

AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUNG ADULTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IDEAL MATE
FOR LONG-TERM ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS AND
SHORT-TERM SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

BY

JOE BRADSHAW, B.A., M.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2008

Copyright © Joe Bradshaw, 2008
All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

JOE BRADSHAW

AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUNG ADULTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IDEAL MATE FOR LONG-TERM ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS AND SHORT-TERM SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

MAY 2008

This study evaluated the influence of hip hop music videos on the perception of ideal mates among African Americans. Comparison of African American young adults' desirable traits for long-term romantic partners and short-term sexual partners were also examined. African American college students completed questionnaires involving long-term and short-term mate selection and recorded the amount of time spent watching hip hop related television and the number of hip hop music videos viewed in a span of 5 days. Young African Americans were found to place similar emphasis on the internal and external attributes for both short-term sexual and long-term romantic relationships. The findings of this study also indicated no gender differences among young African Americans in reference to how important they perceived the physical attractiveness, social status, or sexual characteristics of a potential mate for both a short-term sexual relationship and a long-term romantic relationship. Exposure to hip hop music videos and viewing of hip hop related television programming was not significantly ($p > .05$) related to the internal or external attributes desired for long-term romantic relationships. For short-term sexual relationships, no significant ($p > .05$) relationship was found for either

hip hop television viewing and internal attributes or hip hop television viewing and external attributes; also for short-term sexual relationships, there was no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop video exposure and external attributes, but there was a significant ($p < .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal attributes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COPYRIGHT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
APPENDIX TABLES.....	xi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Purpose.....	8
Hypotheses.....	9
Theoretical Framework.....	11
Delimitations.....	14
Definitions.....	14
Summary.....	16
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	18
Gender Preferences.....	20
Social Variables.....	23
Sexual Preferences.....	29
The Media Effect.....	33
Television Viewing.....	33
Music Videos.....	36
Hip Hop Culture, Music, and Videos.....	38
Definition and History of Hip Hop and Rap.....	39
Problem Related to Hip Hop Music Videos.....	41
Summary.....	42
III. METHODOLOGY.....	44
Sample/Subjects.....	44
Instrumentation.....	44

Variables	45
Scales of Instrument.....	46
Procedures.....	47
Data Analysis	50
Summary	52
 IV. RESULTS.....	 54
Participants.....	54
Findings.....	55
Physical Attractiveness	55
Social Status.....	58
Internal Attributes.....	60
External Attributes.....	66
Social Homogamy.....	70
Sexual Characteristics	73
Television Viewing and Hip Hop Music Video Exposure	
Open Scales.....	78
Long-term Mate Selection and Short-term Mate Selection.....	78
Hypothesis 1 Gender and Long-term Physical	
Attractiveness.....	80
Hypothesis 2 Gender and Short-term Physical	
Attractiveness.....	81
Hypothesis 3 Gender and Long-term Social Status	81
Hypothesis 4 Gender and Short-term Social Status.....	82
Hypothesis 5 Rating of Long-term Internal and External	
Attributes.....	83
Hypothesis 6 Rating of Short-term Internal and External	
Attributes.....	85
Hypothesis 7 Gender and Long-term Sexual Characteristics	87
Hypothesis 8 Gender and Short-term Sexual Characteristics	87
Hypothesis 9 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Long-term	
Internal and External Attributes.....	88
Hypothesis 10 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Short-term	
Internal and External Attributes.....	89
Hypothesis 11 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of	
Long-term Internal and External Attributes.....	90
Hypothesis 12 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating	
of Short-term Internal and External Attributes	91
Hypothesis 13 Predictors of Long-term Mate Selection.....	92
Hypothesis 14 Predictors of Short-term Mate Selection.....	95
Summary	97

V. DISCUSSION.....	100
Strengths/Weaknesses.....	101
Discussion of Findings.....	103
Demographics	103
Hypothesis 1 Gender and Long-term Physical Attractiveness	104
Hypothesis 2 Gender and Short-term Physical Attractiveness	105
Hypothesis 3 Gender and Long-term Social Status	106
Hypothesis 4 Gender and Short-term Social Status.....	107
Hypothesis 5 Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes.....	108
Hypothesis 6 Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes.....	110
Hypothesis 7 Gender and Long-term Sexual Characteristics	113
Hypothesis 8 Gender and Short-term Sexual Characteristics	115
Hypothesis 9 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes.....	117
Hypothesis 10 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes	119
Hypothesis 11 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes.....	120
Hypothesis 12 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes	121
Hypothesis 13 Predictors of Long-term Mate Selection.....	122
Hypothesis 14 Predictors of Short-term Mate Selection.....	125
Conclusion	127
Summary of Findings.....	127
Implications of Study	130
Recommendations for Future Research.....	133
REFERENCES	136
APPENDICES	146
A. Research Instrument.....	146
B. Tables	167
C. Consent Letter of Information.....	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Physical Attractiveness.....	56
2. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Physical Attractiveness.....	57
3. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Social Status.....	58
4. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Social Status.....	59
5. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Internal Attributes.....	61
6. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Internal Attributes.....	64
7. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term External Attributes.....	67
8. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term External Attributes.....	69
9. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Social Homogamy.....	71
10. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Social Homogamy.....	72
11. African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Sexual Characteristics.....	74
12. African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Sexual Characteristics.....	76
13. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Physical Attractiveness by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	80
14. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Physical Attractiveness by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	81
15. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Social Status by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	82
16. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Social Status by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	83
17. Means Report for the Scoring of Long-term Internal and External Attributes by African American Young Adults.....	84

18. Summary ANOVA for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Internal/External Attributes by African American Young Adults.....	84
19. Means Report for the Scoring of Short-term Internal and External Attributes by African American Young Adults.....	85
20. Summary ANOVA for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Internal/External Attributes by African American Young Adults.....	86
21. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Sexual Characteristics by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	87
22. t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Sexual Characteristics by African American Young Adult Males and Females.....	88
23. Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Television Viewing and Their Rating of Long-term External and Internal Attributes	89
24. Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Television Viewing and Their Rating of Short-term External and Internal Attributes	90
25. Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Their Rating of Long-term External and Internal Attributes	91
26. Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Their Rating of Short-term External and Internal Attributes	92
27. Stepwise Regression for Predicting African American Young Adults' Long-term Mate Selection	93
28. Stepwise Regression for Predicting African American Young Adults' Short-term Mate Selection.....	95

APPENDIX TABLES

Table	Page
A1. Measurement of Variables.....	168
A2. Item Response Frequency Percentage.....	175
A3. Scale Reliability Test.....	190
A4. Variable Correlations.....	191

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the influence of hip hop music videos on African American young adults' perceptions of ideal mates, both short-term sexual partners and long-term romantic partners. In particular, this study describes how exposure to hip hop culture by watching hip hop videos influences young African Americans' choice of partners for sexual or romantic relationships. Thus, this study evaluates the effect of hip hop music videos on the perception of ideal mates among African Americans. Comparison of African American young adults' desirable traits for long-term romantic partners and short-term sexual partners are also examined.

Statement of Problem

Finding the perceived compatible mate for the long term can become a challenging journey for many of today's singles (Cobb, Larson, & Watson, 2003). Many of today's generation of young adults are exploring more short-term relationships instead of seeking long-term romantic partners; thus, they may be less concerned with finding perfect matches. Furthermore, sexual relationships have been distinguished from long-term relationships aimed at marriage. Some research has indicated differences in the selection of short-term sexual partners and long-term romantic partners. However, with sexual relationships, there are still grounds for healthy selection; sexual differences

between partners can possibly lead to interpersonal conflict, dissatisfaction, and destruction of relationship (Regan, Levin, Sprecher, Christopher, & Cate, 2000).

