deviation for romance variables.....	70
Table 5: Percentages for questions from the Intimacy Scale.....	71
Table 6: Percentages for questions from the Fantasy Scale.....	72
Table 7: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale. ....	73
Table 8: Percentages for questions from the Romantic Love Scale. ....	74
Table 9: Percentages for questions from the Eros Love Style Scale. ....	75
Table 10: Percentages for the Ideal Martial Scale. ....	76
Table 11: Percentages for the Romantic Love Scale. ....	76
Table 12: Percentages for questions from the Intimacy Scale by gender. ....	77
Table 13: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale for male participants. ....	78
Table 14: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale for female participants. ....	79
Table 15: Percentages for questions from the Romantic Love Scale by gender. ....	80
Table 16: Percentages for questions from the Eros Love Style Scale by gender. ....	81
Table 17: Means and standard deviations for television variables. ....	82
Table 18: Television Cultivation Measures.....	83
Table 19: Television Cultivation Measures for Males.....	84
Table 20: Television Cultivation Measures for Females.....	85
Table 21: Percentages of watched television programs.....	86
Table 22: Magazine Readership.....	87

Table 23: Means, standard deviations and alphas for collaborative scales.....	88
Table 24: Independent t-tests for intimacy scale variables by respondents' level of television viewing.....	89
Table 25: Independent t-tests for marriage variables by respondents' level of television viewing. ....	90
Table 26: Independent t-tests for Eros Love Style questions and Television Perception Scale based on overall television viewing.....	91
Table 27: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index. ....	92
Table 28: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of reality television viewing.....	93
Table 29: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of soap opera television viewing. ....	94
Table 30: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of prime-time television viewing. ....	95
Table 31: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of sitcom television viewing.....	96
Table 32: Independent t-tests for media variables by respondents' gender.....	97
Table 33: Independent t-tests for romance and marriage variables by respondents' gender.....	98
Table 34: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of overall television viewing. ....	99
Table 35: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index. ....	100

Table 36: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of reality television viewing. ....	101
Table 37: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of soap opera television viewing. ....	102
Table 38: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of sitcom television viewing. ....	103
Table 39: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of overall television viewing. ....	104
Table 40: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index. ....	105
Table 41: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of reality television viewing. ....	106
Table 42: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of soap opera television viewing. ....	107
Table 43: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of sitcom television viewing. ....	108
Table 44: Independent t-tests for television variables by respondents' current love status. ....	109
Table 45: Independent t-tests for romance and marriage variables by respondents' current love status. ....	110
Table 46: Pearson correlation coefficients for female's who read both male and female orientated magazines with the romance and marriage variables. ....	111
Table 47: Pearson correlation coefficients for male's who read both male and female orientated magazines with the romance and marriage variables. ....	112

Table 48: Pearson correlation coefficients for television viewing variables and romance variables..... 113

Table 49: Pearson correlation coefficients for female’s television viewing and romance variables.  
..... 114

Table 50: Pearson correlation coefficients for male’s television viewing and romance variables.  
..... 115

## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

One of the most common activities in the home is watching television, and this plays a crucial role in shaping American culture (Straubhaar & LaRose, 1999). For those who lack personal experience, television becomes the model for behavior (DeFleur & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). Therefore, it is no wonder that the American population views marriage according to how the media present it in the movies, on television or in a magazine. The mass media tend to romanticize marriage through visions of falling deeply in love, emotional happiness and lavish romantic settings. Americans view romantic love as the only condition in the establishment and maintenance of a marriage (Rosenblatt, 1974); however, actually falling in love is only part of a marriage. Without understanding the institution of marriage as a whole, the marriage could fail due to becoming overwhelmed and stressed (Bachen & Illouz, 1996; Illouz, 1997). Falling in love is a magical experience; however, the mass media do not realistically portray the effects of what happens once the honeymoon is over. Marriage, at times, is hard work and a struggle. It requires two people to work together to overcome obstacles; however, the media as a whole do not portray it this way, rather it shows marriage and love as a fairytale.

Through several outlets, the media have forged an unbreakable connection between love and marriage. Given the increase in divorce, this connection must be examined further to see if the media continue to foster this relationship. It has been long suggested by music legend Frank Sinatra that “love and marriage go together like a horse and carriage.” Even further back in history in the 1930s, 95 out of 100 movies used romance as one of its main plot lines (Illouz, 1997). Films, advertisements and television create a visual component of how romance could be

achieved in a relationship between two people. According to Berscheid and Walster (1978), the only expected and approved precondition to marriage in American society is falling in love.

The mass media romanticizes marriage and romance through several outlets, including television and magazines. This romanticized view of marriage may be one explanation for the high divorce rates in society because it leads to idealistic expectations. “One of the most insidious factors undermining marital satisfaction and longevity is that individuals enter into marriage with unrealistic, idealistic, and romanticized notions about marriage (Demo & Ganong, 1994, p. 199). In 2003, the divorce rate in the United States grew to half the marriage rate (National Center for Health Statistics, 2003). If a couple enters into a marriage with unrealistic perceptions and expectations, it more than likely will harm their chances for developing a long-term and satisfying relationship (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981).

Divorce has become a common practice in American society. In 1966, the only ground for divorce was adultery (Rosenberg, 2004). Currently the list of acceptable reasons for divorce include: cruel and inhuman treatment, abandonment, confinement to prison for three or more consecutive years, conversion of a legal separation, and absence for five successive years (Rosenberg, 2004). However, an even more common reason for divorce is the no-fault clause, which states that married couples do not have to prove who was at fault for breaking the marriage (Rosenberg, 2004). In a little more than 40 years, grounds for divorce can now be granted without explaining what went wrong. When a couple is granted a no-fault divorce, they are simply saying they failed without acknowledging what caused the failure in the marriage. To be honest, there is not one isolated cause for the increased divorce rates in American society; nonetheless, one of the contributing factors is unrealistic perceptions and expectations of marriage (Larson, 1988), which is conveyed through the media.

One example of the effects unrealistic perceptions of romance and marriage has on television can be seen in the aftermath of the reality television show *The Bachelorette*, which is a show centered on love at first sight and romance that leads to marriage. The television show sends its participants on lavish dream dates filled with fantasy and romantic get-a-ways that are rarely seen in the average person's life, mostly due to the cost of these types of dates (Edwards, 2005; Heldenfels, 2005). However in February 2005, during the third installment of ABC's *The Bachelorette*, the show ended without a fairytale and an extremely upset audience. Bachelorette Jen Schefft was brutally criticized in the media for going onto the reality television show and not finding the love of her life in the allotted six-week timeframe the show is filmed (Edwards, 2005; Heldenfels, 2005). Several people sent Schefft nasty messages to her personal e-mail because of her decision not to marry one of the participants (Heldenfels, 2005). Other viewers of the show flooded the online message boards with notes criticizing Schefft and the show (Calgary Herald and Herald News Services, 2005). One viewer wrote, "I will not be watching the *Bachelor* or *Bachelorette* again after last night's ending. Thanks for ruining it for me." While another viewer wrote, "I think the best thing is that [the men] don't have a spoiled rotten woman in their lives who doesn't know what she wants. I will never watch the show again" (Calgary Herald and Herald News Services, 2005). Viewers expected the show to end with a fairytale, even on reality television. One woman stepped out of the fairytale box, suggesting falling in love is not easy, and the *Bachelorette* audience hated her for it. The ending of this show indicates that Americans expect to see love and happiness, they do not expect to see the turmoil and work that it takes to get married (Calgary Herald and Herald News Services, 2005; Edwards, 2005; Heldenfels, 2005).

Another example can be seen in the HBO series, *Sex and the City*. At first, the show's theme portray four single women dating men in New York City, but looking at the undertones and goals of the women on the show, it is really about four single women in New York City looking for marriageable men (Duncan, 2003). The women of *Sex and the City* continually compare men to unrealistic standards, but are certain they will find the man of their dreams. However, during the series finale of the show, the women each find him with relative ease alluding to the fact that the women will live happily ever after now (Duncan, 2003).

The roots of divorce and obsession with sexuality are developments of more modern eras (Hartman, 2004). During the nineteenth century, love was viewed as being associated with tragedy rather than happiness (Illouz, 1997). However, as the twentieth century approached, "love began to be represented not only as a value in itself but as an important motive in the pursuit of happiness" (Illouz, 1997, p. 30). The question becomes then, what changed between the nineteenth and twentieth century that turned love from an evil to a source of happiness. Illouz (1997) suggests it was the new forms of technology and media that created the changes. New technology provides a mean to reach the masses, which allowed the media to provide a new theme for life – if you are in love, you will be happy.

Currently television suggests women need to have a man to be happy and if they don't, they should be looking for one. Currently in many women's magazines, one of the top themes is 'how to find a man'. However, rarely is advice given on television or in magazines on how to maintain a lasting relationship or marriage (Duncan, 2003; Schlenker, Caron & Halteman, 1998; Willemsen, 1998; Peirce, 1990). Several social critics and relationship therapists have charged the media with brainwashing consumers with impossible and unhealthy romantic love goals,



which contribute to the unrealistic expectations within relationships and marriages (Norwood, 1985; Katz & Liu, 1988). According to Katz and Liu (1988, p. 329),

A large part of the problem is the glorification of false love through the media, which hold out insubstantial but glamorous relations as a never ending lure...The relationships portrayed by the media are a symbol of status rather than of emotional health or personal well-being.

According to George Gerbner and other cultivation theorist, the media cultivate unrealistic portrayals of the real world (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner& Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). Gerbner studied the effects television has on perceptions of violence in the real world. Cultivation theorists argue that the more you watch television the more likely you will perceive the real world in a false manner. Another way to identify how media impact behaviors is by looking at Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1973; 1978; 2001). Social cognitive theory suggests an individual can learn behaviors through observations.

This study attempts to examine college students' perceptions of love and romance and its effects within a marriage. It examines the level that fantasy plays in the romantic relationships of college students and if women who watch specific types of television programs fall into a romantic pattern not associated with reality. It also examines if reading magazines, both traditional male and female magazines, have an effect on participants' perceptions of romance and marriage.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

According to DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1989), the American population looks to the television as a model of behavior when they lack personal experiences or access to other options of information.

The media are a readily available and attractive source of models. They provide a symbolic meaning of almost every conceivable form of behavior. A rich literature has shown that both children and adults acquire attitudes, emotional responses, and new styles of conduct from all the media, and especially from films and television (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1989, p. 216).

The same average American who looks to the television for experiences watches approximately three hours of television per day (Straubhaar & LaRose, 1999), which places television into a crucial role in shaping society. When looking how television could shape society, Hendriks (2002) provides an example of a young girl's experiences with television. The young girl may regularly watch her favorite television character excessively diet to lose weight. When the character finally loses the weight, she is rewarded with compliments of beauty. The young girl may now want to emulate the behavior to also be positively reinforced, and thus entering a dang

Romance on television has increased throughout the past century (Illouz, 1997). During the early twentieth century, the *Guide to Periodical Literature* had fewer than 10 references to articles that dealt with romance and love; however, the theme of love in the guide has more than tripled throughout the later part of the twentieth century (Illouz, 1997). According to Jeffres (1997), the less a person knows about an issue the more likely they will turn to the media for interpretation of the issue; therefore, because teens tend to find it difficult to talk to authoritative figures, they use the media to understand and interpret issues about sex, romance and love in

their own lives (Illouz, 1997). Young people stated they only turned to their mother one-third of the time and their father about 17% of the time to learn and discuss romantic love in their own lives (Illouz, 1997).

### **Television Content**

Today television is consumed with unrealistic plots on soap operas and prime-time television situational comedies (Fitzpatrick, 1991). Romantic visual cues found in television have been found to form the foundation for an adolescent's model of romance (Bachen & Illouz, 1996). And the media favor stereotypical themes about appearance and relationships conveying to woman that their life should be centered on a marriage and men's life should be centered on a career (Signorelli, 1997). Through its many messages, television provides a visual cue of how romance can be achieved in a romantic relationship and a marriage.

A six-month content analysis on the perceptions of marriage on television discovered that there was no "marital dialogue between husbands and wives, but [merely] dialogue about marriage and family life" (Fitzpatrick, 1991, p. 216-217). This suggests the portrayals of relationships in the media have become reactions about marriage and family, not the intimate details that shape a marriage or family from the couple itself (Fitzpatrick, 1991). The media focus on the idea of marriage, but not an actual marriage, which could be a reason why many people, ranging in age from children to adults, perceive romance and marriage falsely. Fitzpatrick's research provides evidence that the media only show part of the story regarding romance and love, allowing for people to see love and romance through a false prism (Fitzpatrick, 1991).

Television not only shows love and romance in an unrealistic manner, but it also shows television's youth in an unrealistic manner, suggesting adolescents and teens can solve their own problems about romantic situations without adult help (Heintz-Knowles, 2000). Several prime-time entertainment series episodes were examined for its representation of youth characters, including *Beverly Hills 90210*, *Dawson's Creek*, *Felicity*, *Party of Five*, *Popular* and *That 70's Show*. Within the television shows, Heintz-Knowles identified 163 youth characters as playing either a primary or secondary role. The study identified *youth characters* as ages between 13 and 21. The researcher suggests that youth characters on television tend to portray problems and solution in ways that are not representative of the current demographics of the United States youth population (Heintz-Knowles, 2000). TV youth are more likely to be in situations that deal with romantic relationships, friendship and popularity, and family issues. Interpersonal relationship was the primary problem that influenced the majority of the youth television characters. Also, with television shows that have a predominantly youth cast, the adolescents will more often than not attempt to solve their problems related to romantic relationships without adult help (Heintz-Knowles, 2000).

erous path of eating disorders (Hendriks, 2002).

The visual cues that are seen on television burn the concept of how romance can be achieved in a person's mind. Ranging in ages from 8 to 17, 183 participants were interviewed to understand what was considered romantic (Bachen & Illouz, 1996). Younger audiences tend to convey romance and love through clear romantic behaviors such as hugging and kissing or through a scene digressed from daily life, such as elegant dinners and walks at sunset on the beach (Bachen & Illouz, 1996). The researchers concluded that romantic visual cues found in television form the foundation for an adolescent's model of romance. However, the actual details

of a romantic relationship and the continued work and effort of the relationship are often not effectively portrayed within television relationships (Fitzpatrick, 1991).

Social situations on television still contain many stereotypes that cause viewers to have an unrealistic perception of the real world (Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001). On television, more women than men are classified as being married or formerly married (Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001). The study also found that “married women are still portrayed with reduced options, for they can rarely successfully combine marriage and employment – married women are still less likely to work outside the home than single or formerly married women” (Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001, p. 20). The results of this type of stereotypical images presented on television could lead to consequences during the socialization process of children, adolescents and heavy television viewers (Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001).

A six-month content analysis of television talk shows that included Oprah Winfrey, Ricki Lake, Jenny Jones, Maury Povich, Montel Williams and Jerry Springer, discovered that personal relationships (friendships, acquaintances, co-worker and romantic relationships) portrayed romantic relationships neutrally 45% of the time, negatively 51% of the time and positively a mere 4% of the time (Smith et al., 1999). The researchers did a content analysis of the programming, but never compared it to any form of actual perceptions or behaviors of individuals who watch talk shows. However, the researchers did mention that “research needs to be done to determine if, in fact, exposure to television, and particularly talk shows, does cause distortion of reality...[because] personal relationships and personality traits appear frequently and tend to be portrayed in a negative manner on talk shows” (Smith et al., 1999, p. 185).

In an ethnographic analysis between soap operas in America and Great Britain, the researchers describe American soap operas as a “never ending game of romantic musical chairs”

(Liebes & Livingstone, 1994, p. 725). The researchers chose an ethnographic approach to analyzing the content of soap operas to ensure that the cultures would be accurately portrayed with all the cultural aspects intact when analyzing the content. The researchers concluded that American soap operas promote individualism and romance among middle and upper class members of society. With American soap operas being centered around middle and upper class characters, work is not necessary, which leaves additional time for the characters to focus on romantic relationship situations. Also, American soap operas do not socialize male characters to be nurturing, yet mothers disappear to pursue romance instead of raising their daughters. British soap operas, however, promote motherhood and the mother/daughter relationship as a central part of the plot (Liebes & Livingstone, 1994).

Another important implication of the media is that adolescents, especially young girls, are receiving consistent messages from various outlets that influence their futures (Signorelli, 1997). A content analysis of six mass media outlets provides evidence that the messages have crossed over from television into movies and magazines. The analysis of television, movies, music videos, magazines, advertisements and commercials suggests the media in each outlet play a dual role. First the media provide positive role models of “independent women who rely on themselves to solve their own problems” (Signorelli, 1997, p. 5). However, the media favored stereotypical themes about appearance and relationships. Across all media, women are portrayed in this manner 26% to 46% of time – compared to men, who are only portrayed as ‘thin’ or ‘very thin’ 4% to 16% of the time. Also women’s lives are portrayed in the context of relationships while men’s lives are portrayed in the context of careers (Signorelli, 1997). Men more were likely in television and movies to be portrayed as having either a professional or blue-collar job (46% television and 40% movies) compared to women (30% television and 27% movies). Also,

women were more likely to follow a path that led to a romantic relationship and men were most likely to follow a path that led to a successful career (Signorelli, 1997).

## **Magazine Content**

Television content is not the only mass media outlet that constructs social perceptions and attitudes. Another prime media source that shapes perceptions and attitudes of adolescents and adults are magazines; however, more traditional women's magazines have been analyzed than men's magazines (Schlenker, Caron & Halteman, 1998; Willemsen, 1998; Peirce, 1990). Pierce (1993) argued girls use magazines to understand the love "script," which is a script that girls feel they should follow and tends to be influenced by magazines.

One of the most prominent teenage girl's magazines is *Seventeen*, which is described as a young woman's first fashion and beauty magazine (Schlenker et al., 1998). The researchers conducted a content analysis to determine if the articles presented within the magazine changed in response to the feminist movement beginning in the 1940s (Schlenker et al., 1998). Twelve issues (January to December) were analyzed in 1945, 1955, 1965, 1975, 1985 and 1995. In accord with a previous study conducted by Pierce (1990), the researchers looked for messages that stress the important of finding a man, looking attractive to men, dating behaviors, and sex and relationship problems. The main category that articles were sorted into was the *Male-Female Relations* category, which included articles about relationships and love, relationship advice columns, and feature articles on male celebrities. The researchers found that in each year the percentage of content that fit into the *Male-Female Relations* category was approximately the same except for in 1975 at the height of the feminist movement – 1945 (17%), 1955 (14%), 1965 (13%), 1975 (6%), 1985 (13%), and 1995 (14%) (Schlenker et al., 1998). Articles ranged in titles

from “*Why Am I Unlucky in Love*” and “*Marriage: The men to avoid*” in the 60s and 70s to “*How to Turn a Crush into the Real Thing*” and “*What Do Boys Want*” in the 80s and 90s (Schlenker et al., 1998). Peirce (1990) argued girls go to magazines, such as *Seventeen*, for information because they will not find such narrowly tailored content for their age group anywhere else. Peirce later concluded that from the non-fiction items in magazines a girl “learns that her job is to look good, find a boyfriend, and take care of the home and hearth” (Pierce, 1993, p. 61).

Traditional female-oriented magazines tend to highlight the importance of physical beauty as it is related to finding a male companion (Signorielli, 1997). Magazine articles that discuss dating and sex appear in teenage girls’ magazines approximately 44% of the time; however, the magazines only discuss the importance of school or careers 12% of the time. Also, these magazines are more likely to send a message that a man is central to a woman’s life than about becoming successful without having a man (Signorielli, 1997). Magazine articles also emphasize the importance of a woman’s appearance. For example, 37% of the articles include a focus on appearance, 32% focus on fashion, 18% focus on makeup, and 16% focus on hairstyles, which suggests that keeping up with your appearance will help you get the man you want.

There are also examples of gender discrepancies in magazines outside of the United States. For example, a study conducted in the Netherlands compared two teenage magazines: *Yes*, a traditional teenage girl’s magazine similar to *Seventeen* or *Teen*; and *Webber*, a comparable teenage boys’ magazine (Willemsen, 1998). The researcher used the first six issues of *Webber* from April through September 1994 and the first issue of each month of *Yes* (it is a weekly magazine) during the same timeframe. *Yes* had significantly higher content that focused



on themes related to love, sex and relationships compared to *Webber* (12.7% and 6.6% respectively). *Yes* also devoted almost 40% of its pages to fashion, beauty, love and relationships, and romantic fiction; *Webber* devoted 33% of its pages to stereotypical masculine subjects, celebrities and hobbies (Willemsen, 1998). In the articles presented in each magazine, the main problems faced for teenage girls was *how can I catch a boyfriend* while the main problem for teenage boys was *how can I dump a girlfriend*, providing evidence that two completely different messages are transmitted in the magazines. Also, *Yes* used more emotional words within the content of the articles and *Webber* used more cool and tough words with long sentences and complex structures. The researcher concluded that both girls and boys are socialized into traditional gender roles through teenage magazines and if the publications continue to keep the stereotypes alive, the gender gap can only get wider (Willemsen, 1998).

As young women grow, they look to the media for ideas about who they should become (Signorelli, 1997). Without positive role models who argue academics and careers are just as important, if not more, than a romantic relationship, women may grow into a world with unrealistic perceptions of love, romance and marriage.

### **Theories of Love**

Several theories of love have emerged to explain many of the global concepts and multidimensional constructs of love. Lee's (1973) six love-styles is one of many theories designed to determine a person's feelings about love and romance. Love-styles are important to consider because each love-style can be broken down into one of six ways to define love. Love is not something that has a single definition; therefore, considering the six-love styles can help explain several different stages of love (Lee, 1973; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1998).

Love-styles cannot be defined as a preference a person is born with nor as something that remains constant throughout a lifetime; however, it can be defined as a set of ideas and preferences that accumulate over time in a particular setting or culture to assist individuals in explaining the world they live in (Lee, 1988). The many ideologies for loving are referred to as love-styles by Lee. Lee (1973, 1988) identifies six major love-styles by name: Eros (romantic, passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), Storge (friendship love), Pragma (logical, practical love), Mania (possessive, dependent love), and Agape (selfless love).

Lee (1988) began his research on love with writers and poets throughout history, such as Plato and Ovid. Through his content analysis, he found more than four thousand descriptions of some aspect of love, which he then categorized in similar groups. Lee chose words from ancient Greek and Latin to describe his love categories because he felt English could only describe it in one word – love. Once his categories were complete, he tested each of them in interviews with heterosexual and homosexual couples (Lee, 1988).

Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) found empirical evidence that Lee's (1973) theory was practical and able to be measured. After surveying undergraduate students at a large southeastern university in the United States, the researchers concluded the Love Attitude Scale was a good instrument for correlation with other scales. The research indicated that Eros highly values love and passion and can be categorized by the early attraction between two people. Also, Eros and Mania are considered to be high in emotion, Agape is average in emotion and Ludus, Storge, and Pragma are all low in emotion (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

A study conducted two years later revealed those who are currently in love tend to be more likely in the Eros, Agape and Mania love-style categories whereas those who are not currently in love tend to be in the Ludus category (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988). The study

surveyed undergraduate students in a large Southwestern university in the United States and asked about their love attitudes based on Lee's (1973) six love styles. The study suggests people in love and people not in love will differ on many love style variables (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988), but falling in love is still a socially and culturally driven emotion that will differ among individuals of different cultures, even if they are both considered to be in love. Another conclusion from the study argues people in love are more likely to reject a sexual permissive lifestyle and accept a sexual commitment to one person as being a merging of two souls into one (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988).

### **The Meaning of Love**

The meaning of love was transformed through several cultural, social and economic changes in the early 1900s with the growth of new inventions, such as the telephone, photography, film, newspapers and magazines. (Illouz, 1997). According to Illouz (1997), the transformations undergone to the meaning of love are characterized by:

...The increasing prominence of the theme of love in mass culture, especially in film and advertising; the glorification of the theme of love as a supreme value and the equation of love with happiness; [and] the association of love and consumption, more specifically, the romanticization of commodities (p. 28).

This transformation to the meaning of love created a theme that romantic love is a precursor to marriage (Bailey, 1988). During the second half of the twentieth century, romantic love continued to be seen as the essential key to marriage and to maintaining a marriage in the United States (Kephart, 1967). Burgess and Wallin (1953) observed in the 1950s that "the expected, approved, and sanctioned precondition to marriage in American society is falling in love.

According to our mores, love is the only right basis for marriage” (cited in Berscheid & Walster, 1979, p. 148).

In the 1980s, romantic love and marriage was examined by Simpson, Campbell and Berscheid (1986), who determined that love remained the only perceived reason two people should get married. A survey of undergraduate students at the University of Minnesota was administered to small groups of 10 to 20 individuals using the same questions Kephart used in his 1967 study on marriage and love with only one change – the wording, which was changed from boy and girl to man and woman. In accord with the previous study, “no matter how ideal a prospective partner might be on all other dimensions, one does not entertain the thought of marriage unless one is ‘in love’” (Simpson, Campbell & Berscheid, 1986, p. 368). Kephart’s study (1967) did not find support from men that love was a mandatory precondition to marriage, only women. Simpson et al. (1986) argues this shift in men and women’s views on marriage were heavily connected to several different social factors of the time, including women entering the work force, the reduction in pressure to get married at a young age and the increase of importance on falling in love from the mass media. Both college educated men and women felt love was the only true basis for getting married (Simpson, Campbell & Berscheid, 1986). The visual images and models of falling in love and marriage, which Simpson et al. (1986) argued has increased, continue to be displayed through mass media outlets; therefore, placed as a significant role in the cause of unrealistic perceptions and attitudes of romance, love and marriage among the American population (Bachen & Illouz, 1996; Illouz, 1997; Segrin & Nabi, 2002).

The importance of love in the establishment and maintenance of a marriage has also been looked at cross-culturally (Levine, Sato, Hashimoto and Verma, 1995). Based on Kephart’s study

(1967), college students were surveyed from secondary education centers in India, Pakistan, Thailand, Mexico, Brazil, Japan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Australia, England and the United States. Western and Westernized cultures rated love significantly higher as a prerequisite to establishing and the maintenance of a marriage than Eastern cultures. Ironically, Western cultures that rated love as the essential key to establishing a marriage came from “nations with higher economic standards of living, higher marriage rates and divorce rates, and lower fertility rates” (Levin et al., 1995, p. 554). The difference between Western and Eastern cultures suggests that although the idea of staying in love to maintain a marriage may be the most common reason to get married, it may not be the most realistic reason. The views of marriage stem from the types of culture and beliefs that exist within the society. Western cultures tend to be more individualistic, focusing on the individual’s interest and the interest of the immediate family; whereas Eastern cultures tend to be more of a collectivist society, focusing on the group’s interest and the social relationships with others (Hofstede, 1980).

If marriage continues to be based on love, then it needs to be clearly defined; however, love is an intangible feeling and has numerous definitions (Beall & Sternberg, 1995). Beall and Sternberg (1995) argue that love is a social construction that can not be experienced by all societies and cultures in the same manner. For example, in the nineteenth century, love, sex and marriage were considered to be unrelated (Archer, 1985). Sex was viewed as the tool for procreation while marriage was viewed as an institution for economic purposes. Modern cultures challenge this type of reasoning suggesting love can fix any difficulties in a relationship and love and marriage are tightly connected (Simmons et al., 1986). However, love still tends to be viewed as a multilayer construct that includes behaviors, feelings and thoughts (Beall & Sternberg, 1995). It has no one meaning because no one person can define it in the same manner.

Although it has multiple layers, love is still intangible. Sternberg (1988) attempted to define love by highlighting three essential components of love: intimacy, passion and commitment. Intimacy is defined as feeling connected to another person. Passion is defined as feeling physically attracted to another person. Commitment is defined as being committed to a romantic relationship and one's partner (Sternberg, 1988).

Beall and Sternberg (1995, p. 433) also argued "love is a social construction that reflects its time period because it serves an important function in a culture." This argument is consistent with the views offered by Illouz (1997) who suggests that the commodification of romance existed when love intersected with the market in the 1920s forcing the American culture to change, resulting in the theme of *falling in love then getting married*. According to Illouz (1997),

The 'romanticization of commodities' refers to the way in which commodities acquired a romantic aura in early twentieth-century movies and advertising imagery. The 'commodification of romance,' on the other hand, concerns the ways in which romantic practices increasingly interlocked with and became defined as the consumption of leisure goods and leisure technologies offered by the nascent mass market. The two processes took place during deep upheavals of the cultural, economic, and social spheres (p. 26).

The idea of falling in love was not a new concept in the 1920s, but the visibility of it through the mass media facilitated behaviors, such as petting, kissing and the theme of romance in public places, which were represented throughout the movies, magazines and advertisements at the time (Illouz, 1997). For example, more people would attend a movie if the word "love" was in the title or implied in the title. Also, advertisements of the time were more likely to show a couple that was well-dressed in an intimate or romantic leisure situation. Thus, the mass media showed its audiences that falling in love could lead to happiness (Illouz, 1997). The mass media did not create romance, but it did "transform the old romantic ideal into a 'visual utopia' that combined elements of the 'American dream' with romantic fantasy" (Illouz, 1997, p. 31).

Another study looked at college students beliefs in selected myths about marriage (Larson, 1988). The researcher examined 279 college undergraduate students who were never married and enrolled in marriage and family relationship courses at a Northwestern university. A questionnaire was designed to measure the romanticism and the beliefs in common marital myths, the *Marriage Quiz*, which contained true and false questions. The marital myths were gathered after reviewing literature on myths about marriage (Larson, 1988). The study found that college students as a whole responded incorrectly to almost half of the items on the *Marriage Quiz*. Also, students who considered themselves romantic were more likely to believe in myths about marriage than students classified as non-romantic. Some of the most common questions missed were about topics of marital satisfaction and its change over the life span, the relationship of cohabitation to later marital satisfaction, and the type of love that leads to marital satisfaction over the life of the marriage (Larson, 1988).

Romance and love among college students is challenged by the idea of a casual hookup. A hookup can be defined as a “sexual encounter (that may or may not involve sexual intercourse) between two people who are brief acquaintances or strangers, usually lasting only one night without the expectation of developing a relationship” (Paul & Hayes, 2002, p. 643). The study showed that 70% of participants had taken part in a hookup sometime during their college years (there were 187 participants; 155 female and 32 male) (Paul & Hayes, 2002). However, despite knowing the definition of a hookup, most of the women still suggested that a hookup was a “stepping stone to a romantic relationship” (Paul & Hayes, 2002). The expectations females had in the hookup suggested that females had hope of a long-term relationship even if it was unrealistic (Paul & Hayes, 2002).

Falling in love is a different process for different people. In the beginning of a relationship, as two people are more uncertain about each other, the Mania, dependent love attitude may be higher. Then as people fall more in love and grow more dependent on each other, the Agape, selfless love attitude may grow stronger (Lee 1973; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988). Each of these different type of attitudes suggest that people falling in love “experience a different reality from people not in love” (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988, p. 165), yet the romantic love shown on television reflects an Eros, passionate love attitude, which provides a television viewer with a skewed view of falling in love (Fitzpatrick, 1991).

### **Theoretical Linkage**

Expectations of hooking up, relationships or marriage derive from an underlying cause, which could be the media and its capability to shape relational expectations. As more and more perceptions of marriage and love are skewed, it is essential to look at the role the media play in shaping unrealistic perceptions of love, romance and marriage perceived by individuals. Media effects theories that are rooted in identifying the cause of people’s perceptions, attitudes and behaviors are: cultivation theory and social cognitive theory. Each theory is further explained to show the potential linkage between unrealistic perceptions of romance and marriage and how the media may shape those perceptions.

### ***Cultivation Theory***

The media perform a socially significant function by acting as a conveyor of American ideas and beliefs of life and culture. The media not only deliver “facts” about social reality, but they help define social ideals, and teach messages, values and definitions. Viewers who are constantly exposed to these messages may incorporate them into their perceptions and attitudes



of real life (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner& Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002).

Cultivation theory attempts to explain the effects that these consistent messages have on its viewers (Gerbner et al., 2002). The theory looks at the general exposure to the messages rather than specific types of shows. Cultivation theory states that when you take away the superficial characteristics of different types of shows, common themes, messages and lessons exist throughout all programming. The theory focuses on the manner in which television cultivates a shared conception of reality among various groups that are exposed to a system of messaging over a long period of time. This type of analysis differs from other effect studies, such as priming, because cultivation looks at the long term effects not just the immediate effects of watching, for example, a violent show (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner& Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002).

According to George Gerbner et al.(1978) cultivation analysis must first begin with examining the models that are seen in television. Gerbner and his colleagues suggest heavy television viewers compared to light viewers will understand the real world in terms of the facts that are presented on television (Gerbner et al., 1978). Thus, cultivation theory can play a key role in the way people perceive romantic relationship through media use and how it affects their reality.

In 1969, George Gerbner began his first discussions of the cultural indicators project, which later became a series of studies that significantly contributed to the theories of mass communication. In Gerbner's article (1969), he begins laying the framework for cultivation theory arguing that he was interested in analyzing the context in which individuals and groups

interpret the messages that are presented on television (Gerbner, 1969). Gerbner's purpose for cultural indicators was to help guide social and cultural matters.

Resonance refers to the consistency between real life perceptions and world of television (Gerbner et al., 2002). A strong resonance would mean the television world is consistent with the real world. This would also mean there is a high cultivation effect. Furthermore, there are two levels of cultivation effects (Gerbner et al., 2002):

- The first order is the learning of facts from television that become a person's general beliefs about the everyday world. One example would be to look at television viewers who see romantic situations on television daytime soap operas. Heavy viewers would assume that if a person attempted to look and act like the characters seen on television they would receive the same benefits and praises.
- The second order involves relating the television messaging to larger attitudes such as questions if people are generally romantic. Those that believe people are generally romantic will change their attitude and perception of the situation, which will affect their own romantic behavior.

Cultivation effects are the results of overall television viewing regardless of specific programs and genres on television (Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 1978). Gerbner and his colleagues stated, in their research related to cultivation effects, that storytelling principles exists in similar patterns across all types of genres; therefore, cultivated effects on beliefs or attitudes should be the same regardless of any particular genre or program (Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 1978).

In 1976 Gerbner teamed with colleague Larry Gross to compile the first cultural indicator that dealt with violence. Overall, violence on television and its perceptions in the real world has been a significant indicator of the existence of cultivation. Gerbner and Gross (1976) studied the perceptions of violence of individuals who were considered heavy and light television viewers. A content analysis of several United States television networks demonstrated that there were more violent acts on television than in the real-world (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). After studying several adults and adolescents, Gerbner and Gross (1976) ultimately discovered that television viewing tends to cultivate violent attitudes and perceptions more in heavy viewers than in light viewers. The heavy viewers tended to give the “television answer” more frequently than the light viewers. However, an individual can reduce cultivation effects given certain characteristics of the viewer (Gerbner & Gross, 1976, p. 191-192). For example, a college education can reduce cultivation effects and the percentage of overall ‘television answers;’ however, if the college educated individual is considered a heavy viewer, television answers and cultivation effects will show an increase compared to college educated light viewers (Gerbner & Gross, 1976).

Since then numerous of studies have provided support for cultivation theory. Heavy television viewing has cultivated unrealistic perceptions related to violence on television (Gerbner et al., 1980; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli & Morgan, 1980); gender, race, marital status and work (Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001); age (Gerbner et al., 1980); and marriage (Segrin & Nabi, 2002). “Those who spend more time with television are more likely to perceive social reality in ways that reflect the potential lessons of the television world (the ‘television answer’) than are those who watch less television but are otherwise comparable (in terms of important demographic characteristics) to the heavy viewers” (Gerbner et al., 2002, p. 47).

Cultivation analysis can also explain the effects television has on an individual's perception of social reality in a number of ways. Cultivation theory argues the world of television becomes a social reality to the viewer (Gerbner et al., 2002). Many people take what is seen on television to be factual and apply those beliefs to real life (Gerbner et al., 2002). Gerbner (1998) said television is a centralized system of storytelling. Television's drama, commercials, news and other programs bring a relatively coherent system of images and messages. The system begins to cultivate from infancy the thoughts and preferences that tend to be acquired from other primary sources such as parents and peers. Thus the concept of cultivation is used to describe the independent contributions television viewing makes to viewer's conception of social reality (Gerbner et al., 2002).

Cultivation theory would hypothesize that people who spend more time watching television are more likely to base their social reality on the images, portrayals and ideologies they see on television. The cultivation differential is the difference between conceptions of reality between light and heavy viewers in the same demographic subgroup (Gerbner et al., 2002). Furthermore, it represents the difference in an ideology or outlook that television, in conjunction with various other factors, creates (Gerbner et al., 2002).

Mainstreaming refers to the effects heavy television viewing has on its audience suggesting heavy viewers will share similar outlooks and beliefs despite different backgrounds (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner, et al., 2002). Heavy television viewers from different regions, ethnicity, social economic status, political affiliations, who would normally have different beliefs and outlooks, had little or no difference in their perspectives and beliefs as it was related to television. The repeated messages on television superseded the previous beliefs and caused

known differences in backgrounds to become less influential on attitudes and behaviors (Gerbner et al, 1980).

Cultivation analysis concludes that television affects people's perception of social reality in a number of ways (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner& Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner et al., 2002). First, many people take what they see on television to be factual. One example is the perception of the frequency of crimes. Studies have found that heavy viewers have exaggerated perceptions of the total number of people involved in violent acts each week. Television has been shown to consistently demonstrate people involved in acts of violence (Gerbner et al., 2002). This may cause viewers to believe there are comparable crime rates in real life. Heavy viewers based their information on what they see on television and apply it to real life. In addition, the *mean world syndrome* resulted from research that found long-term exposure to television tends to cultivate an image of a relatively mean and dangerous world. Heavy viewers were more likely than light viewers to have negative outlooks on people and hold beliefs such as: "people can't be trusted" and "most people are just looking out for themselves" (Gerbner et al., 2002).

Some of the cognitive processes that are thought to occur during cultivation are explained in the "heuristic processing model of cultivation effects." The model has two propositions (Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner et al., 2002):

- The first proposition states that television enhances accessibility, meaning that information that is most accessible in the mind will most likely be used in forming perceptions and attitudes.

- The second proposition states that the social perceptions created through frequent television viewing are constructed through searching a small subset of information which is most accessible – heuristic strategies.

A content analysis that compared the United States Census to television violence (Gerbner et al., 1978) reported a significant difference between people's perceptions and reality. According to Gerbner et al. (1978, p. 195), the 1970 Census reported “.32 violent crimes per 100 persons.” However, a content analysis of prime-time television between 1969 and 1977 suggested that 64% of major characters were involved in some form of violence, either as a perpetrator, victim or both (Gerbner et al., 1978). According to the 1970 Census, a person would only have a one-third of 1% chance of encountering violence in their lives, but when an individual watches television, a person could be convinced a violent act could occur to more than half the people around them in their life (Gerbner et al., 1978). The difference between television violence and actual violence in reality clearly demonstrates the differences an individual could perceive after heavy television viewing.

Cultivation studies that look at the relationship of violence and television viewing suggests the theory of cultivation does exist and it is based on television viewing, not based on specific genres of television viewed (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1978; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). However, a viewer of television talk shows “might be likely to distort the frequency of negative personal relationships and personality traits that occur in the real world” (Smith et al., 1999, p. 185). Smith et al. (1999) suggests that more specific types of television shows cultivate a belief or attitude within the real world based on the content of the program. According to Rossmann and Brosius (2004), as program variety increases, it is reasonable to

assume there are genre-specific cultivation effects. In their paper, they argued the future research of cultivation effects will be centered on the type of television content viewed opposed to an individual's personal characteristics (Rossmann & Brosius, 2004).

The values and morals that television programs highlight tend to be constant with what middle school and high school student value as important (Potter, 1990). The study drew participants from a middle school and high school that were associated with a large state university. The 308 respondents, who approximately ranged in age from 11 to 18 years old, were asked to complete two questionnaires. The second questionnaire was given three months after the first. The results of the study suggested adolescents were “more likely to have perceived the lessons that are dominant in the television world than they are to perceive less dominant lessons” (Potter, 1990, p.850). This was significantly related to the amount of television each adolescent watched – the more television they watched, the greater chance they were going to perceive the dominant lessons learned from television as more important to them. The top three lessons the adolescents felt were most important were also the most dominant in television, which are “*Truth always wins out; honesty is the best policy,*” “*Good wins over evil,*” and “*Hard work yields rewards*” (Potter, 1990). Selnow (1986) identified these themes as the primary rules by which all television stories are resolved. After a content analysis of 222 sub-plots of primetime fictional television programs, the results indicated that the lessons learned indicate by the adolescents in Potter's study were the most prevalent on television, which are consistent with findings related to cultivation theory.

Television can also cultivate perceptions about relationship satisfaction – those who watch more television tend to be less satisfied with their romantic relationships (Shapiro & Kroeger, 1991). The study looked at the relationship between participants' attitudes about

romantic relationships and their popular mass media exposure. A convenience sample of 109 adults who were currently involved in a relationship completed three surveys, which questioned them about their relationship beliefs, relationship satisfaction and mass media exposure. Participants with greater unrealistic perceptions about romantic love reported less satisfaction with their current relationships, more exposure to popular mass media content and less exposure to television news. Also, married women who were exposed to more media were less satisfied with their current relationship (Shapiro & Kroeger, 1991).

A later study (Galician, 2004) found that there is a relationship between mass media and romantic perceptions and expectations for both men and women. Through the use of a survey, the researchers examined 381 participants from two different age groups – Generation Xers and Baby Boomers. The median age for the Baby Boomers was 38 and the median age for the Generation Xers was 20. The researchers examined romantic love expectations with several mass media outlets, including entertainment, news, romance novels, television soap operas, television sitcoms and fashion magazines. In accord with Shapiro and Kroeger (1991), the study found support that the more a person watches television, the more he or she will have romanticized perceptions of love and marriage and be dissatisfied with the current relationship (Galician, 2004).

### ***Genre-Specific Cultivation Effects***

Genre-specific cultivation effects should not lead to the rejection of cultivation theory, but “to a more sophisticated conceptualization of the process and the variables involved” (Cohen & Weimann, 2000, p. 112). Cultivation theory may no longer be a culmination of overall television viewing, but a focus on the effects of a specific genre of programming that is enjoyed



and obtained purposively by the viewer (Rossmann & Brosius, 2004; Cohen & Weimann, 2000; Smith et al., 1999; Hawkins & Pingree, 1981). Nonetheless, cultivation theory will always have “some effects on some people under some circumstances,” but specific genres of television strengthened that cultivation effect (Cohen & Weimann, 2000, p. 113). If overall television viewing can cultivate specific attitudes and images of the world, then it would be reasonable to conclude that specific genres of television will cultivate stronger attitudes and images (Cohen & Weimann, 2000).

Hawkins and Pingree (1981) researched cultivation in hopes to find a causal link between television exposure and an individual’s social beliefs of reality. Their study did not find a causal link, but it did bring forth an important criticism of cultivation theory. Cultivation theory argues that overall television viewing cultivates perceptions; however, Hawkins and Pingree (1981) noted that cultivation effects are stronger when a person watches more specific genres of programming like soap operas. This cultivation effect, however, is not the way Gerbner and his colleagues have argued is since cultivation theory research first began (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 1978; Gerbner et al., 1980; Hawkins and Pingree, 1981), but does show how cultivation theory could exist in other forms.

In a study conducted by Buerkel-Rothfuss and Mayes (1981), the researchers discovered that exposure to soap operas was related to false perceptions of professions and problems in the real world by participants. The researchers surveyed 290 students in a large southern university. Of the sample, 71% claimed to watch at least one episode of a soap opera in a typical week. Students were asked to estimate the number of females and males that fit into several descriptions including, “are doctors, are lawyers, have had an affair, are divorced and are happily married.” The study showed that an increase in exposure to soap opera viewing is positively

associated with an increase in the overall estimate of the number of doctors and lawyers there are in the real world for both men and women. Also, increased exposure was positively associated with the higher estimates of men and women who have had an affair and are divorced. However, there was no association between exposure and estimates of men and women who are happily married (Buerkel-Rothfuss & Mayes, 1981).

Looking at cultivation effects in the context of romantic relationships and marital expectations, cultivation theory would suggest that television is portraying fantasized images of what relationships and marriage should be which in turn cultivates an unrealistic perception of love and romance. This would imply that the idealized images portrayed on television would include “a great deal of romance, physical intimacy, passion, celebration, happiness, ‘love at first sight,’ physical beauty, empathy, and open communication” (Segrin & Nabi, 2002, p. 249). Illouz (1997) also suggests love and romance, such as a walk on the beach, a dozen red roses or an intimate dinner, are symbols constructed by media images since the early 1920s when new media, such as films and television, emerged as the dominate form of communication.

To examine the cultivation effects of marriage, the researcher examined 285 undergraduate students at a large university in the southwestern United States (Segrin & Nabi, 2002). The participants were asked to describe marriage in an open-ended format as well as completing a survey. The researchers discovered that although there was no effect with overall television viewing of idealistic expectations of marriage, specific television genres do provide evidence there is an effect. Students who viewed television programs that focus on relationships and marriage were more likely to have unrealistic perceptions than those who just watched television. The researchers also noted that older participants in the study held less idealistic expectations about marriage than younger participants (Segrin & Nabi, 2002).

The criticisms of cultivation theory can explain the effects of genre-specific television programming, but only in terms of heavy television viewers versus light television viewers; therefore, social cognitive theory can further explain the effects a specific genre of television has on an individual. Social cognitive theory uses the idea of modeling or imitating behavior as the source that trains a person to think and act in specific ways. Gerbner suggests cultivation effects exists no matter the program on television; social cognitive theory can examine the effects on a more narrow level, suggesting a specific television show will effect an individual even when comparing, for example, men and women's effects.

### ***Social Cognitive Theory***

Social cognitive theory, originally named social learning theory by Albert Bandura, is based on a framework to analyze the symbolic communication that influences humans thoughts and actions. Social cognitive theory argues people learn from observing others in social situations then modeling the behavior (Bandura, 1978; 1986; 2001; 2002). According to the theory, once the actions are learned, a person's behavior will tend to mirror the learned actions. Various people can serve as model, including parents, peers, colleagues or various media outlets, such as characters on television or models in a magazine (Bandura, 1973; 2001). "Because of the influential role the mass media play in society, understanding the psychosocial mechanism through which symbolic communication influences human thought, affect, and action is of considerable import" (Bandura, 2001, p. 265).

Social cognitive theory is based on three causal functions of self and society, which are 1) personal factors; 2) behavioral patterns; and 3) environmental events (Bandura, 2002, p. 121). These three areas of social cognitive theory form a group of causal functions that work together

to shape and influence a person's behavior and perceptions of the world. Social cognitive theory, therefore, can predict behavioral outcomes before the behavior is executed (Bandura, 1978; 1986; 2001). To determine the behavioral outcomes, several human attributes must be examined to establish an individual's personal construction of reality, which are: symbolizing capability, self-regulatory capability, self-reflective capability and vicarious capability (Bandura, 1978; 1986; 2001).

The first capability Bandura identifies to determine the behavioral outcomes is *symbolizing capability*. This capability states that people take what they view and put it into symbols to define it within the world (Bandura, 2001). It is a tool that helps individuals comprehend their surrounding environment to help guide future interactions. "Through symbols, people give meaning, form, and continuity to their experiences" (Bandura, 2001, p. 267). For example, a smile is a symbol of behavior that is defined as happy with most people. However, it can still mean something different to each person. A smile could also be polite in an awkward situation. Therefore, symbolizing capability is based on personal experiences and how people perceive those experiences through their own prism (Bandura, 2001).

The next capability is *self-regulatory capability*. It assumes people can control their actions and behavior (Bandura, 2001). People have a moral obligation to their own self and can therefore, regulate and control their own actions and behaviors. For example, a person can watch a television show, view a negative stereotype or situation and through his own moral judgment, decide not to imitate the situation. People do not quickly change their beliefs of right and wrong; therefore, "their self-sanctions for actions that match or violate their personal standards serve as the regulatory influencers" (Bandura, 2002, p. 123). Also, the forethought perspectives and individual cognitions battle with can anticipate the potential consequences of an actions,

which also help regulate actions and behaviors (Bandura, 2001). Self-regulatory capability becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy for each individual, which increases self-efficacy, meaning a person who thinks he will win usually will win (Bandura, 2001).

*Self-reflective capability* is the idea that a person can reflect back to personal actions and behaviors to determine one's worth or self-efficacy as it is relative to others (Bandura, 2001). Self-reflective capability is considered the most distinctly human capability (Bandura, 1986, p. 21). Through self reflection, an individual can make sense of the actions and experiences that will allow their cognitive self to alter their own attitudes and behaviors accordingly (Bandura, 1986; 2001).

The last capability of social learning theory is *vicarious capability*. Vicarious capability assumes people learn through the experiences of others, which is also known as modeling or observational learning (Bandura, 1986; 2002). This is the idea that people learn from the examples set by others. One form of modeling is abstract modeling, which is a higher form of modeling (Bandura, 2002). This form of modeling is more than merely mimicry, but an adoption of customs or rules that can be used to generate new behaviors beyond what was seen or heard. The vicarious capability can explain the impact of romantic television shows viewers and their unrealistic perceptions of romance and marriage.

The media now have the ability to expand modeling through the television sets in people's homes. The television allows people to view its models in the privacy of the individuals own home and shows the individual how others live in the fantasy world (Bandura, 1971). The problem with setting the fantasy world as a model is that many people can not determine when fantasy ends and reality begins (Bandura, 1971).

Learning through the example of models can only be successful when four interconnected subsystems link together. Each subsystem contains a specific condition that must be met for modeling to have lasting effects on behavior. These subsets are attentional processes, retention processes, behavioral production processes and motivational processes (Bandura, 1973; 1986; 2001). The four subsystems govern the vicarious capability allowing modeling to play an active role in shaping the behaviors and attitudes of individuals (Bandura, 2001).

The effects of modeling are maximized only when a person pays attention to or recognizes the key components of a model's behavior. This is known as *attentional processes* (Bandura, 1973; 1986). Successful observational learning is rooted in the attention given to the model, which is guided by the practical value of the model's behavior and the model's interpersonal attraction (Bandura, 1973; 1986; 2002). The connection to interpersonal attractions guide the attention to the message the model is sending through the media. According to Bandura et al. (1966) the television captivates an audiences' attention for an extended period of time so effectively that viewers are capable of learning without being given any additional incentives. Therefore, television could hold the attention of audiences long enough to influence the viewer's perception of romance, which ultimately would allow the viewer to learn a new behavior related to romantic relationships.

The second essential attribute of modeling is *retention processes*. A person will remember a specific behavior that could be successfully modeled later (Bandura, 1973). The capability of a viewer to create cognitive symbols and codes of information enhances learning through retention (Bandura, 2001). The observational learning study showed that children will retain information and modeled behavior more effectively, if they actively think about the model's action in words and vivid imagery (Bandura et al., 1966). Children who were passively

observing the model or mentally preoccupied did not retain the information as clearly (Bandura, 1966). Therefore, a person who actively watches romantic television, creating vivid mental images of romantic situations, will perceive and model similar romantic gestures than a person who passively watches.

In the third attribute of modeling –*behavioral production processes* – a person must have the required skills to model the behavior (Bandura, 1973; 1986; 2002). Bandura (1973) suggests that a child can observe his parents’ driving behavior. The child could learn through observation how to sit in the driver’s seat, buckle his seat and even put the key in the ignition; but, the behavior of driving will most likely be impeded by the fact that his legs are too short to put on the pedals (Bandura, 1973). The child ultimately lacks the ability to carry out the behavior even though it was learned through observation. Romance fall into the same pattern lacking the social skills to carry out the learned behavior. For learned behavior to be modeled through behavior, a person must have the subskills the behavior requires (Bandura, 1973; 2002). However, “not all information acquired will translated into overt behavior, but if [television] viewers do decide to act on what they have learned, they will seek to reproduce and refine the relevant behaviors through practice” (Hendriks, 2002).

*Motivational processes* of modeling draws the line between obtaining behaviors and performing behavior because “people do not perform everything they learn” (Bandura, 1986; 2002). When positive reinforcements are present, learned behaviors have a greater chance of becoming actions than negative reinforcements. People become motivated to achieve similar success of their peers but become reluctant to behave like those who have been given severe consequences for their actions (Bandura, 1973; 1986; 2002). Therefore is would be accurate to

say when romantic gestures are praised, a person will perceive the action to be positive and model the behavior.

An early social learning theory study found that adolescents who actively watch television will show a higher level of knowledge of the information presented than adolescents who passively watched (Bandura, Grusec and Menlove, 1966). Participants were drawn from two different elementary schools in a lower-middle class community. The students ranged in age from 6 to 8 years old, with participants evenly broken by gender – 36 boys and 36 girls. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the groups – the facilitative symbolization, the competing symbolization and the passive observation group. Within each group, the participants were divided again – one group was given incentives and the other group received no incentives. The facilitative symbolization group was asked to verbalize each action that was taking place during the movie. The competing symbolization group was asked to count repeatedly during the movie to gauge if children could pay close attention to the movie while engaging in another activity. Finally the passive observation group was simply asked to pay close attention to the movie. Children in the incentive groups were also instructed that they will be participating in a review of what they had learned from the movie following the screening. The children were rewarded with candy for the questions they answered correctly. The adolescents who were instructed to verbalize every action of the model were able to retain significantly more information than those who were distracted during the four-minute movie presentation (Bandura, Grusec and Menlove, 1966). The mean number of matching responses reproduced for the non-incentive facilitative group was 17.2, compared to the mean number for the non-incentive passive observation and competing groups, which was 13.8 and 8.7 respectively. However, offering an incentive to answer the questions correctly did not significantly alter the outcome of



any of the groups. The researchers indicated the students “exerted strong efforts to observe and to retain the responses exhibited by the model” (Bandura, Grusec and Menlove, 1966, p. 504). This study indicates adolescents who pay attention to models, such as television models, will retain the information and potentially duplicate it. In one of the four-minute sequences the participants watched, a man punched and showed strong aggression towards a Bobo the Clown doll. In another sequence a model shot a dart gun at a plastic container. Later a participant of the study showed similar aggression towards a replica of the doll by shooting a dart gun at the Bobo the clown doll. Mass exposure may result in overlapping and flawed modeling responses as indicated by the boy who shoot the dart gun at the Bobo doll and not a plastic container (Bandura, Grusec and Menlove, 1966).

A more recent analysis of modeling behaviors suggests cognition not only influence how an individual learns behaviors, but also how behaviors influence cognitions (Bandura, 2001). Although an individual’s behavior is learned through direct experience, much of the learning is accomplished through observational learning – observing the behaviors of others (Bandura, 2001). The modeling element of social cognitive theory is rooted in the idea of imitation and is coupled with reinforcement (Bandura, 2001). If a behavior is deemed as a resolution to a problem, rewarding or has positive consequences, the chance an individual will model the actions are increased.

Another way modeling is increased is through the perceived similarity of the model. Individuals tend to emulate models whom they identify. Thus the more likely an individual relates to the model, the greater change the behaviors of the model will be carried out (Bandura, 2001). Males and females are more likely to imitate the behaviors of same-sex models than models of the opposite sex (Perry & Bussey, 1979) Perry and Bussey proposed that children will

not only model same-sex behavior, but they will also code particular behaviors as male-appropriate and female-appropriate. Most boys know how to put on a dress and makeup yet few boys actually choose to do so because they code the behavior as female-appropriate and purposively choose not to engage in such behaviors. The study broke children into groups – one group focused on the modeling conditions and the other group did not. Through a series of different trials, the children would choose item preferences that were previously indicated by models as favorable or unfavorable. The results of the study clearly supported the argument that children would imitate the response made by a person of the same-sex than a person of the opposite-sex (Perry & Bussey, 1979). Modeling is not only done by children, but can also be a function of adults; therefore, it would be a likely assumption that females who watch highly romantic television programs would tend to emulate the female characters on television and hope their significant other would emulate the male character that sweeps the females off her feet.

Another factor that influences the attention and identification of a model is the attractiveness of the model. In a study on media violence, attractive perpetrators were more likely to be identified with and attended to than unattractive perpetrators (Bandura, 1986). The closer the perpetrator was to the demographic characteristics of the viewer, the more likely the viewer would identify to him or her. Therefore, attractive perpetrators are more likely to be modeled than unattractive perpetrators in violent acts (Bandura, 1986). The idea that an attractive perpetrator could be a model also suggests that the overall attractiveness of television characters has a stronger modeling effect on a viewer than unattractive television characters – the more attractive the television character the more likely the character will be modeled (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura also argues individuals learn through observation the behaviors to value in particular situations related to the individual (Bandura, 2001). According to Hendriks (2002), it

is continuously reinforced for women that there is a close relationship between beauty and thinness by television programs. Television programs repeatedly idolize models and thinner women who easily obtain popularity and success. Shaw and Waller (1995) say women tend to use the television as a source of information for current trends, social norms and standards of beauty. “Females are, thus, socialized through television to adopt the cultural standards of their society. They integrate this knowledge into their cognitions and ... they come to accept this norm as reality” (Hendriks, 2002, p. 117).

## **Hypotheses**

The researcher employed several indicators to analyze the perceptions of romance and marriage among college-aged participants. These indicators included examining the participants perceptions of romance, the expected maintenance of a marriage based on romantic love, trust between partners, idealized expectation of love at first sight, indicators of fantasy ruminations about romantic relationships, and individual love styles. Looking a fantasy perceptions and idealized expectations of marriage examines similar measures; however, fantasy perceptions looks at the extent a person’s fantasizes about romance and love whereas idealized expectations looks what a person’s expects from a marriage.

The purpose of this study is to examine and test hypotheses related to college students perceptions of romantic relationships and marriage. As noted by Demo and Ganong (1994) many people enter into marriage with “unrealistic, idealistic, and romanticized notions about marriage” (p. 199). The first set of hypotheses focus on the idea that television exposure cultivates unrealistic perceptions about romance and marriage in college students. Those who are

considered heavy television viewers should have significantly higher false perceptions about romance and marriage.

H<sub>1</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers will have more unrealistic perceptions of romance than light television viewers.

H<sub>2</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers will have more unrealistic expectations about marriage than light television viewers.

H<sub>3</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers will fall in the Eros love style category, which is considered to be the love style category most centered on romantic love, more than light television viewers.

The criticism of cultivation theory highlights an additional form of measurement of cultivation theory by looking at a specific genre of television rather than overall television viewing; therefore, several hypotheses centered on the idea of the cultivation effects of genre-specific television programming. After Hirsch's (1980) reanalysis of cultivation theory, he suggested that more research should be done focusing on specific genres and programs on television as an indicator of viewer perceptions.

H<sub>4</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers, who watch specific romantic type television programs, will have more unrealistic ideas of romance than light television viewers.

H<sub>5</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers, who watch specific romantic type television programs, will have more unrealistic expectations about marriage than light television viewers.

H<sub>6</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers, who watch specific romantic type television programs, will fall in the Eros love style category more than light television viewers.

H<sub>7</sub>: Students who are heavy television viewers, who watch more soap operas, will have more unrealistic expectations about marriage than light television viewers.

The set of third hypotheses is largely driven by the fact that overall television viewing may not cultivate expectations about romance or marriage and fantasies related to marriage and romance are modeled through several media outlets including magazines and television; therefore, the set of third hypotheses is rooted in social cognitive theory's modeling concept.

H<sub>8</sub>: The more female students read female magazines, the more likely they will have unrealistic expectations about relationships and marriage.

H<sub>9</sub>: The more female students read male magazines, the less likely they will have unrealistic expectations about relationships and marriage.

H<sub>10</sub>: The more male students read female magazines, the more likely they will have unrealistic expectations about relationships and marriage.

H<sub>11</sub>: The more male students read male magazines, the less likely they will have unrealistic expectations about relationships and marriage.

H<sub>12</sub>: The more students watch specific romantic television programs, the more likely they will have unrealistic perceptions of romance.

H<sub>13</sub>: The more women who watch romantic television programs, the more likely they will have unrealistic perceptions of romance and marriage.

## **CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY**

Participants in this study were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory speech class in a southeast United States university. Each student who participated in the study could have the opportunity to receive extra credit towards their total grade in the course, but no monetary compensation was offered. The sample size was 423 students. The mean age of participants was 18.6 years old and the majority of the sample was underclassmen (freshman and sophomores).

### **Procedures**

Participants were given verbal instructions on how to complete the survey as a group in their introductory speech class. The participants were asked to sign a consent form that specifically states they are not required to take the survey. To ensure anonymity, participants were provided separate envelopes for their survey and consent form and in no way were they linked to each other. Professors were encouraged to offer extra credit to their students for completing the survey; however, it remained the professors' choice to do so. Students were asked to take the survey home to complete and return to the researchers in the allotted time. Students were instructed not to complete the survey in class due to the nature of some of the questions that seek personal and private information as well as to prevent classroom disruptions.

### **Measures**

Participants' idealized romance and marital expectations were assessed through closed-ended survey questions. Several of the questions were chosen to create scales, including: the fantasy rumination scale, the idealized expectations for intimacy, a scale of the perceived

importance romantic love plays in the maintenance of marriage, and a scaled to measure romantic love.

The *fantasy rumination* is a 4-item scale created by Segrin and Nabi (2002). The scale will assess the degree to which participants' think or fantasize about romantic relationships and marriage. Items included, "I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married," "I have put a lot of thought into what kind of wedding I would like to have," "I often find myself talking about romantic relationships," and "I often find myself thinking about romantic relationships." Questions will be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Segrin and Nabir (2002) had a Cronbach's alpha for the five item scale of .79, which is above what is acceptable.

The *intimacy scale* is a 4-item scale created on Tornstam's (1992) expectation for intimacy scale. This scale is intended to measure the idealized expectations for intimacy in a close relationship. Items included, "I should be able to trust my partner completely," "I should know the inner most feelings of my significant other," "I should have a feeling of mutual understanding with my partner," "I should be interested in my partner's problems," and "I should be able to talk openly to my partner about everything." Questions will be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Tornstam (1992) had a Cronbach's alpha for the five item scale of .71, which is slightly above acceptable.

The *ideal marital expectations scale* will measure the importance of certain themes related to marriage based on research conducted by Segrin and Nabi (2002). Each of the themes that were found to be of great importance through their qualitative research was turned into a statement and participants will be asked to rate the importance of each statement as it relates to a successful and healthy marriage. Statements include, "Successful conflict resolution," "spending

as much time together as possible,” “being physically intimate as often as possible,” “having a positive relationship with your spouses’ parents,” “being able to tell each other everything,” and “being best friends with your spouse.” Questions will be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from very important to very unimportant. The Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .73, which is above what is acceptable.

The *romantic love scale* will measure the role romantic love is perceived to play in a marriage and the maintenance of a marriage. Based on Kephart’s (1967) scale, items will include, “if love has completely disappeared from a marriage, I think it is best for the couple to make a clean break and start new lives” and “in my opinion, the disappearance of love is not a sufficient reason for ending a marriage, and should not be viewed as such.” Questions will be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Several other questions individually measured the expectations of romance in a relationship or marriage. In addition, several television behavioral questions were included in the survey: amount of television viewing, amount of genre-specific television viewing, and a perceived reality of television scale. Participants were asked about the total number of issues of magazines they read. Students were asked to estimate the number of magazines they read in a year. Below are the specific examples of the scales that were used in the study.

### ***Hypothesis 1***

To measure hypothesis 1, students who are heavy television viewers will more likely have an unrealistic idea of romance than light television viewers, several scales were used. Hypothesis 1 is rooted in cultivation theory and will measure the effects of heavy television viewers versus light television viewers. It examines the relationship between overall amount of



television viewing and perceptions about romance and relationships. The independent variable is the amount of television watched by participants in the study. It was measured by *overall television viewing*. It is a simple indication of how much time an individual watches a day. Participants will be asked “In a typical day, how much time do you spend watching television (in minutes and hours)?” When analyzing the data, the time will be converted into minutes. The dependent variable is perceptions about romance and relationships. It was measured using the *intimacy scale*.

### ***Hypothesis 2***

To measure hypothesis 2, students who are high television viewers will have more idealistic expectations about marriage than light television viewers, several scales were used. Hypothesis 2 examines the relationship between overall amount of television viewing and perceptions about marriage. The independent variable is the amount of television watched by participants in the study. It was measured by the overall *television viewing* scale previously mentioned. The dependent variable is perceptions about marriage. It was measured using the *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*.

### ***Hypothesis 3***

Hypothesis 3 states students who are high television viewers will fall in the Eros love style category, which is consider to be the love style category most centered around romantic love, than light television viewers. It examines the relationship between overall amount of television viewing and a person’s likelihood of falling into Lee’s (1973) romantic and passionate love-style, *Eros*. The independent variable is the amount of television watched by participants in the study. It will be measured by the overall *television viewing* scale previously mentioned. The

dependent variable is a person's love-style, *Eros*. To measure the dependent variable, the *Love Attitude Scale* will be used based on Hendrick and Hendrick's (1998) study that empirically looked at Lee's (1973) scale. The scale is composed of a six 3-item subscales that is based on research originally conducted by Lee (1973): Eros (passionate love), Ludas (game-playing love), Storge (friendship love), Pragma (practical love), Mania (dependent love), and Apage (altruistic love). The scale is designed to examine the differences between each love style as it relates to television viewing. The original scale designed by Hendrick and Hendrick (1988; 1986) was a 42-item scale to measure each of the six love styles; however, in later research (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1998), it was discovered that a 24-item or 18-item scale are more efficient and concluded that either scale would be adequate for researchers who need a more brief love scale for their research. Eros variables will indicate the romantic perceptions of individuals and will measure romantic, passionate love styles. Previous studies had Cronbach's standardized alphas of .82 for Eros, .74 for Ludas, .86 for Storge, .78 for Pragma, .74 for Mania, and .90 for Agape (Hendricks and Hendricks, 1998).

The next four hypotheses in the study will be rooted in a common criticism of cultivation theory. First proposed by Hawkins and Pingree (1981) and later endorsed by many other researchers (Rossmann & Brosius, 2004; Segrin & Nabi, 2002; Cohen & Weimann, 2000; Smith et al., 1999), genre-specific cultivation effects has become a topic of more recent research. Researchers suggest there is a stronger cultivation effect if a person watches a specific genre of television programming rather than simply viewing television.

#### ***Hypothesis 4***

Hypothesis 4, students who are high television viewers that watch specific romantic type television programs will have an unrealistic idea of romance and relationships, than light television viewers, will be measured similarly to hypothesis 1; however, the independent variable will be different. It examines the relationship between specific type of television programs and perceptions about romance and relationships. The independent variable is the amount of specific television programs watched by participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*. Genre-specific television programs will be measured in a variety of ways. The first way will be to ask participants to indicate how much time of a certain genre of programming they watch on a given day, including television programs such as “reality shows,” “soap operas” and “sitcoms.” The second way will ask participants to indicate whether they watched a specific television program in the past week, such as “The Bachelor/Bachelorette,” “Sex and the City” and “Desperate Housewives.” Finally, a genre-specific scale (Segrin & Nabi, 2002) will be used to assess the extent to which participants regularly watch four types of television programming: “romantic comedies,” “soap operas,” “daytime talk shows,” and “reality-based shows about relationships.” Segrin and Nabi (2002) had a Cronbach alpha of .68 in their research. The dependent variable for hypothesis 4, which is the same as hypothesis 1, is perceptions about romance and relationships. It will also be measured using the *intimacy scale*, which is previously discussed in hypothesis 1.

#### ***Hypothesis 5***

Hypothesis 5, students who are heavy television viewers will have more idealistic expectations about marriage than light television viewers, will be measured in a similar manner as hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 5 examines the relationship between viewing specific television

programs and perceptions about marriage. The independent variable is the amount of specific television programs watched by participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*, which is explained in hypothesis 4. The dependent variable is the person's perceptions about marriage. It will be measured using the *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which were explained in hypothesis 2.