In the United States, the idea of marriage among young adults has undergone a metamorphosis; it has been reshaped during the last decade of the 1900s with more spontaneous sexual encounters and dating characterized by short-term involvement. This phenomenon is characterized by a decrease in married couples, increasing cohabitation, and out of wedlock births (Cherlin, 2004; Oropesa & Landale, 2004; Seltzer, 2004). When these individuals who have experienced a series of short-term relationships and casual sexual encounters do decide to have a long-term relationship, they tend to fail. Over the last 30 years, the number of divorced individuals has quadrupled, and divorced individuals make up about 1 in every 10 adults 18 years of age and older (Huston & Melz, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 2005). The divorce rate for 2003 was 3.8 and 3.7 for 2004; the most currently reported annual U.S. divorce rate, as of 2005 is 3.6 per 1,000 of total population for 46 reporting states and the District of Columbia. The number of reported marriages for 2005 was 2,230,000, down from 2,279,000 in 2004, yielding a current marriage rate of 7.5 per 1,000 of total population. Most of the decline can be attributed to the high rate of cohabitation replacing marriage (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics, 2006).

The levels of relationship instability in the U.S. have been linked to social problems. According to Amato (2004), the decreasing number of lifelong marriages and increasing number of single-parent families have been found to be related to numerous

social hardships such as poverty, delinquency, escalated violence, drug abuse, dwindling educational standards, and destruction of social communities. The devaluation of and loss of societal strength in marriages have affected the bonds between married couples, their families, religious institutions, and communities at large. One result is an increasing number of young adults who face the challenge of raising children in single-parent households (Amato, 2004).

Short-term sexual relationships may temporarily alleviate an individual's frustration of not finding a compatible mate but they still do not prepare individuals for taking on long-term relationships when such relationships develop; thus, in the long run, individuals still may encounter difficulty with finding suitable mates. An explanation is rooted in the attitudes and beliefs more firmly held by members of western society than those of more isolated eastern cultures; these beliefs add to psychological unease and disappointment with the mate selection processes. Some of these beliefs are labeled as constraining beliefs about the process of choosing a mate (Cobb et al., 2003). Such thoughts are personal beliefs that can restrict one from finding the best mate by encouraging minimal effort in finding the right mate, not acknowledging the needed thought of considering interpersonal strengths and weaknesses and premarital factors damaging to marital success, and escalating the problems of finding a mate and adding frustration and distress by limiting alternative options (Larson, 2000). Beliefs that mold mate seekers' perceptions and attitudes toward finding a suitable mate take form in held falsehoods such as the view that love alone is a good enough reason for entering marriage, belief in a perfect "one and only," and the thought of waiting and discovering a soul mate.

The constraining beliefs make the selection of a mate even more difficult, because seekers who hold these views set too high or too low standards, decreasing their chances of finding a true long-term match (Cobb et al.).

The question of how the current trend of fading long-term romantic relationships among young adults and the pursuit of more short-term sexual relationships steadily evolved has been attempted to be answered by pointing toward the influences of the media, particularly the television viewing patterns of individuals dating back to their adolescence. Mass media including television, magazines, movies, music, and the Internet have been accused of portraying high levels of sexuality and normalizing non-committed sexual relationships. Sexual language and enactments occur in media targeting young audiences; nearly half of music videos of the country, rock, and rap/hip hop genres display sexual or erotic messages (Brown, 2002). African Americans, who have been found to watch more television than other ethnic groups, prefer entertainment with Black characters and listen to their own self-proclaimed music genres of R&B and rap or hip hop (Brown).

Modern media, specifically music videos, often communicate sexual messages, stereotypes, male dominance characterized with aggression, and objectification of women (Kalof, 1999). Such elements in rap music videos often communicate to teenagers and young adults the degradation of African American women. The viewing of rap music videos that contain explicit sexual images seldom portray how the long-term consequences of risky behavior may affect young African Americans by modeling negative images and harmful practices to health (Wingood, DiClemente, Bernhardt, &

Harrington, 2003). Young African Americans have been found to digest more media than their White counterparts, and findings indicate that African Americans, especially youths, are more connected with Black-oriented media than mainstream media. Thus, they frequently watch media that portray the lifestyles of African American young adults. One highly influential media form for African American youths and young adults is the hip hop music video. The viewing of these videos has been linked to having more sexual partners and an increased likelihood of acquiring sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) (Ward, 2005).

Hip hop videos may be detrimental to the sexual health of many African American teenagers by promoting promiscuous lifestyles of non-committed individuals portrayed as being acceptable in urban life. A life threatening STD on the rise in the African American community is the Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus (HIV). More than one million Americans are infected with HIV, and African Americans currently make up close to 50% of all American HIV infections (“Crisis,” 2005). HIV infection has greatly impacted African American women, and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) is the leading cause of death among African American women between the ages of 25 and 34 years (Ferguson, Quinn, Eng, & Sandelowski, 2006).

The problem of young African American women being infected with HIV has occurred within the context of a gender ratio imbalance of African Americans. The imbalance is obvious in the environment of college campuses; as of 2004, only 758,400 African American men attended undergraduate institutions of higher education in the United States compared to 1,406,300 African American women (U.S. Department of

Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). The imbalance is even more evident at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) where African Americans account for 82.6% of the total enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). The gender imbalance ratio at HBCUs has been found to give African American men the potential of having multiple African American women as sexual partners (Ferguson et al., 2006). The finding is indirectly linked to females accepting males' non-condom use preference and resulting in the females often being infected with HIV. The gender ratio imbalance at HBCU campuses facilitates dating environments that provide women with few options, one of which is to share or date the same men (Ferguson et al.). Young African American women in college do not necessarily date the same men by choice; according to recent data, only 32% of young African American males attended college compared to 42% of African American females (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). In terms of completion of college, The National Center for Education Statistics (2004) indicated a total of 18,688 Bachelor's degrees, 4,565 Master's degrees, and 199 doctoral degrees were received by women at HBCUs and only 10,158 Bachelor's degrees, 1,773 Master's degrees, and 165 Doctoral degrees were received by men.

The gender ratio imbalance among African Americans extends beyond the college setting; it is relevant within the entire African American community. African American women have been found to settle for men not necessarily on their educational level; more than 17% of African American males do not finish high school compared to about 13% of African American females. Due to the scarcity of comparably educated African

American men, a number of African American women choose to remain single instead of settling for a mate who does not measure up to their standards (Cose & Samuels, 2003). Based on the U.S. Census in 2000, 39% of African American women had never married while the same statistic was only 20.8% for White women (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). A shortage of acceptable prospective African American men is leading to an increasing number of educated and successful African American women choosing to live alone and poorer African American women who need assistance necessarily rearing children alone, further cycling an urban underclass (Cose & Samuels).

African American families are affected by the growing number of single parent homes headed by young women. African American children are much more unlikely than children of the majority population of the United States to be raised in a married-couple household. African Americans make up only 7.5% of American children living in households in which their parents are married, and African American women are more likely to be single mothers than other American women in general (“Living Single,” 2002). About 34% of African Americans live in households consisting of single mothers with children under the age of 18 years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Overall, the number of mother-headed single parent families is growing in the United States with African American families responsible for most of the increase. Highly related to single parent families is poverty, and single parent families in the African American community are disproportionately represented (McCreary & Dancy, 2004).

In reference to African Americans with little schooling, marriage rates for African American women have decreased by as much as 50% over the last 30 years. In 2000, less

than 30% of African American women with little education were married compared to more than 60% of White women without any higher education. The low percentage of poor urban African American women not being married has been a result of a shortage of African American men available for marriage (Lopoo & Western, 2005). The problem of single parent households and poverty has escalated due to low male employment rates and high rates of imprisonment among young African American males in poor communities. Incarceration of African American males has removed men from the urban neighborhoods, therefore reducing marriage rates and the likelihood of African American children having a father in their homes. The declining marriage rates among the disadvantaged have increased the number of children born out of wedlock and the risk of poverty. The rapid growth of the prison population with African American men has led to more births outside of marriages and economic disadvantages among poor African Americans, affecting the less educated African American women (Lopoo & Western).

Purpose

The aim of this study was to examine the influence of hip hop music videos on African American young adults' perceptions of ideal mates, both short-term sexual partners and long-term romantic partners. In particular, this study describes how exposure to hip hop culture by watching hip hop videos may influence young African Americans' choice of partners for sexual or romantic relationships. Thus, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of hip hop music videos on the perception of ideal mates among African Americans. Comparison of African American young adults'

desirable traits for long-term romantic partners and short-term sexual partners was also examined.

Hypotheses

To fulfill the purpose of this study, the following hypotheses were tested.

1. When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.
2. When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.
3. When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.
4. When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.
5. There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering long-term romantic partners.
6. There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering short-term sexual partners.
7. There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a long-term romantic relationship.
8. There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a short-term sexual relationship.

9. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner.
10. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.
11. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner.
12. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.
13. Long-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.
14. Short-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip music video exposure.

Theoretical Framework

Theories derived from social framework have attempted to explain mate selection. The Social Role Theory rests on the notion that the mates are chosen based on cultural duties and responsibilities assigned to specific roles; further, the sexes seek partners who are anticipated as good prospects for carrying out marital, familial, and occupational roles. From this perspective, social role theorists suggest preferences for mates vary according to differences placed on the social expectations for men and women (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). With this theoretical view, the traditional cultural roles displayed by men and women of a society play a necessary part in what personal characteristics are valued in the task of finding a well suited mate. At most, the roles of women have been linked to the domestic front while those of men have been tied to the public domain (Doosje, Rojahn, & Fischer, 1999).

In many modern nations, women continue to have responsibility for rearing children and performing domestic tasks and men spend more time engaged in work away from the home. This is a traditional system in which the male is the main provider of the family by participating in the public workforce while the female assumes the job of tending to household work. Due to such an established system of division of labor, women make the most of finding a mate who currently is or likely to be successful economically, or one who will execute the wage-earning role of providing for the family. This perspective suggests that men pursue a mate who possesses skills of a good

homemaker (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). These traditional expected roles of men and women are further supported by the matching of older men with younger women, thus giving way for a relationship in which husbands have more resources and authority in families than their wives (Eagly & Wood, 1999).

Social Role Theory argues that acts within the socialization process cause both sexes to seek partners who have the socially valued traits related to the social roles of the given culture. This means individuals tend to choose mates who possess the stereotypic qualities assigned to their necessary gender role. Throughout most societies, women are expected to be physically attractive nurturers and men are assumed to be assertive good earners (Doosje et al., 1999). The contrasting positions of men and women as conveyed from the Social Role Theory lead to distinguished preferences for marriage partners demonstrated through various proximal, mediating processes (Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000). Men and women choose mates differently due to their assumed roles for behavior within their culture (Dunkel & Papini, 2005); therefore, individuals are socialized to search for partners who perform their assumed gender roles according to the specific culture (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002).

In relation to the Social Role Theory, mate selection can be attributed to what a potential mate has to offer in general; one theory for shedding more insight on this phenomenon is the Social Exchange Theory. According to the Social Exchange Theory, individuals who are prospects for marriage exchange their personal assets (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004). Examples of traded personal assets are one's occupational status, physical attractiveness, and personality. Based on this theoretical view, partners carry an array of

desirable traits during the dating process. The goal of available partners is to discover a fair exchange with a potential mate.

In explanation of how viewing media, particularly music videos, can shape perceptions and practices, the Cognitive Social Learning Theory and the Social Learning Theory can be applied. The theories state that individuals imitate behaviors of other persons. Characters on television shows and music videos model specific behaviors and present ideologies to viewers. When the television models are rewarded for their behavior and the characters being watched are perceived as attractive and similar and the portrayed practices are thought of as accomplishable, practical, easy, widespread, and with gained value, the viewers are likely to copy that behavior in their personal lives (Bandura, 1994). The theories assume that individuals who consume media content depicting attractive persons who enjoy having sexual intercourse without committing to long-term relationships and without negative consequences will practice the modeled behavior in their own lives (Brown, 2002).

Agenda Setting and Framing Theories posit that the media communicate what is important in the lives of the consumers, and such communication directs consumers' thoughts about necessary surroundings. Another theory is the Cultivation Theory, which holds that television has the most profound power in teaching customs in a culture. Television tells stories that constantly deliver myths and ideologies and presents facts and current trends of relationships as socially acceptable. According to the theory, the viewing of stereotypical portrayals of gender roles and sexuality in music videos aids in normalizing promiscuous sexual activity and other trends of unhealthy behavior (Brown,

2002). The Cultivation Theory is the leading theory in connecting television content and the viewer's perception of social reality. This theory proposes that over a period of time large consumers of television develop perceptions of their real life environment as being very similar to what they are exposed to on television (Eggermont, 2004).

Delimitations

This study focused on a small group of African American young adults, ages ranging from 18 to 33. Participants of this investigation were African American young adults from a college/university setting in a rural environment. The findings of this study pertain to individuals residing in a small rural area around a Historically Black College/University of the American Southeast.

Definitions

Ethnicity – one's belonging to a particular group of cultural origin

External attributes – concrete recognizable traits of a person: physical possessions, socio-economic status, outward appearance, personal skills, and noticeable behavior

Gender – one's social identity as being either male or female

Hip hop – a subculture involving fashion, language, art, music, dance, and other forms of entertainment

Hip hop music video exposure – the number of hip hop music videos viewed in the span of 5 days

Internal attributes – abstract inner features of a person such as personality, kindness, friendliness, humor, expressiveness, trustworthiness, intelligence, and the nature of their character.

Long-term mate selection – preference for partners desired for steady dating, romantic cohabiting, or a marital relationship (Regan et al., 2000)

Long-term romantic partner – person pursued with potential of being a partner in a steady dating, romantic cohabiting, or marital relationship (Regan et al.)

Marital status – current status indicating whether one is married, divorced, separated, widowed, or single

Physical attractiveness – perception of how good looking or attractive a person appears based on their facial and body features

Rap – a form of expression with the use of oral words usually rhyming to a beat

Sexual characteristics – preferred sexual characteristics in a mate pertaining to the physical act of sex, sexual experience, desires, knowledge, and openness to unfamiliar sexual behavior

Sexual orientation – one’s preference for pursuing males, females, or both sexes as mates

Short-term mate selection – preference for partners desired for a one-night stand or brief sexual affair without commitment (Regan et al.)

Short-term sexual partner – person pursued with potential of being a partner for a one-night stand or inconsistent sexual affair without commitment (Regan et al.)

Social homogamy – sharing or possessing similar social characteristics such as common interests or hobbies and religious, educational, political, socio-economical, and family backgrounds with a potential mate

Social status – human and social capital features such as monetary possessions, material wealth and assets, professional positions, and education held by a person

Television viewing – the number of hours spent watching hip hop related television shows in the span of 5 days

Summary

Mate selection is a phenomenon that has been investigated to understand why individuals choose particular persons as long-term romantic relationship partners and short-term sexual partners. Today's young adults are faced with a growing challenge of finding compatible partners (Cobb, Larson, & Watson, 2003). The challenge has been of great consequence especially in the African American community in which there is a gender ratio imbalance of socially equivalent partners in regard to educational attainment and financial earnings, more females achieving than males (Cose & Samuels, 2003; Lopoo & Western, 2005). Given the high failure rate of marriages in the United States and problems associated with it, a number of factors are considered in selecting the proper mate (Cherlin, 2004; Huston & Melz, 2004; Oropesa & Landale, 2004; Seltzer, 2004). The media have played a role in shaping the perceptions and behavior of today's adolescents and young adults; a particular media form is the array of music videos (Brown, 2002; Kalof, 1999).