### ***Hypothesis 6***

Hypothesis 6 states that students who are heavy television viewers who watch specific romantic type television programs will fall in the Eros love style category more than light television viewers. Hypothesis 6 examines the relationship between overall viewing specific types of television programs and a person's likelihood of falling into Lee's (1973) romantic and passionate love-style, *Eros*. The independent variable is the amount of specific television programs watched by participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*, which is explained in hypothesis 4. The dependent variable is a person's love-style, *Eros*. To measure the dependent variable, the *Love Attitude Scale* will be used, which is explained in hypothesis 3.

### ***Hypothesis 7***

Hypothesis 7, students who are heavy television viewers that watch more soap operas will have perceive marriage with higher fantasy perceptions than light television viewers, was examined based on the criticism of cultivation theory. Hypothesis 7 examines the relationship between overall viewing of soap operas and a person's perceptions of marriage. The independent variable is the amount of soap operas viewer in a typical week by participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*, which is explained in hypothesis 4, that will

assess the amount of time in a given week the participant watches soap operas as well as the frequency they watch soap operas. The dependent variable is a person's perceptions about marriage. It will be measured using the *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal marital expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which were explained in hypothesis 2. The relationship between soap opera viewing and perceptions of marriage was previously looked at by Buerkel-Rothfuss and Mayes (1981), but no significant relationship was found. Therefore, this hypothesis is designed to re-examine the relationship to see if over the past 24 years the effect has changed.

The remaining hypotheses in the study will be rooted social cognitive theory. Cultivation theory suggest that there is an effect on heavy television viewers versus light viewers; however, social cognitive theory examines the people who watch television programs or read specific magazines with their behavior that could be viewed on television or in magazines. Social cognitive theory's modeling effects suggest people of all ages model behavior they see and are not familiar with through their own experiences (Bandura, 2001; 2002), they will intimate, thus younger participants in the study will be more likely to intimate and perceive romantic relationships and marriage with unrealistic perceptions.

### ***Hypothesis 8 and 9***

Hypothesis 8 and 9 measure the same independent variable. Both hypotheses examine the effects on magazine readership on female students; however, hypothesis 8 examines the relationship with female magazines and hypothesis 9 examines the relationship with male magazines. Typical male magazines, such as *Maxim* and *Playboy*, and typical female magazines, *Cosmopolitan* and *Seventeen*, are defined as those magazines whose audience is a specific gender. These magazines were chosen based on previous content analyses conducted that show

there is a heavy amount of content that focuses on romance in the female magazines and non-romantic content in the male magazines (Schlenker, Caron & Halteman, 1998; Willemsen, 1998; Peirce, 1990). Hypothesis 8 examines the relationship between magazine readership of female students and the perceptions of marriage and relationships. The independent variable is the total amount of female magazines read in a year by female students. It will be measured by calculating how many different female magazines are read with the overall total number read within the year. Students will be asked how many issues in a year, 0-12, they have read of the following magazines, *Cosmopolitan*, *Marie Claire*, *Glamour*, *Seventeen*, *YM*, *Vogue*, *Maxim*, *Playboy*, *FHM* and *Stuff*. Even though some magazines are considered to be traditional male or traditional female magazines, both men and women can answer either question. This will allow the researchers to later be able to examine possible effects of men reading women's magazines and women reading men's magazines. The dependent variable is the female's perceptions about marriage and relationships. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which is explained in hypothesis 1 and 2. Hypothesis 9 examines the relationship between magazine readership of female students and the perceptions of marriage and relationships. The independent variable is the total amount of male magazines read in a year by female students. It will be measured by calculating how many different male magazines that are read with the overall total number read within the year. The dependent variable is the female's perceptions about marriage and relationships. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which is explained in hypothesis 1 and 2.

### ***Hypothesis 10 and 11***

Hypothesis 10 and 11 also examine the effects of magazines readership among male students. Hypothesis 10 examines the relationship between magazine readership of male students and the perceptions of marriage and relationships. The independent variable is the total amount of female magazines read in a year by male students. It will be measured by calculating how many different female magazines are read with the overall total number read within the year. The dependent variable is the male's perceptions about marriage and relationships. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which were explained in hypothesis 1 and 2. Hypothesis 11 examines the relationship between magazine readership of male students and the perceptions of marriage and relationships. The independent variable is the total amount of male magazines read in a year by male students. It will be measured by calculating how many different male magazines that are read with the overall total number read within the year. The dependent variable is the male's perceptions about marriage and relationships. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which is explained were hypothesis 1 and 2.

### ***Hypothesis 12***

Hypothesis 12 states the more students watch specific romantic television programs, the more likely they will have unrealistic perceptions of romance and marriage. It was measured based on social cognitive theory. Hypothesis 12 examines the relationship between viewing specific television programs and perceptions about marriage. The independent variable is the total amount of specific television programs watched by participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*, which is explained in hypothesis 4. The

dependent variable is the person's perceptions about marriage. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which were explained in hypothesis 1 and 2.

### ***Hypothesis 13***

Hypothesis 13 indicates more women than men who watch romantic television programs will have unrealistic perceptions of romance, relationships and marriage. It was also measured based on social cognitive theory. Hypothesis 13 examines the relationship between viewing specific television programs with a person's gender and their perceptions about marriage. The independent variable is the total amount of specific television programs watched by female and male participants in the study. It will be measured by *genre-specific television viewing*, which is explained in hypothesis 4, and by a student's gender. The dependent variable is the person's perceptions about marriage. It will be measured using the *intimacy scale*, *fantasy rumination scale*, *ideal martial expectations scale* and *romantic love scale*, which is explained in hypothesis 1 and 2.

In each hypothesis that uses television as an independent variable (H<sub>1</sub>-H<sub>7</sub> and H<sub>12</sub>-H<sub>13</sub>), to analyze a person's perceived reality of television, the *TV perception scale* (Rubin, 1981) will be used. Question asked will include, "television shows life as it real is" and "television lets me see how other people live." This scale will be examined to asses the extent to which participants feel television presents truthful portrayals. The scale will be used to determine if the more a person feels television contains realistic portrayals, the less likely each of the television hypothesis will be true. Questions will be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was recorded at .82.



## CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Data were collected for the survey during the Fall 2005 semester using a convenience sample of students from a southeastern United States university (N=423) with a response rate of 72.1%. Women constituted the majority of the sample (54.8%) and roughly 69% of the samples was white (table 1). This is comparable to the current university's male to female ratio, which reports approximately 60% of students as females (unsourced, 2005a). It is also comparable to the current university's ethnicity ratio, which reports approximately 70% as of students as white (unsourced, 2005b). Students represented a variety of colleges within the university: College of Arts and Sciences (31.7%), College of Business Administration (27.7%), College of Engineering (15.0%) and College of Health and Public Affairs (10.9%) (table 1). Approximately 41% of participants stated they were currently in love and generally participants had been in love between 0 and 2 times (table 2). The mean age of participants was about 19 (table 3) and 69% of participants were freshman (table 1).

The Likert scale shows participants general agreement for the romance and marriage questions. Participants strongly agreed or agreed that in a romantic relationship there should be a feeling of mutual understanding between the two partners (92.9%), there should be interest in each other's problems (94.0%), and there should be a complete level of trust (97.6%) (table 5). However, only 62.4% strongly agreed or agreed that their wedding day would be the happiest day of their life. And about half of the participants strongly agreed or agreed that they often catch themselves thinking about marriage (50.2%) or often find themselves talking about romantic relationships (53.2%) (table 6). In general participants strongly agreed or agreed that love is an important prerequisite for getting married and staying married (table 8). Also participants

strongly agreed or agreed that their ideal partner will fit their standards of beauty or handsomeness (78.9%), and the participant and his or her ideal partner will have the right physical chemistry (79.5%) (table 9). The majority of participants, 68%, scored in the top fourth of the Ideal Martial Scale, which indicates a more fantasized view of romantic relationships (table 10). And approximately 23% of participants scored in the bottom third of the Romantic Love Scale, suggests that the participants do not view romance as the ingredient to a successful marriage (table 11). For the most part, female participants had a higher level of agreement for all romance and marriage variables than male participants (table 12, table 13, table 14, table 15, and table 16).

Participants were asked to indicate the importance of six variables as they relate to a romantic relationship. Students indicated they felt that the ability to openly communicate about anything with a partner as the most important of the six variables (70.7%). Of the variables participants could consider as very important to a romantic relationship, participants ranked the variables as follows: the ability to consider your partner as your best friend (50.6%); being able to successfully resolve conflicts (48.2%); having a positive relationship with your partner's parents (42.7%); spending as much time together as possible (14.9%); and being physically intimate as often as possible (11.0%) (table 7). Both males (table 13) and females (table 14) indicated that communication was very important, 62.8% and 76.3% respectively. However, more males than females felt physical intimacy in a romantic relationship was very important, 14.5% and 8.4% respectively.

Participants reported watching approximately 137 minutes of television per week (SD=107.02) (table 17). Students were also asked to report their viewing habits for various

genres of television programs: reality shows ( $M=69.36$ ,  $SD=100.24$ ), soap operas ( $M=14.07$ ,  $SD=67.90$ ), sitcoms ( $M=84.00$ ,  $SD=108.73$ ), and primetime ( $M= 33.00$ ,  $SD=67.48$ ).

To examine the television viewing for cultivation purposes, the television viewing time was broken down into thirds, which represent light, medium and heavy television viewers. For overall television viewing, light viewers were those who watched less than 90 minutes of television in a week and heavy viewers were those who watched more than 180 minutes of television (table 18). Each genre was broken down the same way to reflect the genre-specific cultivation effects. The television show index, which is an additive index that included specific romantic types programs such as *Sex and the City*, TLC's *The Wedding Story*, and *Friends* (table 21), was based on the overall number of shows a person watched. Heavy viewers were consider those who watched more than two of the shows and light viewers were those who watched zero shows (table 18). For reality television shows, heavy viewers watched more than 60 minutes and light viewers watched zero minutes (table 18). And for sitcom television shows, heavy viewers watched more than 120 minutes and light viewers watched zero to 30 minutes (table 18). However, daytime soap opera viewing and prime time television was broken down into those who watched the programs and those who did not because there were not enough participants who to break the data into thirds. A similar process was done for each of the television programs based on gender and it was also broken down into similar light and heavy categories (table 19 and table 20).

The survey also asked about participant's magazine readership. The students did not report heavy magazine readership with an overall mean of 7.77 ( $SD=11.02$ ), which were calculated based on the number of magazines a student read per month. Females reported reading more magazines than males, with a mean of 9.22 ( $SD=10.03$ ) magazines read per year (table 22).

Females also read more male magazines than males read of female magazines (table 22).

Students read *Cosmopolitan* the most ( $M=2.17$ ,  $SD=3.53$ ).

Several questions were combined from the romance variables and the television variables to create seven different scales. Of the seven scales, four had reliabilities alphas greater than .70: Ideal Marital Scale ( $\alpha=0.733$ ), Romantic Love Scale ( $\alpha=0.800$ ), Television Perception Scale ( $\alpha=0.786$ ), and Genre Specific Scale ( $\alpha=0.700$ ). The other three scales did not have reliabilities greater than 0.70; therefore, the questions from the scales were used as individual variables (table 23).

### **Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis predicted a cultivation effect among participants, which means that the participants who are heavy television viewers would have more unrealistic perceptions about romantic relationship than light television viewers. The Intimacy Scale questions were consolidated into a single variable, however, the alpha was not reliable and the variables were used individually (table 5). The Intimacy Scale was intended to measure idealized expectations for intimacy in a romantic relationship. An independent t-test was used to compare means of heavy television viewers and the light television viewers using the four romance variables. There was no significant difference found between the two types of viewers (table 24).  $H_1$  is not supported.

### **Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis also predicted a cultivation effect among participants. The Fantasy Scale questions were to be consolidated into a single variable, however, the alpha was not reliable and the variables were used individually (table 6). The Fantasy Scale was intended to

measure the degree in which participants' think or fantasize about romantic relationships and marriage. The Ideal Marital Scale ( $\alpha=0.733$ ) and the Romantic Love Scale ( $\alpha=0.801$ ) were also used to measure the participants' view of marriage and its overall cultivation effect. The Ideal Marital Scale (table 7) measured the importance of varying statements towards a successful and healthy marriage. The Romantic Love Scale (table 8) measured the amount romantic love is perceived to play in a marriage. An independent t-test was used to compare means of heavy television viewers and the light television viewers using three questions from the fantasy scale and the two scales. There was no significant difference found between the two types of viewers (table 25).  $H_2$  is not supported.

### **Hypothesis 3**

$H_3$  predicted heavy television viewers would fall in the Eros Love Style category. The Eros Love Style Scale (table 9) questions were consolidated into a single variable, however, the alpha was not reliable and the variables were used individually. An independent t-test was used to compare means of heavy television viewers and the light television viewers using the three Eros questions (table 26). The physical chemistry variable was the only one of the three variables that was significant ( $p<.05$ ).  $H_3$  is not supported.

### **Television Perception Scale and Cultivation Effects**

To test the overall perceived reality of television, the Television Perception Scale was used (table 17). When the television perception scale ( $\alpha=0.786$ ) was compared with light and heavy television viewers, there was a significant relationship ( $p<.01$ ) (table 26). The mean of heavy television viewers ( $M=4.24$ ) was significantly higher than the mean of light television viewers ( $M=3.39$ ). This suggests that those who watch more television tend to perceive

television as a way to see how others live whereas light television viewers perceive television for its entertainment value rather than reality.

#### **Hypothesis 4**

H<sub>4</sub> predicted a genre-specific cultivation effect among participants stating that heavy romantic television viewers would have an unrealistic idea of romantic relationships. There are five independent variables that were tested. These five variables are: TV Show Index (table 27), overall reality television viewing time (table 28), overall soap opera television viewing time (table 29), overall prime-time television viewing time (table 30), and overall sitcom television viewing time. To measure H<sub>4</sub>, the four Intimacy Scale questions were used (table 5). The TV Show Index was divided into heavy, medium and light television viewers. Then an independent t-test was used to compare mean of heavy and light viewers using the four Intimacy Scale romance variables (table 18). The mutual understanding variable, which looked at how participants the connections between two people within a relationship, was the only one of the four variables that was significant ( $p < .01$ ) with a mean from heavy viewers scoring higher than light viewers. When looking at the other four media variables, there was some significance between mutual understanding and reality television ( $p < .05$ ) (table 28), and trust and prime-time television ( $p < .05$ ) (table 30), both with heavy viewers means greater than light viewers. Although there is some support for H<sub>4</sub>, it is not supported.

#### **Hypothesis 5**

H<sub>5</sub> predicted a genre-specific cultivation effect among participants stating that heavy romantic television viewers would have an unrealistic idea of marriage and falling in love. The same five independent variables were used from H<sub>4</sub>; however, the dependent variables changed

to reflect a person's perception of marriage. To measure marriage perceptions, the three questions from the Fantasy Scale, the Ideal Martial Scale and the Romance Love Scale were tested. An independent t-test was used to compare the means between the heavy and light televisions viewers of the TV Show Index, reality TV time, soap opera TV time, prime-time TV time, and sitcom TV time (table 18).

All of the means for the heavy viewers were greater than the light viewers when comparing the TV Show Index with the marriage variables. And four of the five variables were significant: wedding day happiest day of life ( $p < .01$ ), often think about marriage ( $p < .01$ ), often talk about romantic relationships ( $p < .01$ ), and the Ideal Martial Scale ( $p < .05$ ) (table 27).

A significant difference was found between the means of overall amount of reality TV time and wedding day happiest day of life ( $p < .05$ ) with heavy television viewers having a greater mean ( $M=2.89$ ) than light viewers ( $M=2.68$ ) (table 28). Also there was a significant difference between the overall amount of soap opera TV time and talking about romantic relationships ( $p < .01$ ) with the heavy viewers having a greater mean ( $M=2.82$ ) than light viewers ( $M=2.39$ ) (table 29). The overall amount of prime-time television viewing was significant with thinking amount being marriage ( $p < .01$ ), the Ideal Martial Scale ( $p < .05$ ), and Romantic Love Scale ( $p < .05$ ) (table 30). However, the difference between the means of the Romantic Love Scale is opposite of what was predicted. The mean for heavy television viewers ( $M=3.84$ ) was less than the mean for light television viewers ( $M=4.22$ ) (table 30). Lastly, the overall amount of sitcom television viewing was significant with perceiving that the wedding day will be the happiest day of life ( $p < .05$ ) and often thinking about marriage ( $p < .01$ ) both with heavy television viewing means greater than light television viewers (table 31).  $H_5$  is supported.

## **Hypothesis 6**

H<sub>6</sub> predicted a genre-specific cultivation effect among participants stating that heavy romantic television viewers would fall into the Eros Love Style Category. Again the same five independent variables were used from H<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>5</sub>; however, the dependent variables are questions from the Eros Love Style scale. An independent t-test was used to compare the means between the heavy and light television viewers of the TV Show Index (table 27), reality television viewing time (table 29), soap opera television viewing time (table 30), prime-time television viewing time (table 31), and sitcom viewing time (table 32). The physical chemistry variable was significant with the TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ) (table 27) and the ideal standards of beauty variable was significant with the soap opera time ( $p < .05$ ) (table 30) and prime-time television ( $p < .05$ ) (table 30). The physical chemistry variable measures the participants' perceptions of passion needed to have a successful relationship. While the ideal standards of beauty variables suggest that participants do have a certain level of beauty or handsomeness needed when choosing a partner. There is some support for H<sub>6</sub>.

## **Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 predicted that high soap opera television viewers would perceive marriage in a more idealistic manner than light television viewers. An independent t-test was conducted to test the soap opera television viewing variables with the Fantasy Scale variables, the Ideal Marital Scale and the Romantic Love Scale (table 29). Only one of the five variables were statistically significant. The difference between the means of heavy ( $M=2.82$ ) and light ( $M=2.39$ ) soap opera television viewers was significant ( $p < .01$ ) with the talking about romantic



relationship variable. It is unknown why the significance was only seen in one variable and, therefore, because of the risk of chance with only one variable, H<sub>7</sub> is not supported.

### **Television Perception Scale and Genre-Specific Cultivation Effects**

Genre-specific cultivation effects were examined overall by a person's perceived reality of television. Based on each of the five independent variables used to test genre-specific effects, a t-test was run with the Television Perception Scale. There is significance between the scale and all five of the independent variables: TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ) (table 28), reality television time ( $p < .01$ ) (table 29), soap opera time ( $p < .01$ ) (table 30), prime-time television ( $p < .01$ ) (table 31), and sitcom television time ( $p < .01$ ) (table 32). In general, this indicates that cultivation effects do exist among heavy television viewers of genre-specific television programs.

### **Hypothesis 8**

Hypothesis 8 predicted a social cognitive modeling effect based on overall magazine readership. For this hypothesis, a series of bivariate correlations were conducted using z-scores to examine the potential relationship between reading female orientated magazines and the effects it has on female's perceptions of romantic relationship and marriage (table 46). There was little significance, which could be attributed to chance. H<sub>8</sub> is not supported.

### **Hypothesis 9**

Hypothesis 9 also predicted a social cognitive modeling effect based on overall magazine readership; however, it looked at the relationship between female readers of traditional men's magazines and their perceptions of romance and marriage. Again, a series of bivariate correlations were conducted using z-scores to examine the potential relationship. There is a

significant, negative relationship between female magazine readership of male magazines and several of the variables, including: the mutual understanding variable, the wedding day as the happiest day of life variable, the often think about marriage variable, the often talk about romantic relationships variable, and the Ideal Marital Scale (table 46). This indicates that more women read men's magazines, the less romantic they are.

However, there is a significant, positive relationship between the Male Magazine Index ( $p < .05$ ) and Maxim ( $p < .01$ ) with the Romantic Love Scale. Although the relationships are weak, the negative relationships between male magazines and the romance and marriage variables indicates an important relationship, which suggests that the more female read male magazines, the more likely they are romantic (table 46). Therefore,  $H_9$  is partially supported.

### **Hypothesis 10**

This hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between males who read female magazines and idealized perceptions of marriage and romantic relationship. A series of bivariate correlations were conducted using z-scores to examine the potential relationship between reading female orientated magazines and the effects it has on male's perceptions of romantic relationship and marriage (table 47). There was no significance; therefore,  $H_{10}$  is not supported.

### **Hypothesis 11**

This hypothesis predicted a predicted a negative relationship between male's who read traditional male magazines and idealized perceptions of marriage and romantic relationship. A series of bivariate correlations were conducted using z-scores to examine the potential relationship between reading male orientated magazines and the effects it has on male's

perceptions of romantic relationship and marriage (table 47). There was little significance and  $H_{11}$  was not supported.

## **Hypothesis 12**

This hypothesis predicted a positive correlation between watching genre-specific romantic television programs and the perceptions of romance and marriage. A series of bivariate correlations were conducted using z-scores to examine this potential relationship. There was a positive, significant correlation between many of the variables, including the following as the major correlated variables (other correlations can be seen on table 48).

The feeling of mutual understanding variable was significantly correlated with: the TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ), Sex and the City ( $p < .05$ ), Lifetime Romance Movies ( $p < .05$ ), MTV's The Real World ( $p < .01$ ), TLC's The Wedding Story ( $p < .01$ ), Wife Swap ( $p < .05$ ), and the Genre-Specific Television Viewing Scale ( $p < .01$ ).

The wedding day as the happiest day of life was significantly correlated with: TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ), Sex and the City ( $p < .05$ ), Lifetime Romance Movies ( $p < .01$ ), Desperate Housewives ( $p < .01$ ), MTV's The Real World ( $p < .01$ ), and the Genre-Specific Television Viewing Scale ( $p < .01$ ).

The often think about marriage variable was significantly correlated with: overall sitcom time in minutes ( $p < .01$ ), TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ), Lifetime Romance Movies ( $p < .01$ ), Friends ( $p < .01$ ), Daytime Soap Operas ( $p < .01$ ), TLC's The Wedding Story ( $p < .01$ ), Wife Swap ( $p < .05$ ), and the Genre-Specific Television Viewing Scale ( $p < .01$ ).

The often talk about romantic relationships variable was significantly correlated with: overall sitcom time in minutes ( $p < .05$ ), TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ), Sex and the City ( $p < .05$ ),

Lifetime Romance Movies ( $p < .01$ ), Friends ( $p < .01$ ), TLC's The Wedding Story ( $p < .05$ ), Wife Swap ( $p < .01$ ), and the Genre-Specific Television Viewing Scale ( $p < .01$ ).

Although the correlations are weak, there are still enough statistically significant correlations between the media variables and the romance variables support this hypothesis. This relationship indicates there is a social cognitive modeling effect between those who watch particular romantic television programs.  $H_{12}$  is supported.