Hip hop music videos, which are highly concentrated in sexual content in particular, are influential in the lives of young African Americans and may communicate messages and ideas pertaining to dating and sexual relationships (Kalof, 1999; Wingood et al., 2003). The influence that hip hop videos have on viewers may mold their perceptions of the ideal mate for sexual relationships. African Americans, who are the primary consumers of hip hop videos, may suffer profound effects of the negativity

portrayed in the videos by imitating the art and adding to the cycle of non-committed relationships, sexually transmitted diseases, single parent households, and poverty (Cose & Samuels, 2003; Ferguson et al., 2006; McCreary & Dancy, 2004). Thus the purpose of this study was to examine the influence of hip hop music videos on the perception of ideal mates among African Americans. In reference to the effect of hip hop music videos on perceptions of the ideal mates among African Americans, reasons for choosing long-term and short-term mates can be explained from social frameworks such as the Social Role, Social Exchange, Cognitive Social, Social Learning, Agenda Setting/Framing, and Cultivation theories.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The process of how humans pursue mates and why they choose particular partners for relationships has long been a subject of inquiry. Reasons for selecting mates vary across several fields of study and numerous theories and scientific investigations have proclaimed insight for explaining the mate selection process (Doosje et al., 1999). Interpersonal relationships and the process of forming and preserving them have been of interest to researchers in the social, behavioral, and family sciences. An abundance of relationship studies have focused on marital quality, happiness, and satisfaction; much of the research has concentrated on predictors of quality and success of marriage (Giotakos, 2004; Niehuis, Huston, & Rosenband, 2006).

Studies have been conducted centering on individuals' perceptions of desirable mates based on various personality traits and individual features or assets (Isbell & Tyler, 2005; Regan et al., 2000). In the United States today, many individuals are deciding not to marry; currently the rate of marriage is lower than it was 50 years ago and other forms of relationships such as cohabitation are being adopted by couples (Amato, 2004). Investigating the mate selection process provides some insight on how individuals may or may not form a relationship with the right or most compatible person. Examining mate selection can reveal why individuals choose particular persons as relationship partners (Giotakos, 2004).

Research on the selection of mates and preferred characteristics of partners has concentrated on perceptions of individuals' desirability as mates and their personal features such as friendliness and intelligence or other individual traits like social status, and degree of physical attractiveness. In general, the literature has indicated that both sexes prefer partners who are somewhat intelligent, honest, and emotionally stable as well as possessing good looks and a great personality (Regan et al., 2000); recent findings indicate young adults rating physical attractiveness as less important than personality when choosing a long-term romantic partner (Isbell & Tyler, 2005). Similarity has also been found to play a major part in individuals' selection of mating partners; some of the major contributing homogeneous social attributes mentioned in the literature include religion, education, and social class (Regan et al.). Social perspectives have been frequently employed in the explanation of mate selection. As indicated in the research using social theory, it has been found that males and females differ in the primary desired qualities they would like to have in a mate (Doosje et al., 1999; Geary, Vigil, & Byrd-Craven, 2004; Giotakos, 2004; Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002;). This chapter gives an overview of comparisons/contrasts of males' and females' perceptions of ideal mates, the social elements that shape individuals' perceptions of long-term romantic and short-term sexual partners, the role of sexual preferences in the selections of both short-term and long-term mates, and the influence of watching hip hop music videos and related television programming on the perceptions of ideal mates.

Gender Preferences

Traditionally, men have been found to seek younger women and women have been found to be more accepting of older men who are good providers. From a social stance, women, more than men, have been found to rate earning potential of a partner as important (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Women weigh the social status of men when choosing marriage partners. According to how success is defined in a given culture, men who fit the definition may be often preferred for long-term relationships. Across cultures, women rate financial success as more important than do men, and they prefer mates who are ambitious and industrious (markers of cultural success). Women place higher value on having partners who possess the ability to achieve success based on financial earnings, economic status, and social positions (Geary et al., 2004).

Geary et al. (2004) indicated women's concern for the financial wealth of a man as a valuable trait; Doosje, Rojahn, and Fischer (1999) found this to be evident mainly among women with low levels of education. Moreover, the resources of a potential mate were perceived as more important by both sexes from lower socioeconomic status than by those from a higher socioeconomic status (Luszyk, 2001). Women who find difficulty with supporting themselves financially aspire to marry men who could possibly provide the economic support they need. These women perceive marrying someone without marketable skills or steady employment as an extended economic hardship (Huston & Melz, 2004). For both male and female singles, dating serves as a means of discovery for

finding the right mate; potential mates are typically appraised according to the assets they have to offer, whereas individuals compete for the persons with the most to give by offering their own personal resources (Kalmijn, 1998).

Women more than men have been observed to take greater caution in choosing partners for marriage (Geary et al., 2004). Furthermore, women tend to seek marriage partners who provide emotional support and place value on family (Waynforth, 2001). In addition to finding someone who is culturally successful, women consider having prospective husbands who are empathetic, kind, and clever; they want someone who offers intimacy and emotional satisfaction (Geary et al.). Men who can provide feelings of physical safety are also highly sought by women (Geary & Flinn, 2001). Women like to think of having a relationship in which they have someone who values them to the highest and protects them from the harm of others (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002).

Physical attraction serves as a contributing variable in the selection of a mate (Geary et al., 2004; Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002; Singh, 2004). In the case of women, they tend to want men who are taller than them with an athletic symmetrical body (not overly muscular with broad shoulders); men tend to favor women with mature but youthful/symmetrical appearing faces and lean bodies with little fat (Geary et al.). In comparison to women, men place more value on physical attractiveness (Singh). Males tend to focus more on easily observable traits such as good looking facial and body features (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly). However, men, like women, still consider traits such as intelligence, personality, friendliness, and understanding along with physical beauty; women with good parenting skills are usually preferred by men for long-term

relationships, (Buss, 1999). When considering long-term relationships, men rate inner qualities as more creditable than outward beauty alone; across cultures men prefer to have younger partners (Geary et al.). Singh (2004) also pointed out that across diverse cultures men perceived normal weight figured women as more attractive for long-term relationships than underweight or overweight figured women.

Because men place much emphasis on the physical attributes of women, more physically attractive females are pursued by numerous males. This fact in turn contributes to women considered highly attractive having more opportunities for finding mates who meet their preferences; they also are more likely to end relationships and have higher chances of finding new mates if the previous ones do not measure up to their needs (Singh, 2004). In essence, attractive women often trade their beauty for the social and financial assets of men, thus supporting the exchange theory and fitting the traditional division of labor by which the man is the provider in a relationship (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Women are more accepting of having mates who are not as physically attractive as they had once preferred (Buss, 1999). Both men and women prefer attractive mates in short-term sexual or non-committed relationships but tend to convert to the exchange factor when considering long-term romantic relationships (Singh). Li, Bailey, Kendrick, and Linsenmeier (2002) found that men define female beauty as a must in passionate relationships and sacrifice spending huge amounts of money to achieve such desired beauty.

Both men and women tend to want their potential mates to possess an array of positive internal qualities; however men and women have been found to respond

differently when reporting desired traits in short-term sexual partners but to respond similarly when reporting desired traits in long-term romantic partners (Isbell & Tyler, 2005). The internal traits for both sexes were found to outweigh the external characteristics when considering a romantic partner. These inner characteristics were an expressive caring nature; features such as humor, friendliness, sociability; and a fun personality. Along with these internal traits were socially attractive attributes such as intelligence, honesty, and trustworthiness, which were found to be more important than both social status and physical features of a person's face and body. One's social status was also found to be less significant than outer qualities related to health; social status and material assets were found to rank lower than appearance (Regan et al., 2000).

Social Variables

The social structure of society contributes to preferences of individuals during their pursuit of a perceived well matched partner for a relationship. As the Social Role Theory suggests, the socialization of societal members shapes the preferences of persons for mate selection. The prized traits expected to be possessed by ideal mates are often dictated by the assigned social roles of men and women in a given culture. From the social perspective, roles are usually distinguished and based on gender. However, gender alone does not totally explain preferences for mates in any social setting; other variables such as age and level of education may also contribute to the selection of relationship prospects (Doosje et al., 1999).

As Johannesen-Schmidt and Eagly (2002), Geary et al. (2004), and Singh (2004) reported, the degree to which physical attraction plays a part in the criteria for choosing a

mate varies among males and females. The emphasis placed on outward appearance may also vary along the lines of age and other demographics. For instance Doosje et al. (1999) found in their study that the value of being physically attractive differs according to not just gender but level of education and political orientation, along with age. Young liberals who had low levels of education were found to rate the physical characteristics of a person as most important for being a potential partner. The study (Doosje et al.) also reported the finding that men and women demonstrated the same amount of concern about the socioeconomic status of their preferred partners; furthermore, the importance of one's socioeconomic status as being a determinant for selecting a mate could not be differentiated by level of education alone. The combination of a person's political views, education, and gender was found to be more effective in explaining preferences for mates. A key finding was that only individuals with egalitarian values who did not tie relationship roles strictly to expectations of gender and who did not have great opportunities for making economic gains independently were likely to want a mate with more social fortune or financial wealth. Dunkel and Papini (2005) addressed the issue of earning power between the sexes and found that greater levels of commitment in the relationship created larger gaps between men and women in reference to how important they consider good earning capacity with women placing more attention on earning capacity than men.

In reference to earning power, today's women tend to focus less on the economic wealth of men when choosing a spouse because of their increased involvement in the workforce and their elevated level of financial power and social autonomy. On the other

hand, men with low skilled jobs are beginning to rely more on help from their mates to achieve a certain standard of living (Press, 2004). These males search for wives who can contribute to a family financially, thus making up for the diminishing real wages of their low-skilled jobs. Well educated women can afford to alter their mate selection criteria and focus on other desired traits in partners other than their economic potential.

Within the last half century the increased labor force participation of women and their economic independence have led to new perceptions of gender roles in western culture (Press, 2004). This new idea of an egalitarian household shared by husbands and wives has influenced women to examine and consider the household productivity of prospective spouses; this has been found to be highly important for women who are not willing to continue performing the traditional feminine household work alone when they work just as much or more than their husbands (Press). Further, independent women are likely to pursue men who are capable of performing traditionally female tasks such as housework and tending to children. Despite this trend, males' earning potential is still a factor for mate selection (Sweeney & Cancian, 2004). Sweeney and Cancian asserted that even with the increased financial independence of women, males' economic earning power is still considered and greatly valued for marriage due to sustaining increased standards of living and the perceived necessities for supporting a family. Adding insight, Dunkel and Papini (2005) found the expectations of potential mates depend on the level of commitment between the partners, for attitudes toward gender roles may vary due to the degree of commitment in the relationship.

In reference to socioeconomic patterns, findings point toward similar divisions of household labor and distribution of earnings between couples of different levels of education. However, women with higher education tend to contribute more to the family earnings (Sweeney & Cancian, 2004). The earnings of men and women in relationships are more likely to have equivalent earnings when they are college educated versus those who both only completed high school. According to Xie, Raymo, Goyette, and Thornton (2003), the earning potential of a prospective mate is given more emphasis for determining whether to choose someone as a spouse or not than the actual current earning status of that person. Therefore, individuals tend to take more interest in what they expect from others in the future instead of just judging them based on their current possessions (Sweeney & Cancian).

A study by Blackwell and Lichter (2004) suggested that people generally tend to form long-term relationships with those who resemble them culturally. Individuals have been found to marry within the same social group or approximately near their status (Kalmijn, 1998). Married couples are usually matched according to their education, ethnicity, religion, career, and family socioeconomic background: the highly educated tend to marry other persons who have higher education, African Americans on average marry other African Americans, Catholics ideally marry other Catholics, and so forth (Blackwell & Lichter). One way in which persons seek homogenous relationships is by focusing on socioeconomic assets. In pursuit of high socioeconomic status, individuals concentrate fully on finding potential spouses who offer an array of socioeconomic benefits. This effort leads to a pattern of social homogamy in society. Social status and

prestige are also sought by individuals in their selection of partners to fulfill the desire to remain in a particular group (Kalmijn).

When selecting mates, seekers tend to prefer relationships with persons of the same culture. This includes finding someone who shares similar values and beliefs, which have been found to promote togetherness and a common ground for communication that increases understanding between two spouses. Customarily, individuals want to marry someone who shares the same culture, so they can have mutual harmony in their lives (Kalmijn, 1998). Even in places with much cultural diversity, individuals try to form relationships with persons like themselves. Also, matches are more homogeneous in long-term romantic relationship than short-term sexual ones, suggesting individuals are more willing to have partners who differ from them in dating relationships than in cohabiting relationships or marriages (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004).

People who date, cohabiters, and marital partners all tend to have mates who are similar in reference to education, race or ethnicity, and religion. One finding suggests that relationship homogamy is more common among couples with low levels of education; however, individuals with professional degrees have been found to be more inclined to marry persons with similar levels of education than those who are less educated (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004). Another finding revealed that women in married and dating relationships are more likely to have partners with more education than themselves; however, women in cohabiting situations have not been found to have mates with more education. Across all types of relationships, people typically are involved with those who share the same religious beliefs. A strong indicator of social homogamy as an indicator of

most relationships is race; this finding is higher among African American couples than for White or Latin American couples (Blackwell & Lichter).

People are easily identified by observable traits such as race and ethnicity or by characteristics such as education and occupation. Based on these displayed features, individuals usually form their social networks with persons like themselves. From these networks, they find and select prospective mates. Socialization within endogamous groups along with group sanctions often reinforces the idea of choosing someone of similar background. For example, parents influence their children's choice of mates by arranging meetings with potential spouses, playing matchmaking roles, giving advice on their children's selections, and withdrawing support of their children's choices (Kalmijn, 1998).

The influence of religious institutions such as churches is even stronger than the involvement of parents. Without church approval, many marital unions are difficult; for instance, both Christians of the Protestant and Catholic faith have been found to discourage marriage outside a person's religion. Overall, the structure of society controls the endogamy and homogamy of individuals, which dictates their primary relationships. The more individuals stay within their groups, the higher the chances are that they will meet and marry persons from within those groups (Kalmijn, 1998).

Further, mate selection is not a random process due to the fact of society functioning in distinctive social groups. As Regan et al. (2000) indicated, individuals go beyond just paying attention to a potential partner's individual character, but contemplate the possibility of being compatible with that actual person across several areas of interest.

Similarity has been found to matter in long-term romantic relationships, for instance, common personal values, beliefs, and attitudes have been perceived as important along with having the same interest in activities, living skills, and family background (Regan et al.). Kalmijn (1998) claimed marriage results from three social forces: individual preferences based on exchanges, interaction in social groups, and limitations placed on individuals for finding suitable partners.

Sexual Preferences

The sexual views of couples contribute partially as a preference of mates. The concept of sex in relationships has been found to vary according to the sexes. The perception of sexual fidelity is one concern of individuals when faced with selecting long-term romantic partners. Men and women have been found to differ in how they rate the importance of having a sexually faithful partner (Geary et al., 2004). Men tend to place more emphasis on the sexual faithfulness of their spouses than women, given the jeopardy and detriment of raising the child of another man, something that not all men can tolerate. One particular study (Sargarin, Becker, Guadagno, Nicastle, & Millevoi, 2003) indicated a significant number of men reported being worried about their mate having sexual intercourse with another man and risking the possibility of becoming pregnant.