### **Hypothesis 13**

This hypothesis looked at the differences between males and females who watch romantic television programs and their perceptions of romance and marriage. It predicted that more women than men, who watch romantic programs, will have unrealistic perceptions of marriage. First, to look at the difference between the two groups, two independent t-tests were conducted to compare the means of the two genders. The first t-test looked at the differences between men and women's media uses. The means of females were significantly higher than males when compared with the soap opera viewing time ( $p < .01$ ), reality television viewing time ( $p < .05$ ), the female magazine index ( $p < .01$ ), the romantic TV Show Index ( $p < .01$ ), the Genre-Specific Scale ( $p < .01$ ), and the Television Perception Scale ( $p < .05$ ) (table 32). The mean of the male group was significantly higher than the mean of the female group when compared with the male magazine index ( $p < .01$ ).

After analyzing the means for media uses variables, an independent t-test was conducted to compare the difference of means based on the romance and marriage variables. The means of the females were significantly higher than the males when compared with the mutual understanding variable ( $p < .01$ ), interest in each other problems variable ( $p < .01$ ), trust variable

( $p < .01$ ), wedding day happiest day of life variable ( $p < .01$ ), think about marriage variable ( $p < .01$ ), talk about romantic relationships variable ( $p < .01$ ), marriage is an institution intended to last a lifetime variable ( $p < .01$ ), and the Ideal Martial Scale ( $p < .01$ ) (table 33).

To look at the relationship between gender closer, the data examined by looking at one gender at a time. The females were selected and each of the media variables were divided into heavy, medium and light female viewers (table 20). Then an independent t-test was run for females' overall television viewing (table 34), TV Show Index (table 35), reality television viewing (table 36), soap opera television viewing (table 37), and sitcom television viewing (table 38). There was very little significance with females and the media variables.

Next, the male participants were selected and again each of the media variables were divided into heavy, medium and light male viewers (table 19). Another independent t-test was run for males' overall television viewing (table 39), TV Show Index (table 40), reality television viewing (table 41), soap opera television viewing (table 42), and sitcom television viewing (table 43). Interestingly, there was a significant relationship between males who were heavy TV Show Index viewers and all of the Eros Love Style questions, which is intended to look at a romanticized view of love and passion within a relationship. Heavy male viewers had means significantly higher on all three of the Eros Love Style variables, which include examining the idea that a person is meant for another, they two have the right physical chemistry, and their partner will fit an ideal standard of physical beauty (table 40). Also males who watched more programs from the TV Show Index tended to perceive television as showing truthful portrayals of reality, which include interaction between males and females.

Finally, to examine the overall relationship between the media variables and the romance variables, two series of bivariate correlations were conducted based on gender. The correlations

for female's show significance with only some of the variables, such as the think about marriage variable and wedding day happiest day of life with the media variables (table 49). These correlations are positive, but weak. The correlations for males also indicate some positive, significance (table 50).

There is some support for  $H_{13}$ . The relationship between the males and females is significant based on the t-test; however, the relationships run in the correlations show some positive, significance.

Table 1: Percentages of demographic data.

Variables	%
Gender	
Male	45.2
Female	<u>54.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=416
Year in School	
Freshman	69.0
Sophomore	20.4
Junior	7.7
Senior	<u>2.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=416
Race/Ethnicity	
Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	69.4
Caucasian/Hispanic Decent	13.6
Black/African American	6.6
Asian/Asian American	5.3
Mixed Race	3.4
Other	1.0
American Indian	<u>0.7</u>
	100.00%
	N=412
College related to major	
Arts and Sciences	31.7
Business Administration	27.7
Engineering and Computer Science	15.0
Health and Public Affairs	10.9
Biomedical Sciences	4.6
Education	4.3
Hospitality Management	3.0
Other	<u>2.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=394

Table 2: Percentages of demographic data related to romance.

Variables	%
Currently in love	
Yes	40.9
No	50.4
Undecided	<u>8.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=421
Total number of times in love	
0	23.2
1	47.5
2	22.2
3	5.4
4	1.5
5	0.2
	100.00%
	N=406
Parents still married	
Yes	65.1
No	31.8
Never married	<u>3.1</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Want to get married one day	
Yes	87.0
No	2.8
Undecided	9.2
Currently married	0.5
	100.00%
	N=421



Table 3: Mean and standard deviation for age.

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Age	18.66	1.550	417

Age	%
18	61.2
19	25.4
20	8.4
21	3.1
22	1.2
25	0.2
26	0.2
43	0.2
	100.00%
	N=417

Table 4: Means and standard deviation for romance variables.

<b>Romance Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Used in Scale</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.29	0.628	421	Intimacy
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.37	0.619	420	Intimacy
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.73	0.504	420	Intimacy
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.17	0.696	418	Intimacy
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.80	1.006	420	Fantasy
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.28	1.176	420	Fantasy
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.44	1.016	419	Fantasy
If love has completely disappeared from a marriage, I think it is probably best for the couple to make a clean break from each other and start new lives. *	2.03	0.994	418	Romantic Love
In my opinion, the disappearance of love is not a sufficient reason for ending a marriage and should not be viewed as such. **	2.05	1.018	416	Romantic Love
Marriage is an institution that is intended to last a lifetime.*	3.39	0.757	420	N/A
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.98	0.797	418	Eros Love
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.59	0.937	417	Eros Love
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.04	0.764	418	Eros Love
<b>Please indicate the importance of the following as it is related to a romantic relationship.</b>				
Successfully resolving conflicts***	3.30	0.874	421	Ideal Martial Expectations
Spending as much time together as possible***	2.71	0.838	422	Ideal Martial Expectations
Being physically intimate as often as possible***	2.49	0.905	419	N/A
Having a positive relationship with your partner's family***	3.25	0.820	422	Ideal Martial Expectations
The ability to openly communicate about anything***	3.63	0.675	423	Ideal Martial Expectations
The ability to consider your partner as your best friend***	3.33	0.829	423	Ideal Martial Expectations

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Responses were coded: 4=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 2=neutral, 1=agree, 0=strongly agree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*\*Responses were coded: 4=very important, 3=important, 2=neutral, 1=unimportant, 0=very unimportant (higher number indicates a higher level of importance)

Table 5: Percentages for questions from the Intimacy Scale.

In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.

Strongly Agree	36.8
Agree	56.1
Neutral	5.9
Disagree	1.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=421

In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each other's problems.

Strongly Agree	44.0
Agree	50.0
Neutral	5.2
Disagree	0.7
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=420

In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.

Strongly Agree	75.7
Agree	21.9
Neutral	2.1
Disagree	0.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=420

In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.

Strongly Agree	32.5
Agree	54.1
Neutral	12.0
Disagree	1.2
Strongly Disagree	0.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=418

Table 6: Percentages for questions from the Fantasy Scale.

I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.

Strongly Agree	27.7
Agree	34.9
Neutral	28.4
Disagree	6.9
Strongly Disagree	2.1
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=420

I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.

Strongly Agree	12.1
Agree	38.3
Neutral	21.2
Disagree	20.2
Strongly Disagree	7.9
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=420

I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.

Strongly Agree	13.8
Agree	39.4
Neutral	25.8
Disagree	18.9
Strongly Disagree	2.1
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=419

Table 7: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale.

Indicate the importance of the following as it is related to a romantic relationship

Successfully resolving conflicts

Very Important	48.2
Important	40.9
Neutral	6.2
Unimportant	2.4
Very Unimportant	2.4
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=421

Spending as much time together as possible

Very Important	14.9
Important	49.5
Neutral	27.7
Unimportant	6.9
Very Unimportant	0.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=422

Being physically intimate as often as possible

Very Important	11.0
Important	42.5
Neutral	32.5
Unimportant	12.4
Very Unimportant	1.7
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=419

Having a positive relationship with your partner's family

Very Important	42.7
Important	44.3
Neutral	10.0
Unimportant	1.4
Very Unimportant	1.7
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=422

The ability to openly communication about anything

Very Important	70.7
Important	24.8
Neutral	2.6
Unimportant	0.9
Very Unimportant	0.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=423

The ability to consider you partner as your best friend

Very Important	50.6
Important	36.9
Neutral	9.0
Unimportant	2.4
Very Unimportant	1.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=423

Table 8: Percentages for questions from the Romantic Love Scale.

If love has completely disappeared from a marriage, I think it is probably best for the couple to make a clean break from each other and start new lives.

Strongly Agree	6.2
Agree	26.6
Neutral	36.6
Disagree	25.1
Strongly Disagree	5.5
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=418

In my opinion, the disappearance of love is not a sufficient reason for ending a marriage and should not be viewed as such.

Strongly Agree	7.0
Agree	23.1
Neutral	33.2
Disagree	31.5
Strongly Disagree	5.3
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=416

If a man/woman has all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him/her?

Yes	4.1
No	95.1
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	N=364

Table 9: Percentages for questions from the Eros Love Style Scale.

My partner fits my ideals standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.

Strongly Agree	24.6
Agree	54.3
Neutral	15.6
Disagree	5.3
Strongly Disagree	0.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=418

I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.

Strongly Agree	16.5
Agree	38.8
Neutral	33.3
Disagree	9.4
Strongly Disagree	1.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=417

My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.

Strongly Agree	27.8
Agree	51.7
Neutral	17.2
Disagree	3.3
Strongly Disagree	0.0
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=418

Table 10: Percentages for the Ideal Martial Scale.

Total Score*	%
20	5.5
19	12.9
18	17.4
17	17.9
16	14.3
15	11.7
14	9.3
13	3.8
12	1.9
11	1.9
10	1.4
9	0.2
8	0.5
7	0.2
6	0.2
3	0.2
2	0.2
0	0.5

\* Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

Table 11: Percentages for the Romantic Love Scale.

Total Score**	%
8	3.1
7	3.1
6	20.2
5	14.5
4	24.3
3	12.0
2	15.4
1	3.6
0	3.6

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)



Table 12: Percentages for questions from the Intimacy Scale by gender.

In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	25.0	Strongly Agree	46.9
Agree	64.4	Agree	49.1
Neutral	8.5	Neutral	3.5
Disagree	2.1	Disagree	0.4
Strongly Disagree	0.0	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=188		N=226

In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each other's problems.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	36.2	Strongly Agree	50.7
Agree	55.9	Agree	44.9
Neutral	7.4	Neutral	3.6
Disagree	0.5	Disagree	0.9
Strongly Disagree	0.0	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=188		N=225

In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	68.1	Strongly Agree	82.7
Agree	28.2	Agree	16.0
Neutral	3.2	Neutral	1.3
Disagree	0.5	Disagree	0.0
Strongly Disagree	0.0	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=188		N=225

In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	31.6	Strongly Agree	34.4
Agree	55.6	Agree	52.2
Neutral	11.2	Neutral	12.1
Disagree	1.1	Disagree	1.3
Strongly Disagree	0.5	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=187		N=224

Table 13: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale for male participants.

*Indicate the importance of the following as it is related to a romantic relationship*

Successfully resolving conflicts

Very Important	36.7
Important	48.4
Neutral	7.4
Unimportant	4.3
Very Unimportant	3.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

Spending as much time together as possible

Very Important	13.3
Important	46.8
Neutral	30.9
Unimportant	8.0
Very Unimportant	1.1
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

Being physically intimate as often as possible

Very Important	14.5
Important	47.8
Neutral	28.5
Unimportant	7.0
Very Unimportant	2.2
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=186

Having a positive relationship with your partner's family

Very Important	38.3
Important	44.7
Neutral	11.7
Unimportant	2.7
Very Unimportant	2.7
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

The ability to openly communication about anything

Very Important	62.8
Important	30.3
Neutral	3.7
Unimportant	1.6
Very Unimportant	1.6
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

The ability to consider you partner as your best friend

Very Important	42.0
Important	37.2
Neutral	13.8
Unimportant	4.8
Very Unimportant	2.1
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

Table 14: Percentages for questions from the Ideal Martial Scale for female participants.

*Indicate the importance of the following as it is related to a romantic relationship*

Successfully resolving conflicts

Very Important	57.5
Important	35.0
Neutral	4.9
Unimportant	0.9
Very Unimportant	1.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=226

Spending as much time together as possible

Very Important	16.3
Important	51.1
Neutral	25.6
Unimportant	6.2
Very Unimportant	0.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=227

Being physically intimate as often as possible

Very Important	8.4
Important	37.6
Neutral	35.4
Unimportant	17.3
Very Unimportant	1.3
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=226

Having a positive relationship with your partner's family

Very Important	45.8
Important	44.1
Neutral	8.8
Unimportant	0.4
Very Unimportant	0.9
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=227

The ability to openly communication about anything

Very Important	76.3
Important	21.1
Neutral	1.8
Unimportant	0.4
Very Unimportant	0.4
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=228

The ability to consider you partner as your best friend

Very Important	57.5
Important	36.4
Neutral	5.3
Unimportant	0.4
Very Unimportant	0.4
<hr/>	
	100.00%
	N=188

Table 15: Percentages for questions from the Romantic Love Scale by gender.

If love has completely disappeared from a marriage, I think it is probably best for the couple to make a clean break from each other and start new lives.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	8.5	Strongly Agree	4.5
Agree	28.7	Agree	25.1
Neutral	36.2	Neutral	36.8
Disagree	20.7	Disagree	28.7
Strongly Disagree	5.9	Strongly Disagree	4.9
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=188		N=223

In my opinion, the disappearance of love is not a sufficient reason for ending a marriage and should not be viewed as such.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	4.3	Strongly Agree	6.3
Agree	33.2	Agree	30.5
Neutral	36.4	Neutral	30.9
Disagree	18.7	Disagree	25.6
Strongly Disagree	7.5	Strongly Disagree	6.7
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=187		N=223

If a man/woman has all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him/her?

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Yes	7.3	Yes	1.9
No	92.7	No	98.1
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=151		N=206

Table 16: Percentages for questions from the Eros Love Style Scale by gender.

My partner fits my ideals standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	23.7	Strongly Agree	24.7
Agree	60.2	Agree	50.2
Neutral	13.4	Neutral	17.2
Disagree	2.2	Disagree	7.9
Strongly Disagree	0.5	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=186		N=227

I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	11.9	Strongly Agree	20.3
Agree	40.0	Agree	37.4
Neutral	36.2	Neutral	31.3
Disagree	11.4	Disagree	7.9
Strongly Disagree	0.5	Strongly Disagree	3.1
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=185		N=227

My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.

MALE	%	FEMALE	%
Strongly Agree	18.3	Strongly Agree	35.2
Agree	57.5	Agree	47.1
Neutral	21.5	Neutral	13.7
Disagree	2.7	Disagree	4.0
Strongly Disagree	0.0	Strongly Disagree	0.0
	100.00%		100.00%
	N=186		N=227

Table 17: Means and standard deviations for television variables.

<b>Television Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Used in Scale</b>
In a typical day, how much time do you spend watching television?***	137.08	107.02	419	N/A
Think back to when you were growing up, how many days per week did you watch prime-time television?	4.58	1.85	419	N/A
On the average day, how much time to you watch reality shows?***	69.36	100.24	417	N/A
On the average day, how much time to you watch soap operas?***	14.07	67.90	417	N/A
On the average day, how much time to you watch sitcoms?***	84.00	108.73	417	N/A
On the average day, how much time to you watch prime time television?***	33.00	67.48	417	N/A
<b>Please indicate how often you watch each of the below types of television shows.</b>				
Romantic Comedies *	2.26	1.14	419	Genre Specific
Soap operas *	0.54	1.00	418	Genre Specific
Daytime talk shows *	0.98	1.06	419	Genre Specific
Reality-based shows about relationships *	1.42	1.34	419	Genre Specific
<b>Television Perception Variables</b>				
Television shows life as it really is.*	1.01	0.777	420	TV Perception
Television lets me see how other people live their lives.*	1.57	0.936	419	TV Perception
Television characters who how interactions between people really are.*	1.27	0.816	419	TV Perception
Romantic interactions between males and females on television imitates an ideal relationship.*	1.55	3.027	419	N/A

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicates more television viewing)

\*\*Reponses were coded in minutes

Table 18: Television Cultivation Measures.

Television – General	
Light Viewing – Less than 90 min	32.70
Medium Viewing – 90 to 180 min	33.65
Heavy Viewing – More than 180 min	33.65
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=419)
Television Show Index	
Light Viewing – 0 shows	21.70
Medium Viewing – 1 to 2 shows	44.80
Heavy Viewing – 2 or more shows	33.40
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=420)
Reality Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	38.61
Medium Viewing – 1 to 45 min	11.51
Heavy Viewing – More than 60 min	49.88
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=417)
Soap Opera Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	89.00
Heavy Viewing – More than 10 min	11.00
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=417)
Prime time Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	68.60
Heavy Viewing – More than 30 min	31.40
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=417)
Sitcom Television	
Light Viewing – 0 to 30 min	39.80
Medium Viewing – 45 to 90	26.90
Heavy Viewing – More than 120 min	33.30
	<hr/>
	100.00%
	(N=417)

Table 19: Television Cultivation Measures for Males.

Television – General	
Light Viewing – Less than 60 min	30.9
Medium Viewing – 90 to 165 min	35.5
Heavy Viewing – More than 180 min	33.6
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)
Television Show Index	
Light Viewing – 0 shows	33.0
Medium Viewing – 1 show	28.7
Heavy Viewing – 2 or more shows	38.3
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)
Reality Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	44.7
Medium Viewing – 5 to 30 min	12.7
Heavy Viewing – More than 60 min	42.6
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)
Soap Opera Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	95.7
Heavy Viewing – More than 10 min	4.3
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)
Prime time Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	79.3
Heavy Viewing – More than 30 min	20.7
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)
Sitcom Television	
Light Viewing – 0 to 20 min	32.4
Medium Viewing – 30 to 90	36.2
Heavy Viewing – More than 120 min	31.4
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=188)



Table 20: Television Cultivation Measures for Females.

Television – General	
Light Viewing – Less than 61 min	33.3
Medium Viewing – 75 to 150 min	32.5
Heavy Viewing – More than 180 min	34.2
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=228)
Television Show Index	
Light Viewing – Less than 1 show	31.1
Medium Viewing – Between 2 and 3 shows	38.6
Heavy Viewing – 4 or more shows	30.2
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=228)
Reality Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	33.5
Medium Viewing – 1 to 70 min	32.1
Heavy Viewing – More than 90 min	34.4
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=228)
Soap Opera Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	83.7
Heavy Viewing – More than 20 min	16.3
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=228)
Prime time Television	
Light Viewing – 0 min	59.9
Heavy Viewing – More than 30 min	40.1
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=227)
Sitcom Television	
Light Viewing – 0 to 25 min	23.8
Medium Viewing – 30 to 90	40.5
Heavy Viewing – More than 120 min	35.7
	<hr/>
	100.0%
	(N=227)

Table 21: Percentages of watched television programs.

Variables	%
King of Queens	
Yes	29.3
No	<u>70.7</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Sex and the City	
Yes	24.5
No	<u>75.5</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Lifetime Romance Programs	
Yes	13.1
No	<u>86.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Friends	
Yes	40.0
No	<u>60.0</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Daytime Soap Operas	
Yes	5.7
No	<u>94.3</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Desperate Housewives	
Yes	21.2
No	<u>78.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
MTV's The Real World	
Yes	50.7
No	<u>49.3</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
TLC's The Wedding Story	
Yes	7.6
No	<u>92.4</u>
	100.00%
	N=423
Wife Swap	
Yes	7.6
No	<u>94.8</u>
	100.00%
	N=423

Table 22: Magazine Readership.

Variable	Mean	S.D.	N
Of the following magazines, how many issues have you read in the past year?			
Cosmopolitan	2.17	3.53	417
Marie Claire	0.26	1.22	417
Glamor	0.64	2.00	417
Seventeen	1.24	2.78	417
YM	0.34	1.45	417
Details	0.07	0.80	417
Vougue	0.65	2.10	417
Maxim	0.95	2.32	417
Playboy	0.52	1.72	417
FHM	0.44	1.68	417
Stuff	0.39	1.65	417
Penthouse	0.15	1.00	417
Total Magazine Readership	7.77	11.02	415
Total Male Readership of Male Magazines	4.25	7.89	186
Total Female Readership of Female Magazines	9.22	10.03	226
Opposite Gender Magazine Readership			
Total Male Readership of Female Magazines	0.50	1.77	187
Total Female Readership of Male Magazines	1.11	4.73	227

Table 23: Means, standard deviations and alphas for collaborative scales.

<b>Scales</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Scale Range</b>	<b>Alpha</b>
Intimacy Scale	13.58	1.71	416	0-16	0.646
Fantasy Scale	7.53	2.44	416	0-12	0.646
Ideal Martial Scale	16.22	2.82	420	0-20	0.733*
Romantic Love Scale	4.09	1.84	415	0-8	0.800*
EROS Love Scale	8.60	1.89	414	0-12	0.620
Television Perception Scale	3.85	2.13	418	0-12	0.786*
Genre Specific Scale	5.19	3.30	418	0-16	0.700*

\*Acceptable alpha > .70

Table 24: Independent t-tests for intimacy scale variables by respondents' level of television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.24 (0.683)	3.29 (0.579)	0.566	274	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.39 (0.621)	3.36 (0.579)	0.339	237	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.78 (0.449)	3.72 (0.527)	1.078	266.96	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.18 (0.701)	3.110 (0.672)	0.672	271	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

Table 25: Independent t-tests for marriage variables by respondents' level of television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.67 (0.906)	2.89 (0.972)	1.833	275	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.18 (1.163)	2.41 (1.194)	1.673	273	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.52 (0.971)	2.42 (1.020)	0.789	272	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.36 (2.655)	16.14 (4.34)	0.692	273	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.08 (1.921)	4.34 (1.742)	1.149	271	Ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

Table 26: Independent t-tests for Eros Love Style questions and Television Perception Scale based on overall television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.05 (0.843)	2.90 (0.780)	1.549	275	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.48 (0.971)	2.69 (0.913)	1.865	275	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.14 (0.749)	2.94 (0.769)	2.147	274	p<.05
Television Perception Scale	3.39 (2.217)	4.24 (2.177)	3.213	276	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*

Table 27: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.19 (0.652)	3.43 (0.601)	2.854	228	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.31 (0.609)	3.42 (0.648)	1.317	227	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.65 (0.565)	3.78 (0.498)	1.743	175.64	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.13 (0.733)	3.23 (0.728)	1.956	226	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.58 (1.101)	3.03 (0.963)	3.277	229	p<.01
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	1.93 (1.162)	2.54 (1.147)	3.856	190.99	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.24 (1.036)	2.62 (0.986)	2.782	226	p<.01
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.43 (3.205)	16.45 (3.110)	2.391	228	p<.05
Romantic Love Scale***	3.93 (1.931)	4.20 (1.784)	1.059	225	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.90 (0.840)	2.91 (0.804)	0.075	227	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.51 (0.881)	2.63 (0.987)	0.935	226	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.86 (0.758)	3.16 (0.780)	2.894	228	p<.01
Television Perception Scale****	3.08 (2.099)	4.28 (2.209)	4.120	229	p<.01

\*Responses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).