With attraction factored into the sex variable of mate selection, the literature reveals both sexes as preferring partners whom they perceive as sexually attractive. However, this finding is more indicative of men than of women (Geary et al., 2004). Sexual attraction has been found to be related to sexual attitudes and love styles that each

person hopes to find in the other. The comparison of attitudes, values, and beliefs about sexual activity has been linked to the choices made by individuals in finding sexually compatible partners (Lacey, Reifman, Scott, Harris, & Fitzpatrick, 2004). A recent study by Garcia (2006) indicated both men and women desire partners who are perceived as having much sexual experience based on having a high number of sexual partners and being involved in various different types of sexual activity; these perceived highly sexually experienced partners were found to be desirable for both marriage and short-term dating by participants of the study (Garcia). Earlier research by Simpson and Gangestad (1992) found that persons who easily display their sexuality prefer to partner with individuals who are even more physically (sexually) attractive and demonstrate obvious social assets. In contrast, those who are less appealing sexually tend to pursue partners who possess more covert qualities such as kindness, intimacy, responsibility, and faithfulness, all related to more conservative attitudes and love styles that involve commitment.

Comparing men and women in regard to specific desired characteristics in a sexual partner, men have been discovered to place more emphasis on having a mate who is physically attractive, easily reaches sexual climax, and enjoys exploring sexual or erotic books or videos. In contrast, the literature indicates women preferring a partner who is sexually experienced, who understands how to provide pleasure, and who assumes the leading role during sex (Giotakos, 2004). Previous findings by McGuirl and Wiederman (2000) reported women being interested in a male who is open to sexual conversation, gives compliments during sex, and takes the dominant role. Giotakos (2004)

also found that women tend to like forms of affection that do not necessarily involve genital stimulation and tend to favor romantic settings for the act of sex.

The consideration of sexual preferences among couples plays a part in the degree of their level of sexual satisfaction. Research has shown a significant relationship between sexual satisfaction of couples and their overall relationship satisfaction (Litzinger & Gordon, 2005). Additionally, it has been demonstrated by researchers that individuals value sexual satisfaction as a major part of having happiness in long-term romantic relationships (Trudel, 2002). Litzinger and Gordon (2005) found sexual satisfaction and good communication to rank next to each other for predicting marital satisfaction. As an indicator of the importance of being on the same level sexually, findings demonstrate that when couples have problems communicating, the process of sexually satisfying each other keeps their relationships satisfied. These findings suggest that a good sex life can help balance some of the harmful results of having bad communication in a relationship (Litzinger & Gordon).

Linked to sexual play in relationships is humor. Laughter and smiling have been used as instruments of attraction for pursuing potential mates (Provine, 2000). Storey (2003) indicated that many young Americans appreciate a good sense of humor and value it as a quality in a mate. Having a good sense of humor has been found to be equated to meaning one displays intelligence, has a positive view on life, and brings a likeable presence; forms of humor such as withdrawn or sarcastic remarks tend to not yield attraction (Storey). Humor has been found to be valued among individuals in search of

mates due to its association with being sociable, popular, understanding, caring, and warm-hearted in nature (Cann & Calhoun, 2001).

The possession of humor has been linked to displaying readiness and great social skills for bonding in a relationship. Using sweet and adoring nicknames humorously have been indicated as a means of making one's mate feel good. This type of humor has been found to play an important part in relationships. When asked what attracts them to a short-term sexual partner, American students have been found to include a good sense of humor as something important; furthermore, the use of private jokes and funny remarks have been found to increase the quality of long-term romantic relationships by adding intimacy, belonging, and togetherness (Storey, 2003).

Litzenger and Gordon (2005) highlighted the importance of being satisfied sexually in a relationship and the benefits that it has on the improvement of an ongoing relationship, but having a different level or amount of sexual appetite between couples can also be detrimental to their relationships (Regan et al., 2000). Variance in sexual cravings between two partners can lead to relationship conflict, dissatisfaction, and cancellation of both short-term sexual and long-term romantic relationships. Men are more likely than women to want partners who broadcast that they are open sexually, easily engaged, and have a high sex drive (Regan et al.). In a much earlier study, Buss and Schmitt (1993) found that men demonstrated less desire for a partner with a small sexual appetite in a short-term sexual relationship than for one in a long-term romantic relationship.

Regan et al. (2000) found that both men and women prefer partners who demonstrate much sexual passion and sex drive in short-term relationships. Additionally, women indicated they wanted a short-term sexual partner to rank very highly in desire for sex more than they would prefer for a long-term romantic partner to be passionate. This was not the case for men, who highly preferred the same amount of sexual passion and drive of a partner in either a short-term sexual or long-term romantic relationship. In the selection of partners in casual sexual relationships, both men and women look for individuals who are sexually and physically appealing. This finding indicates that external qualities are really considered when choosing short-term sexual partners.

The Media Effect

As Social Theory has suggested, the perceptions of individuals may be molded by their social environment. Starting very early in childhood, moving through adolescence, and taking strong effect in young adulthood, elements of society work together in shaping the thoughts and behavior of social characters. Thus, the perceptions of the ideal mate for both short-term and long-term relationships can be highly influenced by the social environment in which individuals find themselves. A major socializing agent in today's western culture is the daily media. A major contributing tool in influencing members of society is television. Therefore, television may assume a large role in providing instructions for sexual and romantic relationships (Eggermont, 2004).

Television Viewing

Research has not determined the extent of media's effect on thoughts about relationships and sexuality. It has been suggested that the television does influence

beliefs about relationships due to its portrayals of sexual behavior and its images of sexual and relationship norms (Brown, 2002). Television has been found to shape individuals' perceptions of ideal romantic relationships; for example, Segrin and Nabi (2002) found adults who watch programs dealing with romantic relationships were more likely to have unrealistic beliefs about getting married. Another study indicated that those who get wrapped up in the fantasy of television love stories tend to expect their mates to demonstrate high levels of empathy at all times and believe that they should be able to communicate perfectly in order for their relationship to work (Haferkamp, 1999). Consuming large quantities of romantically themed television programs was also found to be related to having more fantasy views of marriage (Segrin & Nabi).

Television's impact on viewers becomes more profound the more the portrayals are considered natural or realistic. With the idea of perceived similarity being factored in, viewers who see what they are watching as factual are more likely to be influenced by the portrayals. Therefore, persons who believe what they are watching is real are more likely to expect the same romantic behavior in their own personal relationships (Busselle & Greenberg, 2000). An additional finding in reference to gender was that males and females interpret television content differently; young women were found to be more likely than young men to believe sexual scenes on television are realistic (Brown, 2002). In contrast, Eggermont (2004) found that television viewing is reinforced by perceived similarity. There is a relationship between watching television and expectations for a romantic partner in connection to direct experience; among viewers who have personal

experience, television tends to affect them no matter how much they perceive the television shows to be similar or not similar to real life (Eggermont).

Television also impacts perceptions of sexual relationships, modeling aspects of sexuality, and partner selection. For instance, Ward (2002) found that the higher the consumption of television by adolescents, the more likely they are to over estimate the number of sexual experiences of their peers, leading them to wanting to experiment. Acceptance of short-term sexual relationships is encouraged by the mass media, especially on television. Even though television portrays more than half of its characters of dramas engaged in sex as being in a relationship, the relationships are short lived with a tenth of the couples having sex after only knowing each other very briefly and a fourth of them do not continue the relationship after having sex. Television sends the message that it is fine to have multiple short-term sexual relationships and being a virgin is presented negatively (Brown, 2002).

Literature reveals that adolescents place much emphasis on peer-valued qualities such as looking a certain way to fit physical attractiveness (Hofshire & Greenberg, 2001). Furthermore, television reinforces those valued traits such as slender and curved women and slim and muscular men as being more desirable for both romantic and sexual relationships. Physical attraction is important for all males despite their background and television aids in the belief; the continuous portrayal of beautiful women makes boys feel that success in dating is gained only with having a girl who is considered really good looking (Eggermont, 2004). On the other hand, more girls than boys were found to perceive a romantic partner's pleasant personality as important; however, both male and

female viewers of television rated personality qualities highly as a necessity in a romantic partner indicating that the content of television affects the importance of both external features such as physical attraction and internal characteristics such as personality in the selection of romantic partners (Eggermont).

Television places extra pressure on viewers to fit the images portrayed as good looking or sexy, which is idealized as essentials for being viewed by many as a desirable sexual partner. As previous research has acknowledged this as a problem with female viewers and how they feel about their bodies, it has began striking male viewers more heavily. The media's portrayal of men's body image has increased, and society has added pressure to the physical image of men lately by placing much emphasis on V-shaped bodies with broad shoulders, large defined arms, chest and abdominal muscles, and slim waists. As a result, television has led to feelings of dissatisfaction among men concerning their bodies (Ward, 2005).

Music videos.

Television's portrayal of specific body types as attractive has communicated to viewers what to seek as physically attractive and sexually appealing. The stereotypical images of sexy, thin, and curvy young females and muscular, athletic men on television have been reinforced by continuous pursuit and admiration by many prospective dating partners. A main tool of delivering these sexy images is the cultural media's use of music videos, which depicts physical images that are preferred in reference to sexual relations. These images of sexual suggestiveness, style of dress, and stereotypes in music videos influence young viewers by sending messages about sex and gender (Andsager, 2003).

It has been found that more than half of music videos shown on MTV contain sexual imagery (Andsager, 2003). Sexual content shown in music videos tend to vary according to gender with women wearing more revealing seductive clothing (Smith, 2005). A study by Hansen and Hansen (2000) indicated MTV music video shows routinely display women in sexually provocative outfits more than half of the time of broadcasting and show men in the same fashion only 27% of the time. Andsager (2003) indicated that provocative dressing of women is very common in music videos; a third of all women shown on MTV tend to wear revealing clothing, but less than 10% of males have been found to wear clothing that is considered sexy or revealing.

Music videos do not only deliver messages about sex and gender differences but also molds the attitudes of men and women about sexual behavior and their perceptions of who is desirable for sexual relations. An example is the portrayal of women as submissive to sexually aggressive men who appear to be dominant (Andsager, 2003). A later study by Ward, Hansbrough, and Walker (2005) involving African American adolescents found frequent viewing of music videos to be related to having more stereotypical attitudes toward gender roles, especially the roles demonstrated in the videos. African American high school students who frequently viewed music videos containing stereotypical images were found to possess more stereotypical views about both gender and sexual relationships than those who were exposed to videos with less stereotypical content (Ward, Hansbrough, & Walker, 2005).

Music videos are geared toward adolescents and young adults who tend to be most affected by sexual images. Further, research has indicated that adolescents who

viewed videos containing sexual permissiveness were more likely than those who did not watch sexually permissive music videos to accept sex outside of marriage; this finding was found to be more significant in regard to female adolescent viewers than it was for male viewers (Andsager, 2003). Greater exposure to music videos and a connection with the characters have also been found to be an indicator of higher levels of sexual activity among high school students. Frequent viewing of music videos has been related to having many sexual partners and an increased probability of contracting a sexually transmitted disease, a finding more prevalent among young African American female adolescents (Ward, 2005).

Hip Hop Culture, Music, and Videos

Music videos are currently a growing part of American popular culture and their image of sexuality is one of the most preferred sources of entertainment for young people. A highly evolved and concentrated area of music videos is hip hop/rap. Hip hop, which is a very popular art form and subculture within American culture, is dominated by young African Americans and has influenced adolescents and young adults, especially African Americans, with an array of images found in its music videos (Kalof, 1999). Hip hop videos have been found to influence the lives of African American teenagers. As gangster rap videos have impacted young African Americans by showing violent images, hip hop videos have been found to have similar impact by portraying sexual images (Johnson, Adams, Ashburn, & Reed, 1995).

Definition and history of hip hop and rap.

The impact of hip hop has not been totally understood because many listeners have confused and labeled all rap music as hip hop; “rap music,” “hip hop,” and “gangsta rap” have been tied together in research, but they are not exactly the same. Hip hop is more than just music; it is a way of life that has engulfed the lives of many young African Americans. It influences daily activities such as style of dress, language, art, music, dance, and other forms of entertainment (Richardson & Scott, 2002). Hip hop culture began with 4 elements: rap, graffiti, breakdancing, and DJing. The birth of hip hop was mainly about positively uniting African Americans in the inner city and having fun. Hip hop’s birth in the United States was in the Bronx of New York City in the early 1970s. It became known in the late 1970s through street parties featuring rapping disc jockeys (DJs). By the 1980s, hip hop spread throughout the world and the genre of music even united with other genres such as rock, reggae, jazz, and gospel. With the 1990s, hip hop became commercial by which its sales exceeded \$100 million (Robinson, 1999).

Rap music is a form of expression with the use of oral words usually rhyming to a beat, and it happens to be a huge portion of hip hop culture. Just as rap is a major part of hip hop culture serving as only one form of expression, hip hop music is just one form of rap in general; other than hip hop, rap can be classified as gangsta, political, or commercial. Unlike hip hop music that is party driven for fun, gangsta rap, which is often confused with hip hop, is a form of rap that is used to address unpleasant urban

conditions by employing explicit, violent lyrics capturing the images of inner city struggles. Rap music has been viewed as a recent art form, but it is really a part of the old Black heritage of oral entertainment that existed long before the United States of America (Richardson & Scott, 2002).

Generally defined, rap music is characterized by orally rhyming words to music; it originates from an African custom of speaking in rhymes to a rhythmic beat with background music (Richardson & Scott, 2002). Strongly rooted in African culture, rap is representative of African music and dance by presenting a percussive style of performance, features of multiple meter, call and response, inner pulse control, and songs and dances of social allusion or derision. In Africa, rap grew from narrative poems called toasts, lengthy rhyming stories told mostly within groups of men. The expressions of rap music dating back to ancient Africa involve rhetorical devices such as proverbs, idioms, repetitions, sing-songs, environmental images, metaphors, similes, and folklore. The West African storytellers, historians, and musicians known as griots are given credit for originating rap (Cummings & Roy, 2002).

As one cultural expression of hip hop, rap music has served as a political voice for lower income African Americans in urban communities (Richardson & Scott, 2002). In the United States, rap music has become a huge art form that has crossed over into mainstream popular music. The appeal of rap is not confined to African Americans; it has gained growing support from young people across all ethnicities including middle-class White teenagers (Cummings & Roy, 2002). Further, rap has crossed different socioeconomic classes speaking to more than just working and lower class members of

the inner cities; it has become a part of teen identification grounded in features of adolescent identity development (Richardson & Scott).

Even with the popularity of rap music, there have been many negative critiques of it with the main idea of the art form contributing to the failure and problems of the youth (Richardson & Scott, 2002). Rap has been charged with sending antisocial and violent messages. However, rap music has its positive features also; it brings to the forefront messages about social issues such as the promotion of safe sex and traditional family values. Rap music reflects urban life, and it serves as a symbol of hope, pride, and self-esteem for African American youth when they are faced with hard times due to their social conditions. Rap can ease feelings of physical and psychological pain, and the expression of rap music is focused on themes of oppression and surviving in hostile environments (Cummings & Roy, 2002).

Problem related to hip hop music videos.

Hip hop music videos tend to show women as being sexually weak and possibly lead to girls' increased tolerance of disrespectful and aggressive sexual behavior. Exposure to sexual imagery in music videos has been found to have varying influence on males and females. Stereotyped attitudes and beliefs regarding sexual relationships were found to increase among male viewers and decrease among women (Johnson et al., 1995). Kalof (1999) also found music videos to affect young adults' beliefs about sexual relationships and suggested differences among men's and women's views of romantic relationships.