Table 28: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of reality television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.20 (0.662)	3.37 (0.592)	2.548	365	p<.05
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.38 (0.632)	3.38 (0.620)	0.024	264	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.71 (0.493)	3.76 (0.504)	0.796	364	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.23 (0.682)	3.16 (0.719)	0.918	362	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.68 (1.081)	2.89 (0.926)	2.048	265	p<.05
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.19 (1.081)	2.40 (1.135)	1.706	364	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.41 (1.195)	2.49 (1.022)	0.703	363	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.18 (2.906)	16.28 (2.822)	0.332	364	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	3.93 (1.913)	4.24 (1.751)	1.608	360	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.03 (0.864)	2.92 (0.762)	1.259	364	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.60 (0.969)	2.59 (0.921)	0.053	363	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.94 (0.811)	3.08 (0.770)	1.686	364	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.16 (2.241)	4.38 (1.962)	5.559	366	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 29: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of soap opera television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.28 (0.627)	3.33 (0.634)	0.451	413	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.37 (0.626)	3.39 (0.577)	0.224	412	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.74 (0.498)	3.67 (0.560)	0.826	412	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.17 (0.688)	3.28 (0.750)	1.066	410	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.78 (1.011)	2.93 (0.975)	1.014	413	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.24 (1.170)	2.57 (1.167)	1.754	412	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.39 (1.028)	2.82 (0.806)	3.255	62.95	p<.01
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.16 (2.851)	16.49 (2.643)	0.742	412	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.13 (1.864)	3.89 (1.912)	0.814	408	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.00 (0.790)	2.72 (0.807)	2.304	412	p<.05
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.60 (0.926)	2.41 (1.002)	1.275	411	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.03 (0.756)	3.09 (0.839)	0.454	412	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.71 (2.111)	5.02 (1.891)	4.024	414	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 30: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of prime-time television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.25 (0.642)	3.37 (0.586)	1.932	413	p<.05
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.36 (0.638)	3.40 (0.579)	0.516	412	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.70 (0.536)	3.80 (0.650)	1.979	309.26	p<.05
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.17 (0.716)	3.19 (0.650)	0.279	410	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.73 (1.015)	2.92 (0.982)	1.803	413	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.17 (1.202)	2.52 (1.069)	2.817	412	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.38 (1.037)	2.57 (0.953)	1.745	411	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.01 (2.907)	16.60 (2.611)	1.987	412	p<.05
Romantic Love Scale***	4.22 (1.806)	3.84 (1.906)	1.960	408	p<.05
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.04 (0.770)	2.83 (0.837)	2.440	412	p<.05
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.56 (0.963)	2.62 (0.875)	0.540	411	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.02 (0.781)	3.08 (0.730)	0.682	412	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.59 (2.139)	4.43 (1.989)	3.794	414	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 31: Independent t-tests for romance variables by respondents' level of sitcom television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.26 (0.652)	3.31 (0.612)	0.729	301	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.34 (0.649)	3.44 (0.579)	1.454	301	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.70 (0.498)	3.73 (0.519)	0.557	301	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.15 (0.652)	3.25 (0.735)	1.184	274.38	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.72 (1.005)	2.96 (0.909)	2.254	303	p<.05
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.14 (1.187)	2.56 (1.143)	3.128	301	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.38 (2.867)	2.52 (0.973)	1.202	301	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.05 (2.867)	16.44 (2.673)	1.217	301	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.05 (1.890)	4.25 (1.795)	1.217	297	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.05 (0.849)	2.88 (0.835)	1.687	301	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.52 (0.956)	2.65 (0.915)	1.206	301	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.91 (0.824)	3.09 (0.766)	1.866	301	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.64 (2.078)	4.29 (2.106)	2.678	303	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 32: Independent t-tests for media variables by respondents' gender.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Female Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Male Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
Overall TV Viewing (min.)	142.43 (115.17)	132.14 (96.256)	0.977	414	ns
Sitcoms (min.)	91.62 (121.16)	75.37 (91.497)	1.515	413	ns
Soap operas (min.)	21.31 (86.154)	5.16 (33.598)	2.697	304.23	p<.01
Reality TV (min.)	79.95 (106.275)	56.99 (91.578)	2.363	412.34	p<.05
Female Magazine Index	9.22 (10.026)	0.50 (1.770)	12.831	241.886	p<.01
Male Magazine Index	1.04 (4.608)	4.19 (7.783)	4.870	287.16	p<.01
TV Show Index	2.54 (1.709)	1.32 (1.281)	8.286	410.44	p<.01
Genre-Specific Scale	6.47 (3.263)	3.65 (2.587)	9.803	411.68	p<.01
Television Perception Scale	4.07 (2.081)	3.60 (2.169)	2.227	413	p<.05

Table 33: Independent t-tests for romance and marriage variables by respondents' gender.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Female Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Male Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.42 (0.586)	3.12 (0.638)	4.982	384.14	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.45 (0.611)	3.28 (0.619)	2.909	411	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.81 (0.423)	3.64 (0.573)	3.471	337.84	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.20 (0.694)	3.17 (0.703)	0.443	409	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.98 (0.936)	2.57 (1.047)	4.215	376.99	p<.01
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.47 (1.161)	2.05 (1.148)	3.707	411	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.65 (0.966)	2.18 (1.019)	4.866	410	p<.01
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.76 (2.351)	15.51 (3.190)	4.590	411	p<.01
Romantic Love Scale***	4.00 (1.851)	4.21 (1.829)	1.146	407	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

Table 34: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of overall television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.29 (0.653)	3.45 (0.527)	1.677	150	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.39 (0.655)	3.51 (0.678)	1.113	149	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.83 (0.413)	3.80 (0.435)	0.420	149	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.08 (0.767)	3.21 (0.622)	1.170	148	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.86 (0.948)	3.10 (0.882)	1.679	151	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.36 (1.197)	2.65 (1.133)	1.571	149	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.63 (0.907)	2.69 (0.972)	0.404	149	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.75 (2.028)	17.05 (1.952)	0.946	149	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	3.95 (1.999)	4.25 (1.704)	1.018	147	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.95 (0.951)	2.86 (0.790)	0.639	151	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.51 (0.986)	2.74 (1.005)	1.410	151	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.22 (0.759)	3.00 (0.843)	1.724	151	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.65 (2.236)	4.44 (2.074)	0.819	152	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 35: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.34 (0.634)	3.59 (0.496)	2.527	136	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.41 (0.550)	3.46 (0.682)	0.516	136	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.86 (0.350)	3.85 (0.399)	0.132	136	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.20 (0.689)	3.27 (0.665)	0.619	136	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.89 (1.015)	3.17 (0.857)	1.808	137	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.24 (1.247)	2.81 (0.988)	2.946	136	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.51 (0.998)	2.82 (0.920)	1.917	136	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.55 (2.076)	16.75 (2.934)	0.459	135	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	3.90 (1.881)	3.98 (1.843)	0.265	134	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.92 (0.952)	2.76 (0.866)	0.975	137	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.69 (0.980)	2.65 (1.004)	0.256	137	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.06 (0.809)	3.14 (0.827)	0.641	138	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.65 (1.972)	4.36 (2.216)	2.017	138	p<.05

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).



Table 36: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of reality television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.29 (0.653)	3.55 (0.527)	2.623	150	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.46 (0.576)	3.49 (0.683)	0.257	150	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.78 (0.450)	3.86 (0.390)	1.156	150	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.20 (0.697)	3.22 (0.704)	0.208	149	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.93 (1.018)	3.18 (0.833)	1.639	151	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.33 (1.248)	2.63 (1.118)	1.575	150	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.61 (0.939)	2.66 (1.027)	0.330	150	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.68 (1.877)	16.50 (2.984)	0.452	149	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	3.87 (2.015)	4.24 (1.886)	1.177	147	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.00 (0.894)	2.82 (0.773)	1.346	151	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.68 (0.969)	2.57 (1.093)	0.676	151	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.03 (0.788)	3.14 (0.833)	0.872	151	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.45 (2.100)	4.41 (2.098)	2.846	152	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 37: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of soap opera television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.44 (0.586)	3.35 (0.588)	0.804	223	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.46 (0.615)	3.41 (0.599)	0.494	222	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.83 (0.405)	3.73 (0.508)	1.301	222	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.17 (0.692)	3.30 (0.702)	1.004	221	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.98 (0.934)	2.97 (0.957)	0.035	224	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.45 (1.160)	2.59 (1.189)	0.694	222	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.62 (0.978)	2.86 (0.855)	1.417	222	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.75 (2.373)	16.83 (2.299)	0.676	222	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.02 (1.847)	3.89 (1.911)	0.930	219	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.95 (0.849)	2.73 (0.871)	1.418	224	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.67 (0.973)	2.46 (1.070)	1.165	224	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.13 (0.784)	3.16 (0.866)	0.208	224	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.89 (2.069)	5.03 (1.893)	3.144	225	p<.05

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 38: Independent t-tests for romance variables by female respondents' level of sitcom television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.33 (0.700)	3.45 (0.571)	1.057	132	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.40 (0.631)	3.53 (0.573)	1.219	131	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.74 (0.445)	3.81 (0.453)	0.962	131	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.08 (0.646)	3.32 (0.690)	2.018	130	p<.05
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.93 (0.821)	3.07 (0.905)	0.966	133	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.21 (1.215)	2.80 (1.118)	2.890	131	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.55 (0.911)	2.71 (0.957)	0.994	131	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	16.47 (2.224)	16.75 (2.776)	0.611	131	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.02 (2.034)	4.19 (1.769)	0.509	129	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.00 (0.952)	2.79 (0.996)	1.313	132	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.63 (0.938)	2.68 (1.028)	0.259	132	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.96 (0.823)	3.16 (0.834)	1.366	132	ns
Television Perception Scale****	4.28 (2.069)	4.47 (2.110)	0.947	129	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 39: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of overall television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.17 (0.729)	3.08 (0.576)	0.782	119	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.40 (0.591)	3.19 (0.535)	2.015	119	p<.05
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.72 (0.488)	3.62 (0.607)	1.044	119	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.33 (0.574)	2.98 (0.713)	2.897	118	p<.01
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.43 (1.110)	2.63 (1.021)	1.053	119	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	1.95 (1.115)	2.13 (1.211)	0.842	119	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.36 (1.055)	2.10 (0.987)	1.424	118	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.79 (3.275)	15.03 (3.079)	1.318	119	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.22 (1.817)	4.42 (1.793)	0.623	119	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.17 (0.653)	2.95 (0.771)	1.687	119	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.45 (0.958)	2.63 (0.789)	1.173	119	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	3.00 (0.725)	2.87 (0.665)	1.017	118	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.07 (2.215)	4.00 (2.293)	2.268	119	p<.05

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 40: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of viewing romantic television programs based on the TV Show Index.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.13 (0.614)	3.10 (0.675)	0.284	132	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.29 (0.637)	3.29 (0.542)	0.013	132	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.56 (0.617)	3.72 (0.510)	1.620	132	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.10 (0.762)	3.18 (0.703)	0.679	131	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.44 (1.088)	2.85 (0.988)	2.246	131	p<.05
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	1.82 (1.048)	2.26 (1.199)	2.251	132	p<.05
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.19 (1.022)	2.14 (0.961)	0.306	131	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.03 (3.562)	15.71 (3.042)	1.185	132	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.08 (1.910)	4.45 (1.670)	1.311	132	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	2.83 (0.805)	3.10 (0.653)	2.077	130	p<.01
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.40 (0.906)	2.76 (0.746)	2.499	129	p<.05
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.74 (0.728)	3.01 (0.621)	2.354	130	p<.05
Television Perception Scale****	2.92 (2.152)	4.08 (2.163)	3.106	131	p<.05

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 41: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of reality television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.12 (0.666)	3.13 (0.624)	0.059	162	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.31 (0.676)	3.28 (0.551)	0.358	162	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.65 (0.526)	3.64 (0.621)	0.405	162	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.25 (0.674)	3.09 (0.771)	0.393	161	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.46 (1.097)	2.65 (0.943)	0.167	161	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.06 (1.144)	2.11 (1.169)	0.969	162	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.24 (1.043)	2.16 (1.024)	0.714	161	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.74 (3.533)	15.41 (2.928)	0.058	162	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	3.96 (1.824)	4.34 (1.728)	1.342	161	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.04 (0.838)	3.06 (0.623)	0.223	160	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.51 (0.972)	2.54 (0.765)	0.232	159	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.84 (0.824)	2.98 (0.656)	1.140	160	ns
Television Perception Scale****	2.90 (2.357)	4.23 (1.832)	3.983	161	p<.01

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 42: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of soap opera television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.12 (0.631)	3.13 (0.835)	0.012	186	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.28 (0.626)	3.25 (0.463)	0.124	186	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.64 (0.566)	3.50 (0.756)	0.697	186	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.16 (0.688)	3.25 (1.035)	0.346	185	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.56 (1.049)	2.63 (1.061)	0.160	185	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.03 (1.148)	2.38 (1.188)	0.823	186	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.16 (1.031)	2.57 (0.535)	1.045	185	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.53 (3.172)	15.00 (3.780)	0.462	186	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.22 (1.824)	4.12 (2.031)	0.140	185	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.06 (0.719)	2.75 (0.463)	1.192	184	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.53 (0.873)	2.25 (0.707)	0.879	183	ns
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.92 (0.709)	2.75 (0.707)	0.669	184	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.54 (2.152)	5.13 (2.100)	2.045	185	p<.05

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).

Table 43: Independent t-tests for romance variables by male respondents' level of sitcom television viewing.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Light Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Heavy Viewers Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.15 (0.628)	3.12 (0.618)	0.254	118	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.33 (0.701)	3.32 (0.571)	0.050	118	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.64 (0.549)	3.63 (0.584)	0.118	118	ns
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.28 (0.636)	3.16 (0.790)	0.942	117	ns
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	2.56 (1.133)	2.81 (0.900)	1.369	118	ns
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	1.95 (1.203)	2.24 (1.104)	1.358	118	ns
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.16 (1.052)	2.25 (0.939)	0.495	118	ns
Ideal Marital Scale **	15.51 (3.581)	16.02 (2.489)	0.901	118	ns
Romantic Love Scale***	4.08 (1.934)	4.32 (1.942)	0.689	117	ns
My partner fits the ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.*	3.05 (0.649)	3.02 (0.731)	0.261	117	ns
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.*	2.32 (0.911)	2.63 (0.740)	2.038	117	p<.05
My partner and I have the right physical chemistry.*	2.72 (0.825)	2.98 (0.656)	1.947	117	ns
Television Perception Scale****	3.29 (2.171)	4.034 (2.092)	1.897	118	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

\*\*\*\*Additive Index of questions (range from 0 to 12, higher number indicates a stronger view of television as reality).



Table 44: Independent t-tests for television variables by respondents' current love status.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>In Love Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Not In Love Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
Sitcoms (min.)	89.59 (123.94)	78.93 (98.170)	0.931	374	ns
Soap operas (min.)	13.23 (43.246)	16.07 (86.997)	0.385	374	ns
Reality TV (min.)	67.71 (97.370)	67.64 (93.017)	0.007	374	ns
Female Magazine Index	6.67 (10.514)	4.48 (7.243)	2.380	373	p<.01
Male Magazine Index	2.11 (7.095)	2.83 (5.953)	1.065	373	ns
TV Show Index	2.17 (1.645)	1.85 (1.676)	1.863	375	ns
Genre-Specific Scale	5.79 (3.265)	4.85 (3.320)	2.770	373	p<.01
Television Perception Scale	3.86 (2.187)	3.88 (2.058)	0.077	377	ns

Table 45: Independent t-tests for romance and marriage variables by respondents' current love status.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Female Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>Male Means (&amp; SD)</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>significance</b>
In a romantic relationship, you have a feeling of mutual understanding.*	3.40 (0.611)	3.21 (0.624)	2.920	374	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be interested in each others problems.*	3.53 (0.568)	3.26 (0.636)	4.265	374	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should be able to trust your partner completely.*	3.85 (0.405)	3.65 (0.527)	4.129	373	p<.01
In a romantic relationship, you should know your partner's innermost feelings.*	3.27 (0.740)	3.12 (0.623)	1.998	373	p<.05
I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.*	3.02 (0.994)	2.65 (1.015)	3.490	374	p<.01
I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.*	2.59 (1.147)	2.03 (1.130)	4.777	374	p<.01
I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.*	2.71 (0.970)	2.24 (1.001)	4.649	373	p<.01
Ideal Marital Scale **	17.06 (2.849)	15.57 (2.677)	5.189	373	p<.01
Romantic Love Scale***	4.08 (1.794)	4.16 (1.880)	0.444	370	ns

\*Reponses were coded: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=neutral, 1=disagree, 0=strongly disagree (higher numbers indicate more romantic answer)

\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 20, higher number indicates more fantasized view of romantic relationships)

\*\*\*Additive index of questions (range from 0 to 8, higher number indicates greater view that romance plays a key part in a marriage)

Table 46: Pearson correlation coefficients for female's who read both male and female orientated magazines with the romance and marriage variables.

VARIABLES	Feeling of mutual understanding	Interested in each other's problems	Trust partner completely	Know inner most feelings	Wedding day happiest day of life	Often think about marriage	Often talk about romantic relationships	Ideal Marital Scale	Romantic Love Scale
Female Magazine Index*	-0.059	-0.033	0.050	-0.007	0.082	0.060	0.051	-0.044	0.166 <sup>1</sup>
Cosmopolitan**	-0.025	-0.020	0.020	-0.035	-0.029	0.025	0.062	-0.040	0.176 <sup>1</sup>
Marie Claire**	-0.044	-0.100	0.017	-0.041	0.086	0.035	-0.006	-0.032	0.057
Glamour**	0.009	0.070	0.067	-0.009	0.102	0.074	0.011	-0.002	0.103
Seventeen**	0.016	-0.055	0.114	0.062	0.113	0.069	0.056	-0.002	0.073
YM**	0.001	-0.007	0.007	0.047	0.138 <sup>2</sup>	0.065	0.105	-0.010	0.105
Vogue**	-0.167 <sup>2</sup>	-0.055	-.059	-0.057	-0.023	-0.014	-0.048	-0.059	0.097
Male Magazine Index*	-0.186 <sup>1</sup>	0.068	-0.082	-0.086	-0.199 <sup>1</sup>	-0.103	-0.113	-0.158 <sup>2</sup>	0.154 <sup>2</sup>
Playboy**	-0.119	0.062	-0.049	-0.056	-0.149 <sup>2</sup>	-0.053	-0.044	-0.137 <sup>2</sup>	0.115
Maxim**	-0.194 <sup>1</sup>	0.032	-0.041	-0.049	-0.127	-0.054	-0.137 <sup>2</sup>	-0.106	0.232 <sup>1</sup>
FHM**	-0.218 <sup>1</sup>	0.062	-0.071	-0.120	-0.235 <sup>1</sup>	-0.094	-0.141 <sup>2</sup>	-0.125	0.094
Stuff**	-0.123	0.087	-0.087	-0.082	-0.183 <sup>1</sup>	-.0151 <sup>2</sup>	-0.074	-0.166 <sup>1</sup>	0.114
Penthouse**	-0.148 <sup>2</sup>	0.064	-0.137 <sup>2</sup>	-0.080	-0.198 <sup>1</sup>	-0.134 <sup>2</sup>	-0.095	-0.169 <sup>1</sup>	0.072

<sup>1</sup>p<.01

<sup>2</sup>p<.05

\* Additive Index of the total number of magazines read.

\*\*Responses were coded: 0=no to reading the magazine, 1=yes to reading the magazine

Table 47: Pearson correlation coefficients for male's who read both male and female orientated magazines with the romance and marriage variables.

VARIABLES	Feeling of mutual understanding	Interested in each other's problems	Trust partner completely	Know inner most feelings	Wedding day happiest day of life	Often think about marriage	Often talk about romantic relationships	Ideal Marital Scale	Romantic Love Scale
Female Magazine Index	0.064	0.014	0.086	-0.018	0.036	-0.007	0.010	0.014	0.079
Cosmopolitan**	0.093	0.050	0.130	-0.029	0.094	0.051	0.092	0.038	0.036
Marie Claire**	-0.014	-0.033	-0.082	-0.017	0.102	-0.003	-0.085	-0.035	0.072
Glamour**	0.003	0.001	-0.061	0.018	0.124	-0.016	-0.073	-0.016	0.035
Seventeen**	-0.030	0.038	0.060	0.028	0.023	-0.045	0.061	0.059	0.043
YM**	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Vogue**	0.015	-0.037	0.023	-0.009	-0.112	-0.053	-0.051	-0.021	0.067
Male Magazine Index	0.061	-0.177 <sup>2</sup>	0.018	-0.083	0.147 <sup>2</sup>	-0.049	0.053	0.025	-0.057
Playboy**	-0.025	-0.142	-0.027	-0.083	0.017	-0.092	-0.008	-0.047	0.004
Maxim**	0.085	-0.120	0.007	-0.103	0.183 <sup>2</sup>	-0.054	0.064	0.024	0.037
FHM**	0.024	-0.148 <sup>2</sup>	0.030	-0.007	0.112	-0.025	0.061	0.017	-0.128
Stuff**	0.054	-0.125	0.033	-0.017	0.113	0.016	0.075	0.081	-0.153 <sup>2</sup>
Penthouse**	0.082	-0.081	0.032	-0.083	0.047	0.004	-0.063	0.001	0.054

<sup>1</sup>p<.01

<sup>2</sup>p<.05

\* Additive Index of the total number of magazines read.

\*\*Responses were coded: 0=no to reading the magazine, 1=yes to reading the magazine

Table 48: Pearson correlation coefficients for television viewing variables and romance variables.

VARIABLES	Feeling of mutual understanding	Interested in each other's problems	Trust partner completely	Know inner most feelings	Wedding day happiest day of life	Often think about marriage	Often talk about romantic relationships	Ideal Marital Scale	Romantic Love Scale	Partner is ideal physical standards	Partner and I are meant for each other	Partner and I have right physical chemistry
Reality Shows Time (min.)	0.064	-0.026	0.006	-.095	0.072	0.054	0.029	-.035	0.068	-.064	0.010	0.016
Soap Opera Time (min.)	0.010	-.075	-.016	0.025	-.009	0.054	0.080	0.032	0.000	-.085	-.038	-.035
Sitcom Time (min.)	0.035	0.087	0.017	0.028	0.061	0.135 <sup>1</sup>	0.106 <sup>2</sup>	0.074	0.098 <sup>2</sup>	-.065	0.066	0.070
TV Show Index	0.171 <sup>1</sup>	0.984	0.091	0.060	0.215 <sup>1</sup>	0.228 <sup>1</sup>	0.165 <sup>1</sup>	0.126 <sup>1</sup>	0.042	-.050	0.069	0.135 <sup>1</sup>
Sex and the City**	0.108 <sup>2</sup>	0.074	0.090	0.011	0.099 <sup>2</sup>	0.093	0.117 <sup>2</sup>	0.047	0.052	-.067	0.039	0.130 <sup>1</sup>
Lifetime Romance Movies**	0.125 <sup>2</sup>	0.078	0.050	0.066	0.184 <sup>1</sup>	0.169 <sup>1</sup>	0.129 <sup>1</sup>	0.157 <sup>1</sup>	-.035	-.060	-.016	-.021
Friends**	0.068	0.074	0.052	0.048	0.064	0.161 <sup>1</sup>	0.130 <sup>1</sup>	0.022	0.046	-.098 <sup>2</sup>	0.027	0.117 <sup>2</sup>
Daytime Soap Operas**	0.050	0.017	-.032	0.026	0.080	0.134 <sup>1</sup>	0.071	0.072	-.052	-.057	0.000	0.027
Desperate Housewives**	0.024	0.014	0.004	-.001	0.215 <sup>1</sup>	0.098 <sup>2</sup>	0.051	0.041	-.023	-.021	0.080	0.034
MTV's The Real World**	0.150 <sup>1</sup>	0.011	0.089	0.045	0.154 <sup>1</sup>	0.056	0.027	0.051	0.082	0.025	-.038	0.084
TLC's The Wedding Story**	0.169 <sup>1</sup>	0.088	0.082	0.030	0.085	0.154 <sup>1</sup>	0.124 <sup>2</sup>	0.126 <sup>2</sup>	-.019	-.048	0.019	0.079
Wife Swap**	0.096 <sup>2</sup>	0.031	.087	0.017	0.037	0.108 <sup>2</sup>	0.128 <sup>1</sup>	0.025	0.000	0.007	0.082	0.044
King of Queens**	-.011	-.005	0.060	0.018	0.004	0.074	0.002	0.056	0.046	0.079	0.114 <sub>2</sub>	0.049
Genre-Specific Scale	0.201 <sup>1</sup>	0.149 <sup>1</sup>	0.037	0.063	0.257 <sup>1</sup>	0.272 <sup>1</sup>	0.294 <sup>1</sup>	0.164 <sup>1</sup>	-.012	-.043	0.102 <sub>2</sub>	0.108 <sup>2</sup>
Television Perception Scale	0.078	0.045	- 0.111 <sub>2</sub>	0.047	0.152 <sup>1</sup>	0.215 <sup>1</sup>	0.152 <sup>1</sup>	0.030	0.022	0.022	0.105 <sub>2</sub>	0.075

<sup>1</sup>p<.01

<sup>2</sup>p<.05

Table 49: Pearson correlation coefficients for female's television viewing and romance variables.

VARIABLES	Feeling of mutual understanding	Interested in each other's problems	Trust partner completely	Know inner most feelings	Wedding day happiest day of life	Often think about marriage	Often talk about romantic relationships	Ideal Marital Scale	Romantic Love Scale
Reality Shows Time (min.)	0.060	-0.025	0.068	-0.031	0.011	0.124	0.037	-0.045	0.114
Soap Opera Time (min.)	-0.062	-0.131 <sup>2</sup>	-0.050	-0.003	-0.033	0.012	0.047	0.037	0.023
Sitcom Time (min.)	0.006	0.110	0.031	0.045	0.058	0.065	0.107	0.026	0.182 <sup>1</sup>
TV Show Index	0.129	0.036	-0.033	0.042	0.114	0.172 <sup>1</sup>	0.117	0.045	0.055
Sex and the City**	0.031	0.013	-0.015	-0.039	-0.044	-0.021	-0.005	-0.119	0.054
Lifetime Romance Movies**	0.043	0.040	-0.027	0.056	0.136 <sup>1</sup>	0.135 <sup>2</sup>	0.063	0.117	-0.007
Friends**	-0.009	0.036	-0.043	0.000	-0.057	0.081	0.121	-0.062	0.056
Daytime Soap Operas**	0.007	-0.010	-0.094	0.010	0.085	0.129	0.030	0.103	-0.073
Desperate Housewives**	-0.012	-0.045	-0.076	-0.002	0.197 <sup>1</sup>	0.108	0.026	0.000	-0.039
MTV's The Real World**	0.149 <sup>2</sup>	0.030	0.112	0.058	0.147 <sup>2</sup>	0.084	0.019	0.036	0.155 <sup>2</sup>
TLC's The Wedding Story**	0.119	0.073	0.071	0.029	0.050	0.114	0.094	0.141 <sup>2</sup>	-0.008
Wife Swap**	0.139 <sup>2</sup>	-0.019	-0.192 <sup>2</sup>	-0.033	-0.013	0.058	0.120	0.036	-0.029
King of Queens**	0.099	0.023	0.041	0.081	-0.031	0.054	0.050	0.028	0.037
Genre-Specific Scale	0.098	0.096	-0.063	0.072	0.199 <sup>1</sup>	0.193 <sup>1</sup>	0.221 <sup>1</sup>	0.116	0.052

<sup>1</sup>p<.01

<sup>2</sup>p<.05

\* Responses were coded: 4=very frequently, 3=frequently, 2=neutral, 1=infrequently, 0=very infrequently

\*\*Responses were coded: 0=no to watching the program, 1=yes to watching the program

Table 50: Pearson correlation coefficients for male's television viewing and romance variables.

VARIABLES	Feeling of mutual understanding	Interested in each other's problems	Trust partner completely	Know inner most feelings	Wedding day happiest day of life	Often think about marriage	Often talk about romantic relationships	Ideal Marital Scale	Romantic Love Scale
Reality Shows Time (min.)	-0.004	-0.066	-0.094	0.191 <sup>1</sup>	0.040	-0.007	-0.040	-0.088	0.025
Soap Opera Time (min.)	0.088	-0.022	-0.019	0.115	-0.062	0.111	0.085	-0.057	-0.030
Sitcom Time (min.)	0.013	0.034	-0.022	0.001	0.101	0.135	0.066	0.110	-0.017
TV Show Index	0.027	0.031	0.101	0.065	0.215 <sup>1</sup>	0.197 <sup>1</sup>	0.048	0.069	0.083
Sex and the City**	0.042	0.081	0.121	0.080	0.191 <sup>1</sup>	0.175 <sup>1</sup>	0.156 <sup>2</sup>	0.115	0.106
Lifetime Romance Movies**	0.157 <sup>2</sup>	0.067	0.063	0.088	0.192 <sup>1</sup>	0.154 <sup>2</sup>	0.117	0.134	-0.071
Friends**	0.045	0.065	0.096	0.100	0.121	0.213 <sup>1</sup>	0.055	0.033	0.062
Daytime Soap Operas**	-0.016	-0.032	-0.082	0.088	-0.110	0.062	0.115	0.196 <sup>1</sup>	0.072
Desperate Housewives**	-0.041	0.003	-0.014	-0.046	0.154 <sup>2</sup>	-0.058	-0.041	-0.050	0.041
MTV's The Real World**	0.060	0.062	0.014	0.020	0.098	-0.038	-0.048	0.004	0.013
TLC's The Wedding Story**	0.207 <sup>1</sup>	0.054	0.029	0.019	0.062	0.190 <sup>1</sup>	0.083	0.024	-0.017
Wife Swap**	-0.036	0.088	-0.011	0.104	0.069	0.169 <sup>2</sup>	0.083	-0.046	0.071
King of Queens**	-0.145 <sup>2</sup>	-0.034	0.083	-0.053	0.047	0.110	-0.041	0.100	0.054
Genre-Specific Scale	0.109	0.105	0.007	0.040	0.181 <sup>2</sup>	0.290 <sup>1</sup>	0.231 <sup>1</sup>	0.064	-0.031

<sup>1</sup>p<.01

<sup>2</sup>p<.05

\* Responses were coded: 4=very frequently, 3=frequently, 2=neutral, 1=infrequently, 0=very infrequently

\*\*Responses were coded: 0=no to watching the program, 1=yes to watching the program

## **CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION**

This study examined the relationship between different media and expectations about romantic relationships and marriage. Participants were asked to complete a survey that measured different romantic constructs and the types of media exposures on a daily and weekly basis. The variables were measured to determine the effect the media play in a person's perceptions on romantic relationships and marriage. The results of the study concluded that although general television viewing does not predict perceptions about romance and marriage, the romantic genre of television programs as well as different styles of magazines do have a role in predicting romantic perceptions.

In general, this study provided empirical evidence that participants feel marriage is based on falling in love. As previously studied by Kephart (1967) and Simpson et al. (1986), this study found support that falling in love was a mandatory precondition for marriage. Also, participants felt that marriage was an institution intended to last a lifetime. This outcome suggests that students may not understand the potential stages that a marriage could take throughout its course. According to Larson (1988), marital satisfaction and the feeling of falling in love does change throughout the life span. However, at the current state, the participants may not see the long-term implications of falling in love and staying married.

### **Cultivation Results**

The first part of this study looked at the heart of cultivation theory. Gerbner argues throughout all of his findings that television has a common theme throughout all types of programs (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 2002). However, most of his studies were related to television violence and not romantic relationships. The three cultivation-



based hypotheses were not supported in this study. Therefore, it is an important to note that romance may not be one of the themes found in all types of programs and may not apply to cultivation studies that involve romance or marriage. Segrin and Nabi (2002) also found that overall television viewing is not a good predictor of idealistic expectations of marriage or marital intentions. This does not mean cultivation does not exist; rather it means that cultivation theory may only apply to themes that can be found across all genres of programming, which may include violence.

Despite not finding a significant cultivation effect, the study did find a general cultivation effect based on the television perception scale, which measured the perceived reality of television. Those who viewed more television felt that television presented a truthful view of society. The perception of television varied among heavy and light television viewers, which provides additional evidence that cultivation effects may not be a valid measurement for all types of genres, specifically romance. Nonetheless, those who watched more television do perceive reality through a false prism.

However, overall television viewing was significant with one of the Eros Love Style questions. The Eros Love Scale was not reliable as scale, which suggests that each of the three variables measure something different. Despite the fact that only one of the variables was significant, it may not be merely chance. The importance of a physical chemistry with a one's romantic partner is significant with overall television viewing. Although romance may not be considered a common theme throughout television, sex tends to be found throughout more types of programs (Kunkel et al., 2003). Therefore, it would not be unrealistic to think television influences a person's idea that finding a partner with the *right physical chemistry* is socially important and necessary.

## **Genre-Specific Cultivation Results**

Although there was no support for the first three cultivation hypotheses, there is support for the hypotheses rooted in genre-specific cultivation effects. This indicates that specific types of television programs viewed plays an influential role in a person's perceptions and attitudes regarding romance and marriage. The exposure to romantic genre of television supports previous studies conducted by Hawkins and Pingree (1981) and Segrin and Nabi (2002) and provides an additional link in supporting the genre-specific cultivation effects.

Specifically, the questions from the fantasy scale and the ideal marital scale all indicate heavy viewers of romantic themed television programs have a more idealized perception of marriage and the idea of falling in love. This suggests that television does hold a consistent theme across the genre-specific programs, which include programs that consider romantic, and the theme tends to portray an inconsistent view of marriage to its viewers. Heavy viewers tend to hold the symbols of love that were constructed by the media in the early 1920s, which include falling in love is the only way to be happy and a wedding being the happiest day of ones life (Illouz, 1997). These perceptions are found when comparing the means of heavy television viewers of specific romantic programs, prime-time television programming, and slightly with both sitcoms and soap operas.

Planning a wedding rather than having a marriage was an important difference. Participants who watched more romantic types of shows indicated they fantasized more about their wedding day or the general idea of getting married. Television shows present marriage as a glamorous event in one's life; however, rarely do they show the effects marriage has on two people. Also, it is important to note that those who watched more romantic television shows also viewed love as the only reason two people should get married and stay married. Deciding to

marry another person based on your emotional connection, falling in love, has become an acceptable reason, but television programs that are consistent with this message do not always provide the full picture of marriage. They may be showing the wedding day as the happiest day of person's life, yet they also may be leaving out the marriage. In today's society, love is the reason to marry, but love may fade in and out throughout the course of marriage, and two people need to understand the importance that of the desire and effort to stay married becomes when love begins to fade (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; 1988). This study did not find a link or connection on why love fades over time and then re-appears, but what it did find is a small relationship between watching a lot romance television programs and perceptions of love. Those who perceive television romance as reality may have less of a chance to understand the actual relationship between two people.

Another important finding is the relationship between heavy viewers of specific television programs and the idea of wanting a romantic partner to have the *right physical chemistry*. As previously mentioned, sex may be more common across all types of genres and television programs. The theme of sex is prevalent in much of the television that teens and young adults consume (Kunkel et al., 2003). Therefore, the idea of having the right physical chemistry is important to note when discussing genre-specific cultivation effects. Romance in television may cause a person to think more idealistic about marriage, but with beautiful people on television having a passionate connection with another person can also encourage the desire for finding a physical connection with another person. The idea of having a physical connection with another person is based on Lee's (1973) Eros love style, which is passionate and romantic love.

The Eros love style is based on passion and an immediate chemistry before two people. When looking at the genders separately, it was interesting to see the relationship male

participants of the study had with the Eros Love Style. Males who watched more romantic television programs were more likely to score higher on the Eros Love Style questions than males who watched less romantic television programs. Males who watched more romantic television programs were more likely to perceive their wedding day as the happiest day of their life and they also find themselves talking about how nice it would be to be married. It is interesting because women tend to fantasize more about relationship and marriage; however, this study provides support that men who watch what most consider “female television programs” may have more idealized perceptions of marriage. There are many reasons why these men are considered more romantic, which can not be determined by this study because it can not show causation.

### **Social Cognitive Theory Results**

One part of Social Cognitive Theory looks at the effects models play in shaping attitudes and perceptions. For this study, the researcher used models both on television and in magazines. Females who read traditional male magazines had a negative relationship with the romance and marriage variables. This indicates that females who read more male magazines are less likely to be considered romantic. The types of male magazines used in the study included *Maxim*, *Playboy*, *FHM*, and *Penthouse*. Women who say they read these types of magazines are less likely to be romantic or have idealized perceptions of marriage. This is important to consider because the women who read these types of magazines may hold prior attitudes about marriage or do not enjoy reading magazines such as *Cosmopolitan* or *Vogue*.

When looking at television, the idea of modeling was based on overall television consumption of certain television programs as well as the television consumption based on

gender. There is a relationship with overall genre specific television consumption and perceptions of romance and marriage. Those who watch characters on television tend to perceive romance and marriage in the same context, meaning that there is a modeling effect for those who watch particular romantic television programs.

The idea of getting married is an important theme that shines through for those who watch more romantic television programs. Weddings on television show happiness and excitement of the characters; however, it is rare that the wedding is turned into a marriage on television. This idea suggests that television shows marriage inconsistently, but that the wedding day is always going to be the happiest day of a person's life. Even on shows like *Sex and the City*, where romance is an underlying theme of the show, the idea of a wedding being the happiest day of your life has a significant relationship with those who watch the show. Equally important is the fact that talking about romantic relationship and thinking about marriage has with specific types of television programs. Romantic television programs may encourage a person to think, talk and desire to have certain types of relationship.

Females are also more likely to think about marriage and feel their wedding day will be the happiest day of their life. These relationships are significant with watching more Lifetime romance movies and the genre specific scale, which includes romantic reality shows, soap operas and daytime talk shows. Males also have an equal amount of significances. This is important to note because it suggests that romance is not a gender specific emotion. Romance and the idea of getting married can be equally important to both genders. It also suggests that men and women who watch these types of shows do tend to be more romantic.

## **Limitations**

The biggest limitation of this study is that the results only show a relationship between television viewing and perceptions of romance; it can not show causation of the relationship. Although there is a strong indication that the media play a role in shaping perceptions, it does not necessarily cause those perceptions. The media may be showing perceptions that are simply reinforcing a person's current beliefs about romantic relationships and marriage. Those who are romantic in nature may be seeking out romantic content rather than the idea that romantic content makes people to be more romantic.

Another limitation of the study is although the university was widely representative of current students, it does not take into account people outside of the university setting. Participants in the study were mostly freshmen (69%) who were about 18 years old. Although these students were not at the university long before the study began, the study can not be held representative of a larger population. The study is strictly looking at college-aged participants who are taking an active role in furthering their education. Unfortunately the results can not be generalized to an entire population, which means the study has a low validity.

The survey questions were based on scales used in previous research studies. The scales did meet the accepted level of reliability; however, the reliability was low for more than half of the scales. The low reliability of the scales is another limitation of the study. In future research, it would be best to use scales with the highest reliability possible or measure the questions that make up the scales as an individual measure.

## **Implications**

Although the study can not be generalized to the entire population, the study has important implications. It offers evidence that the media continue to show inconsistent portrayals of marriage and romantic relationships, which needs to be conveyed to a larger population. Perhaps if people understand that television does not show an accurate example of marriage and romantic relationships then they may use television less as a source for the definition of love. This could lead to increase awareness about the life cycle of a marriage, which may reduce the number of divorces.

Another important implication of this study could be to use it as a tool to show more accurate accounts of relationships on television. Although television producers and magazine editors strive to increase ratings and sell their content, they should take a second look at the message they are conveying to the masses. Although it is more likely they will continue to keep up with the ratings rather than provide accurate social messages, this study as well as the many cultivation and social cognitive studies, could provide empirical evidence for producers and editors to take a more active role in the messages they are conveying.

Each day audiences interact with various media on many different levels. Through the content analysis of several different studies (Fitzpatrick, 1991; Signorelli, 1997; Segrin & Nabi, 2002), researchers have provided evidence that there is a distortion in the media of how romantic relationships and marriage are conveyed. As a researcher, it is easy to suggest that an audience watch television and read magazines with an open mind and open to the thought that the media do not always show an accurate portrayal of personal relationships. However, it would hard to share research findings and research conclusions with every member of the audience, particularly those who are heavy television viewers. There seems to be no way to share research conclusions

with the mass media's audiences. The next step would be to examine whose responsibility it is to discuss accurate expectations and portrayals of real-life romances and marriages.

In addition to the individual-level implications, the study also provides implications for theory. Gerbner and his associates clearly identified that cultivation theory applies to all types of programs across all genres; however, this study did not find any cultivation effects of romance. It did find significant effects on those who watch specific types of programs and perceptions of romance, which concludes that genre-specific cultivation effects may be just as important as the overall cultivation effects. Researchers should consider the differences in the overall television viewing with the overall amount of time individuals spend watching specific television programs.

### **Future Research**

Future research should consider looking at a qualitative method of analysis to better understand the relationship of the media and romantic perceptions. With a qualitative analysis, a researcher may be able to find out why people watch particular types of shows and how watching certain types of television programs account for certain perceptions. Also qualitative analysis, such as in-depth interviews or focus groups, may offer a different perspective on the idea of marriage. The participants may offer information that was not brought up in this study, but provides an important insight into the cause of divorce.

Also, this study limited the magazine choices; however, additional magazines such as *Shape* and *Self* that focus on woman's health or *InTouch* and *People* that highlight celebrity romance would also be an important measure. There are so many choices for magazines and this study only skimmed the top. In the future, it would benefit a research to examine as many



magazines as possible to see which magazines play the greatest role in shaping perceptions on marriage and romance.

Another interesting idea for future research would be to conduct an experiment on how a person's emotions change before, during and after watching certain types of romantic programs. It would be interesting to see if watching television programs changes a person's attitude immediately or if romantic attitudes are something that is achieved through reinforcement throughout a lifetime.

The idea of romance being cultivated throughout a young girl's life would be another interesting study in the future. This study looked at the effects the media have on college-aged men and women; however, the media portray romance beginning with Disney movies, such as *Cinderella*, *Snow White*, and *Sleeping Beauty*, who all get their prince charming at the end of the movie. These movies may play an important part in the growth of a young girl into a teenager than a woman. If a woman was already consider romantic at the start of this study, where did the romantic ideas come from in her mind? Perhaps it was the Disney movies as child showing young girls they will live *happily ever after* with their prince charming. It would be interesting to look at the relationship of the media and the idea of romantic relationships at a younger age. And if it was possible, to conduct a longitudinal study of both young girls and boys through adolescents to see if the media socialize adolescents to already be consider romantic by the time they begin college.

Another study that could be pursued based on findings in this study is the relationship between females who read traditional male magazines and their attitudes on marriage and love. It would be interesting to look at if the women have prior attitudes about romance or if reading men's magazines desensitize them to the desire for romance. Again, although there is a

relationship, it can not be said that reading male magazines will make a woman less romantic. It may be the women has never considered herself romantic or in need of romance in her life.

**APPENDIX A: SURVEY**

### **Survey Instructions**

Thank you for participating in the study. In the survey you will find a series of different types of questions. Please read the instructions for each section carefully. Also, this survey will need to be completed on your own time away from the classroom. Note, some questions are personal; therefore, please complete the survey in a private place where no one can see your answers.

Before you complete the survey, please read and sign the consent form, which you will find on the back of this page. Once signed, place it in the white envelope and seal it. Please fill out the survey as completely as possible. After finishing the survey, please place it separately in the manila envelope and seal it. Sign over the seal once the envelope is closed.

Please return the manila envelope and white envelope separately to the researchers, who will collect them at the start of your next class meeting. The envelopes will be opened separately from one another to ensure confidentiality.

Note that this project has been designed solely for research purposes, and no one except the research team will have access to your responses. Surveys will be identifiable by a random number only; there will be no way to identify the respondent.

**Again thank you for participating.**

Sincerely,

Heather Hackbarth

Brianne Straub

September 27, 2005

Dear Student,

Our names are Heather Hackbarth and Brianne Straub, and we are graduate students in the Nicholson School of Communication working under the supervision of faculty member, Dr. Steve Collins. We would like to invite you to participate in research to look at your opinions on a variety of topics. This project has been designed solely for research purposes, and no one except the research team will have access to your responses. Your identity will be kept confidential by a numbering system. Additionally, this consent form will be returned in a separate envelope from your survey. This survey should take approximately 15 minutes, outside of class time, to complete.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. You do not have to answer any question(s) that you do not feel comfortable answering. Please be advised that you may choose not to participate in this research, in which case you do not need to take the survey. Non-participation in this survey will not affect your grade. There is no compensation for participating in this research project, but you will be helping fellow students to further their academic careers. There are no anticipated risks associated with participation in this research. As a participant of this study, you have the right to withdraw consent at any time without consequence.

If you have any questions or comments about this research, please contact Heather Hackbarth or Brianne Straub, or their faculty supervisor, Dr. Steve Collins, Nicholson School of Communication, Orlando, FL, (407) 823- 6236, Scollins@mail.ucf.edu.

Sincerely,

Heather Hackbarth and Brianne Straub

\_\_\_\_\_ I have read the procedure described above.

\_\_\_\_\_ I voluntarily agree to participate in the survey

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant (Printed Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant (Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
SPC1600 or SPC 1016 Instructor

Please circle your answers to the following questions.

### Section I

---

Please indicate the importance of each of the following as it is related to a romantic relationship. For the purpose of this study, a romantic relationship is defined as relationship that includes a commitment, connection and an emotional bond to another person.

- **Successfully resolving conflicts (not going to bed angry)**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important
  
- **Spending as much time together as possible**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important
  
- **Being physically intimate as often as possible**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important
  
- **Having a positive relationship with your partner's family**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important
  
- **The ability to openly communicate about anything**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important
  
- **The ability to consider your partner as your best friend**  
Very Unimportant    Unimportant    Neutral    Important    Very important

### Section II

---

Please circle the answer that best fits your personal opinion. Please remember for the purpose of this study, a romantic relationship is defined as relationship that includes a commitment, connection and an emotional bond to another person.

- **In a romantic relationship you should have a feeling of mutual understanding.**  
Strongly agree    Agree    Neutral    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
  
  - **I think my wedding day will be the happiest day of my life.**  
Strongly agree    Agree    Neutral    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
- I'm married

- In a romantic relationship you should be interested in each others problems.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- If a man/woman had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him/her?

Yes      No      Undecided      I'm married

- If love has completely disappeared from a marriage, I think it is probably best for the couple to make a clean break from each other and start new lives.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- I often catch myself thinking about how nice it would be to be married.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

I'm married

- Marriage is an institution intended to last a lifetime.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- I often find myself talking about romantic relationships.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- In my opinion, the disappearance of love is not a sufficient reason for ending a marriage, and should not be viewed as such.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- In a romantic relationship you should be able to trust your partner completely.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- In a romantic relationship you should know your partner's innermost feelings.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Casual sex/hookup can lead to a romantic relationship.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

• How many times have you been in love? \_\_\_\_\_

• Are you in love now?

Yes          No          Undecided

• Are your parents still married to one another?

Yes          No          My parents never married

• Do you want to get married one day?

Yes          No          Undecided          I'm married

• Do you think you will find the person you will married at UCF?

Yes          No          Undecided          I'm married

### Section III

---

*Some of the items refer to a specific love relationship, while others refer to general attitudes and beliefs about love. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current romantic partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent romantic partner in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be.*

• My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

• I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

• When my partner doesn't pay attention to me I feel sick all over.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

• I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree



- I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- I enjoy playing the 'game of love' with a number of different partners.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- My partner and I have the right physical 'chemistry'.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- Our friendship merged gradually into love over time.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- I would endure all things for the sake of my partner.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- An important factor in choosing my partner was whether he/she would be a good parent.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- It is hard to say exactly where friendship ends and love begins.  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Sometimes I get so excited about being in love that I can't sleep.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- I believe that what my partner doesn't know about me won't hurt him/her.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- I cannot be happy unless I place my partner's happiness before my own.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

#### Section IV

*Please choose the answer that best reflects your opinion.*

- What percentage, out of 100%, of your peers do you think have engaged in sexual activity?

\_\_\_\_\_ %

- On average, how many sexual partners do you think your peers have had?

\_\_\_\_\_ (partners)

*Please circle the answer that best reflects your opinions and behaviors*

- Condoms are a good way to help stop AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Condoms are safe to use.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Using condoms is the responsible thing to do.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- I would feel guilty if I had sex with someone I just met.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- By using condoms, I and my partner are less likely to get AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- If I just met someone appealing and I wanted to have sex, I believe I should have sex.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Casual sex is okay for someone my age and gender.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- It would be against my personal beliefs or standards to have sex with someone I have just met.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Using a condom shows you care about yourself and your partner.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Growing up, how often did you talk to your parents about sex?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- Currently, how often do you talk to your parents about sex?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- Currently, how often do you drink alcohol?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- Currently, how often do you use illegal drugs, including but not limited to marijuana, ecstasy, cocaine, etc.?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- In high school, how often did you drink alcohol?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- In high school, how often did you use illegal drugs, including but not limited to marijuana, ecstasy, cocaine, etc.?

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

- **If I used condoms, my partner would respect me.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **I think there is too much sexual freedom given to adults these days.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **Extramarital sex is never excusable.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **I think there is not enough sexual restraint among young people.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **I think that people indulge in sex too much.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **I think that sex should be reserved for marriage.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **There is too much sex on television.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **People should not masturbate.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **Heavy sexual petting should be discouraged.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **People should not discuss their sexual affairs or business with others.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- **What two consenting adults do together sexually is their own business.**  
Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Have you ever had sexual intercourse with someone of the opposite sex?

Yes                  No

- What best describes your sexual orientation? *(please circle one)*

Heterosexual                  Homosexual                  Bisexual

- How many times in the last year have you had intercourse with someone of the opposite sex? If you cannot remember exactly, please estimate as carefully as possible.

\_\_\_\_\_ *(instances of sexual intercourse)*

- If you have had sex, how old were you when you first engaged in sexual intercourse?

\_\_\_\_\_ *(years old)*

- Altogether during the past year, how many different people of the opposite sex have you had as sexual partners?

\_\_\_\_\_ *(partners)*

- In your entire life, how many different people of the opposite sex have you had as sexual partners?

\_\_\_\_\_ *(partners)*

- In the past 12 months, how many times have you had intercourse with someone you didn't know very well?

Never                  Once                  Twice                  At least 3 times

- Have you had sex in the past year with a partner who you knew was having sex with other people?

Yes                  No

- How many times have you had sex in the past year with a partner you knew was having sex with other people?

\_\_\_\_\_ *(instances of sexual intercourse)*

- Generally, in the past year, how often has alcohol been part of your sexual activities?

Never                  Occasionally                  Half the time                  Often                  Always

- Generally, in the past year, how often has marijuana or drugs other than alcohol been part of your sexual activities?

Never                      Occasionally                      Half the time                      Often                      Always

- Have you had sex in the past year with someone who injects drugs?

Never                      Once                      Twice                      At least 3 times

- When you have heterosexual sex (sex with someone of the opposite sex), how often do you use some kind of birth control?

Never                      Sometimes                      About half                      Most times                      Every time                      N/A

- When you have sexual intercourse, how often do you or your partner(s) wear a condom?

Never                      Sometimes                      About half                      Most times                      Every time                      N/A

- Have you ever had a sexually transmitted disease such as gonorrhoea (clap), syphilis, or Chlamydia?

Yes                      No

- Have you ever had anal sex?

Yes                      No

- Have you ever had oral sex?

Yes                      No

#### Section V

*Please indicate how often you watch the following types of programs.*

- Romantic Comedies

Very Frequently                      Frequently                      Sometimes                      Infrequently                      Very Infrequently

- Soap operas

Very Frequently                      Frequently                      Sometimes                      Infrequently                      Very Infrequently

- Daytime talk shows

Very Frequently                      Frequently                      Sometimes                      Infrequently                      Very Infrequently

- Reality-based shows about relationships (i.e. TLC's *The Wedding Story* or *The Bachelor/Bachelorette*)

Very Frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Infrequently      Very Infrequently

Please mark below the television shows that you have watched in the past week:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor/Bachelorette | <input type="checkbox"/> Desperate Housewives           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex in the City       | <input type="checkbox"/> MTV's <i>The Real World</i>    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime Movies       | <input type="checkbox"/> TLC's <i>The Wedding Story</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends               | <input type="checkbox"/> Wife Swap                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Daytime Soap Operas   | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The King of Queens</i>      |

Please circle the choice that best represents your opinion

- Television shows life as it really is.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Television lets me see how other people live their lives.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Television characters show how interactions between people really are.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

- Romantic interactions between male and females on television imitate an ideal relationship.

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

In a typical day, how much time do you spend watching television (in minutes and hours)?

\_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

Approximately how much time to spend using the Internet for NON-school or work purposes (in hours and minutes)?

\_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

Think back to when you were growing up, how many days per week did you watch prime-time television? (Please circle the number of days 0-7)

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7

Of the amount of time listed in the question above, how much time do you watch the following types of television programming (In minutes and hours)?

- Situation Comedies (ex. *Friends*, *Scrubs*, *Will and Grace*, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Action Adventure (ex. *24*, *NYPD Blue*, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Primetime Soap Operas (ex. *The OC*, *One Tree Hill*, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Daytime Soap Operas (ex. *All My Children*, *Passions*, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- News – Local or National \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Television Movies \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Talk Shows (ex. *Oprah*, *Ellen*, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Music Videos \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Game Shows \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Cartoons \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins
- Reality Television (ex. *Real World*, *Survivor*, *Bachelor*) \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ mins

Of the following magazines, how many issues have you read in the past year (approximately 0-12)?

- |                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| • Cosmopolitan _____ | • Vogue _____     |
| • Marie Claire _____ | • Maxim _____     |
| • Glamour _____      | • Playboy _____   |
| • Seventeen _____    | • FHM _____       |
| • YM _____           | • Stuff _____     |
| • Details _____      | • Penthouse _____ |

Please circle the number that best indicates how likely you are to do the following.

- In a given week how likely are you to watch films that contain nudity or adult content, but are not pornography? (Please circle a number 1-5. If you are not likely to do it, circle a low number. If you are not likely to do it, circle a high number.)

Unlikely                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Likely



- In a given week how likely are you to listen to music with sexually explicit lyrics? (Please circle a number 1-5. If you are not likely to do it, circle a low number. If you are not likely to do it, circle a high number.)

Unlikely                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Likely

- In a given week how likely are you to watch DVDs that contain nudity or sexual content that are not pornography? (Please circle a number 1-5. If you are not likely to do it, circle a low number. If you are not likely to do it, circle a high number.)

Unlikely                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Likely

- In a given week how likely are you to play video games that contain nudity or sexual content? (Please circle a number 1-5. If you are not likely to do it, circle a low number. If you are not likely to do it, circle a high number.)

Unlikely                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Likely

- In a given week how likely are you to view pornography (Internet and/or video)? (Please circle a number 1-5. If you are not likely to do it, circle a low number. If you are not likely to do it, circle a high number.)

Unlikely                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Likely

## Section VI

Please fill out the following questions.

- What is your age (in years)? \_\_\_\_\_

- What is your gender?                      Male                      Female

- What is your year in School? (please circle one)

Freshman    Junior

Sophomore    Senior

Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

- What is your Major? \_\_\_\_\_

- How would you describe your race? (please circle one)

American Indian    Caucasian/Hispanic decent

Asian/Asian American    Caucasian/Non-Hispanic decent

Black/African American Hispanic decent    Mixed Race

Black/African American Non-Hispanic decent    Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

- Please circle the college related to your major (please circle one):

College of Arts and Sciences	College of Engineering and Computer Science
Burnett College of Biomedical Sciences	College of Health and Public Affairs
College of Business Administration	Rosen College of Hospitality Management
College of Education	College of Optics and Photonics
Other, please specify _____	

- Are you enrolled in the Burnett Honors College?

Yes                      No

- How often do you attend religious services or meetings?

Never  
Once a year  
A few times a year  
A few times a month  
Once a week  
More than once a week

- How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as pray, meditation, or bible study?

Never  
Once a year  
A few times a year  
A few times a month  
Once a week  
More than once a week

### **You're finished!**

We appreciate that you took the time to complete our survey. Please place the survey in the manila envelop then seal it. Then place your consent form inside the white envelop and seal it. DO NOT put your consent form inside the manila envelop with your survey. Please return your survey and consent form to your SPC1600 or SPC1016 instructor during your next class meeting

**Thank you!**

## **APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL**



Office of Research & Commercialization

September 22, 2005

Heather Hackbarth and Brianne Straub  
c/o Dr. Steven Collins  
University of Central Florida  
Nicholson School of Communication  
COMM 260  
Orlando, FL 32816-1344

Dear Ms. Hackbarth and Ms. Straub:

With reference to your protocol #05-2831 entitled, "**Television media's impact on attitudes about romantic and sexual relationships**" I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office. **This study was approved on 9/18/05 and the expiration date will be 9/17/06.** Should there be a need to extend this study, a Continuing Review form must be submitted to the IRB Office for review by the Chairman or full IRB at least one month prior to the expiration date. This is the responsibility of the investigator. **Please notify the IRB office when you have completed this research study.**

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board through use of the Addendum/Modification Request form. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

*Barbara Ward*

Barbara Ward, CIM  
UCF IRB Coordinator  
(FWA00000351, IRB00001138)

Copies: IRB File  
Steven Collins, Ph.D.

BW:jm

12443 Research Parkway • Suite 302 • Orlando, FL 32826-3252 • 407-823-3778 • Fax 407-823-3299

An Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Institution



THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA  
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

*IRB Committee Approval Form*

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): Heather Hackbarth and IRB #: 05-2831  
Brianne Straub;  
Steve Collins, Ph.D. (Supervisor)

PROJECT TITLE: Television media's impact on attitudes about romantic and sexual relationships

- New project submission
- Continuing review of lapsed project # \_\_\_\_\_
- Study expires
- Initial submission was approved by full board review but continuing review can be expedited
- Suspension of enrollment email sent to PI, entered on spreadsheet, administration notified \_\_\_\_\_
- Resubmission of lapsed project # \_\_\_\_\_
- Continuing review of # \_\_\_\_\_
- Initial submission was approved by expedited review

**Chair**

Expedited Approval  
Dated: 9/18/2005  
Cite how qualifies for expedited review: minimal risk and #7

**IRB Co-Chairs:**

Signed: [Signature]  
Dr. Sophia Dziegielewski

Exempt  
Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cite how qualifies for exempt status: minimal risk and \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Jacqueline Byers

Expiration  
Date: 9/17/2006

Complete reverse side of expedited or exempt form

- Waiver of documentation of consent approved
- Waiver of consent approved
- Waiver of HIPAA Authorization approved

NOTES FROM IRB CHAIR (IF APPLICABLE): First review, sensitive information. Clarifications need. [Signature]  
9/3/2003

## REFERENCES

- Archer, D. (1985). 'Social Deviance,' in G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. New York: Random House.
- Bachen, C. M. & Illouz, E.(1996). Imaging Romance: Young People's Cultural Models of Romance and Love. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 13(4), 279-308.
- Bailey, B. (1988). *From front porch to back seat*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Bandura, A., Grusec, J.E., & Menlove, F.L. (1966) Observational learning as a function of symbolization and incentive set. *Child Development*, 37(3), 499-506.
- Bandura, A. (1971). *Psychological Modeling*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Atherton, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication*, 28(3), 12-29.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. *Media Psychology*, 3, 265-299.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In Bryant, J. & Zilmann, D. (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* (Second edition, pp. 43-67). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc
- Beall, A. & Sternberg, R. (1995). The social construction of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12(3), 417-438.
- Berscheid, E. & Walster, E.H. (1978). *Interpersonal attraction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brooke, C.N. (1989). *The medieval idea of marriage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. & Mayers, S. (1981). Soap opera viewing: The cultivation effect. *Journal of Communications*, 31(3), 108-115.
- Burgess, E.W. & Wallin, P. (1953). *Engagement and marriage*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Calgary Herald and Herald News Services (2005). An audience scorned: Bachelorette takes heat for jilting suitors, March 2, 2005, *The Calgary Herald (Alberta)*, Retrieved Sept. 3, 2005 from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Clark, M.S. & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 12-24.
- DeFleur, M. & Ball-Rokeach, S. (1989). *Theories of mass communication* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.
- Demo, D.H & Ganong, L.H. (1994). Divorce. In P.C. McKenry & S.J. Price (Eds), *Families and change: Coping with stressful events* (pp. 197-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Duby, G. (1978). *Medieval marriage*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Duncan, R. (2003). Does Sex and the City predict the future of marriage?. *Challenge*, 46(3), 73-88.
- Edwards, E. (2005) On Bachelorette, L word is for loser, (March 7, 2005). *Orlando Sentinel*, Retrieved Sept. 3, 2005 from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Epstein, N. & Eidelson, R.J. (1981). Unrealistic beliefs of clinical couples: Their relationship to expectations, goals and satisfaction. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 9, 13-21.
- Fitzpatrick, M. (1991). Understanding personal relationships through media portrayals. *Communication Education*, 40(2), 213-218

- Galician, M. (2004). *Sex, love & romance in the mass media: Analysis & criticism of unrealistic portrayals & their influence*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gerbner, G. (1969). Toward “cultural indicators”: The analysis of mass mediated message systems. *AV Communication Review*, 17(2), 137-148.
- Gerbner, G. & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communications*, 26(2), 173-199.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Jackson-Beeck, M., Jeffries-Fox, S., & Signorielli, N. (1978). Cultural indicators: Violence profile no. 9. *Journal of Communication*. 28 (3), 176-207.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Signorielli, N. & Morgan, M. (1980). Aging with television: Images of television drama and conceptions of social reality. *Journal of Communication*, 30(1), 37-47.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In Bryant, J. & Zilmann, D. (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* (Second edition, pp. 43-67). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hartman, M.S. (2004). *The households and the making of history: A subversive view of the western past*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, R. & Pingree, S. (1981). Using television to construct social reality. *Journal of Broadcasting*. 25(4), 347-364.
- Hayes, K.A., & Paul, E.L. (2002). The casualties of 'casual' sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 19 (5), 639-661.
- Heintz-Knowles, K.E. (2000). Images of youth: A content analysis of adolescents in prime-time



- entertainment programming, *Prepared for the W.T. Grant Foundation and the Frameworks Institution*, April 9, 2000.
- Heldenfels, R.D. (2005). Bachelorette bitter over final portrayal: Schefft feels she was set up by producers, *The Calgary Herald (Alberta)*, Retrieved Sept. 3, 2005 from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Hendriks, A. (2002) Examining the effects of hegemonic depictions of female bodies on television: A call for theory and programmatic research. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. 19(1), 106-123.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1988). Lovers wear rose colored glasses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 161-183.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1998). The love attitude scale: Short form. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 15(2), 147-159.
- Hirsch, P. (1980). The scary world of the nonviewer and other anomalies: A reanalysis of Gerbner et al.'s findings on cultivation analysis. *Communication Research*, 7(4), 403-456.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Illouz, E. (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: Love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jeffres, L.W. (1997). *Mass media effects*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Katz, S.J. & Liu, A.E. (1988). *False love and other romantic illusions*. New York: Pocket Books.

- Kephart, W.M. (1967). Some correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 29, 470-474.
- Kunkel, D., Beily, E., Eyal, K., Cope-Farrar, K., Donnerstein, E., & Fandrich, R. (2003). *Sex on TV: A Biennial Report to the Kaiser Family Foundation*. Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation
- Larson, J.H. (1988). The marriage quiz: College students' beliefs in selected myths about marriage. *Family Relations*, 37(1), 3-11.
- Lee, J.A. (1988). Love Styles, in R. Sternberg & M. Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lee, J.A. (1973). *The Colors of Love: An exploration of the ways of loving*. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.
- Levine, R., Sato, S., Hashimoto, T. & Verma, J. (1995). Love and Marriage in Eleven Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26(5), 554-571.
- Liebes, T. & Livingstone, S. (1994). The structure of family and romantic ties in the soap opera: An ethnographic approach. *Communication Research*, 21(6), 717-741.
- National Center for Health Statistics (2003). Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: Provisional data for 2003. *National Vital Statistics Reports*, 52(22), June 10, 2004.
- Norwood, R. (1985). *Women who love too much: When you keep wishing and hoping he'll change*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Owen, R. (2005). Living in the `divorce belt' Divorce happens more often in the South than in other regions of the nation (Feb. 9, 2005). *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, Retrieved April 6, 2005 from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Peirce, K. (1993). Socialization of teenage girls through teen-magazine fiction: The making of a

- new woman or an old lady? *Sex Roles*, 29(1/2), 59-67.
- Potter, W.J. (1990). Adolescents' perceptions of the primary values of television programming. *Journalism Quarterly*, 67(4), 843-851.
- Rosenberg, L. (2004) Outside counsel: Is the time ripe for no-fault divorce? (Oct. 20, 2004) *New York Law Journal*, Retrieved April 6, 2005 from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Rosenblatt, C. (1974). Cross-cultural perspectives on attraction. In T.L. Huston (Ed.), *Foundations of interpersonal attraction* (pp. 79-95). New York: Academic Press.
- Rossmann, C. & Brosius, H. (2004). The problem of causality in cultivation research. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research*, 39(3), 379-397.
- Rubin, A.M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. *Communication Research*, 8, 141-165.
- Segrin, C. & Nabi, R.L. (2002) Does television viewing cultivate unrealistic expectations of marriage?. *Journal of Communication*, 52(2), 247-263.
- Selnow, G.W. (1986). Solving problems on prime-time television. *Journal of Communication*, 36(V), 63-72.
- Shapiro, J. & Kroeger, L. (1991). Is life just a romantic novel? The relationship between attitudes about intimate relationships and the popular media. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 19(3), 226-236.
- Shaw, J. & Waller, G. (1995). The media's impact on body image: Implications for prevention and treatment. *Eating Disorders: The Journal of Treatment & Prevention*, 3(2), 115-123.
- Signorelli, N. (1997). A content analysis: Reflections of girls in the media. An executive summary for *Children Now and the Kaiser Family Foundation*, April 1997.

- Signorielli, N. & Kahlenberg, S. (2001). Television's world of work in the nineties. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 45(1), 4-22.
- Simpson, J.A., Campbell, B. & Berscheid, E. (1986). The association between romantic love and marriage: Kephart (1967) twice revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12(3), 363-372.
- Smith, S.W. , Mitchell, M.M., Yun, J.A., Johnson, A.J., Orrego, V.O., & Greenberg, B.S. (1999). The nature of close relationships as presented in televised talk show titles. *Central States Speech Journal*, 50(3), 175-187.
- Sternberg, R. (1988) Triangulating love, in R. Sternberg & M. Barnes (Eds) *The Psychology of Love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Straubhaar, J. & LaRose, R. (1999). *Media now: Communications media in the information age*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Tornstam, L. (1992) Loneliness in marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 197-217.
- University of Central Florida. (2005a, October 7). *Preliminary Fall 2005 Headcount Percentages by Time and Gender*. Retrieved January 23, 2006, from [http://www.irweb2.ucf.edu/scripts/broker.exe?\\_service=beta&\\_program=enroll.class\\_levelimepct.sas&\\_debug=0&hon=%20&new=%20&year=2005&term=F&college=30](http://www.irweb2.ucf.edu/scripts/broker.exe?_service=beta&_program=enroll.class_levelimepct.sas&_debug=0&hon=%20&new=%20&year=2005&term=F&college=30)
- University of Central Florida. (2005b, October 7). *Preliminary Fall 2005 Headcount Percentages by Classification and Ethnicity*. Retrieved January 23, 2006, from [http://www.irweb2.ucf.edu/scripts/broker.exe?\\_service=beta&\\_program=enroll.class\\_level\\_ethepct.sas&\\_debug=0&hon=%20&new=%20&year=2005&term=F&college=99](http://www.irweb2.ucf.edu/scripts/broker.exe?_service=beta&_program=enroll.class_level_ethepct.sas&_debug=0&hon=%20&new=%20&year=2005&term=F&college=99)