Due to hip hop's dominance by young African Americans, the profound effect of its videos' influence has been found among adolescent African Americans. Exposure to the elements in rap music videos can impact the lives of individuals who relate to it in multiple ways and may be detrimental to their health (Wingwood, DiClemente, Bernhardt, & Harrington, 2003). Wingwood et al. compared adolescents with little exposure to rap music videos with those who had been greatly exposed to rap music videos. Findings asserted those who consumed great quantities of rap music videos were twice as likely to have multiple sexual partners and 1.5 times as likely to be infected with a sexually transmitted disease. Hip hop/rap music videos are saturated with explicit sexual content and very seldom communicates the long-term risks of participating in such risky behaviors. The videos model unhealthy practices to adolescents, especially female teenagers who often see themselves as similar to the characters portrayed in the videos. As a result of much exposure to the degrading images of African American women in several rap videos, relationships among African American men and women have suffered due to trying to make their reality mirror the fantasy of the videos that reflect hip hop culture which African Americans are highly engulfed (Wingwood et al.).

Summary

The current literature has indicated some of the desirable traits that single adults often find in mates for long-term relationships. It has been found that qualities for mate selection vary according to gender (Geary et al., 2004; Giotakos, 2004; Johannessen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). The social environment has been also been found to affect the choices of individuals in their pursuit of an ideal long-term romantic partner. Variables

such as political orientation, level of education, and socioeconomic status have been found to predict individual's mate selection (Doosje et al., 1999; Dunkel & Papini, 2005; Sweeney & Cancian, 2004). Furthermore, research also indicates individuals preferring social homogamy in their long-term relationships (Blackwell & Litcher, 2004; Kalmijn, 1998). Not to be excluded, preferred sexual characteristics in mates were found to play a part in the selection of both short-term and long-term mates, equal significance between the sexes for short-term sexual relationships, and more important for males than females for long-term romantic relationships (Geary et al., 2004; Giotakos, 2004; Litzinger & Gordon, 2005; Regan et al., 2000).

Young adults' perceptions of the ideal mate may be influenced by today's media portrayals of dating and depictions of what kinds of individuals are considered desirable and highly pursued for both short-term sexual relationships or long-term romantic engagements. Television serves as the primary instrument of influence, and music videos provide imagery of cultural representations of attractive individuals for relationships and displays of what should be sought after for romantic or sexual partners (Andsager, 2003; Brown, 2002; Eggermont, 2004; Ward, 2002; Ward, 2005). Hip hop music videos, which tend to portray many of the elements of life in urban African American communities, have been found to impact the views of several African American adolescents who consume high volumes of the media form due to their relation of the video characters (Kalof, 1999). Hip hop videos often contain much sexual content and send negative messages regarding sexual behavior and relationships (Wingwood et al., 2003).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The method of research employed for this study involved the administering of a survey and daily diary. To acquire insight on the features individuals value for the selection of both short-term sexual partners and long-term romantic partners and how the viewing of hip hop music videos affect their perceptions of an ideal mate in the selection process, a questionnaire was used. By using this form of data collection instrument, questions were asked to a cross-section of a particular population and allowed an immediate response rate.

Sample/Subjects

A convenient non-random sample was the design for this study. Young African American adults in a public university setting were recruited in classrooms. The sample consisted of 80 single heterosexual adults ages 18-33, who had never been married and were residing in a rural university setting.

Instrumentation

The method of gathering data was a daily diary with a record of time spent watching television in general and viewing hip hop music videos over the span of 5 days combined with a questionnaire. The questionnaire, which is included in Appendix A, consisted of 53 items with rating attributes desired in a long-term romantic partner and a short-term sexual partner. Forty of the items were measured with a 5-point Likert scale

with a range of “extremely important” to “not at all important.” For the last 13 items, a second scale comprised of another 5-point Likert scale with a range of “strongly agree to strongly disagree” was employed, and 6 demographic descriptors preceded the items. Two versions of the questionnaire were distributed; version “A” began with a section of items directed toward a long-term romantic partner and concluded with a section of items referring to a short-term sexual partner, while version “B” began with the section in reference to a short-term sexual partner and ended with the section referring to a long-term romantic partner.

Variables

The variables in this study consisted of preferred traits of individuals in the process of mate selection (Table A1 of Appendix B). The main outcome variables were long-term mate selection, which was conceptualized as a person’s preference for partners in a steady dating, romantic cohabiting, or marital relationship; and short-term mate selection, which was defined as a person’s preference for partners for one-night stands and other inconsistent brief sexual affairs. The predictor variables of long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection included physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

Physical attractiveness was conceptualized as the perception of how good looking a person appears based on their facial and body features. Social status assumed the conceptualization of human and social capital features such as monetary possessions, material wealth and assets, professional positions, and education held by a person.

Internal attributes were defined as abstract inner features of a person such as personality, kindness, expressiveness, trustworthiness, intelligence, and the nature of their character. External attributes were conceptualized as the concrete recognizable traits of a person such as their possessions, outward appearance, and noticeable behavior. Sexual characteristics were defined as a person's preferred sexual characteristics in a mate pertaining to the physical act of sex, sexual experience, desires, knowledge, and openness to sexual behavior. Social homogamy was defined as sharing or possessing similar social characteristics such as common interests or hobbies and religious, educational, political, socio-economical, and family backgrounds with a potential mate. Television viewing was defined as the number hours an individual spent watching television in the span of 5 days, and hip hop music video exposure was conceptualized as the number of hip hop music videos viewed in the span of 5 days. The demographic variable employed in the study was gender; marital status, sexual orientation, and ethnicity served as control variables.

Scales of the Instrument

The scales of the instrument measured the variables that are believed to predict long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection. Physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, and social homogamy were measured by multiple items, each categorized with a 5-point Likert scale; scores ranged from 1-5 ("extremely important," "important," "undecided," "not important most of the time," "not at all important"). Thirty-one items were derived from Doosje et al.'s (1999) instrument that was a translated version of a previous study (Buss, Abbott, Angleitner, Asherian, Biaggio, Blanco-Villasenor, et al., 1990); the other 9 items were derived from another

study (Regan et al., 2000). Sexual characteristics were measured with 13 items on a 5-point Likert scale; scores ranged from 1-5 (“strongly agree,” “agree,” “undecided,” “disagree,” “strongly disagree”). Ten items on this scale were translations of a questionnaire employed in Giotakos’s study (2004); 3 items were created and added from Doosje et al. (1999) and Regan et al. (2000). Television viewing and hip hop music exposure were measured by the amount of time spent watching television and the number of hip hop music videos viewed in a daily diary expanding over 5 days (Thursday-Monday). The 2 main scales of the instrument were the outcome variables of long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection, both measured by the cumulative responses of the scaled items (1-53 for long-term romantic partner and 1-53 for short-term sexual partner) of the instrument.

Procedures

The initial step in the data collection process was acquiring consent from young adult members in an urban/suburban environment for the conduction of a pilot test on the instrument. The pilot test was administered to 9 single African American young adults, 3 males and 6 females, at a small weekend social gathering at the residence of the primary researcher. A letter of information about the study was read to each individual willing to participate. Each person who volunteered to participate in the pilot test completed a questionnaire, and 3 participants also completed a daily television viewing diary over the span of 2 days. Results of the pilot test indicated mostly non-statistically significant ($p > .05$) findings regarding hypotheses 1-8 of the study. There were statistically significant findings ($p < .05$) for hypotheses 4 and 6. There were no statistical analyses in reference

to hypotheses 9-14 involving the variables, hip hop music video exposure and television viewing measured using the daily diary, because diaries were not included in the pilot study for all 9 participants.

Three of the participants completed a shortened version of the diary only to indicate whether instructions for completing the diaries were clear. The 3 diaries completed and returned over the course of 2 days were properly completed and returned indicating reliability of the constructed diary. Reliability analysis was also determined for the scales involved in the analysis of hypotheses 1-8. With only 9 participants, reliability was a Cronbach χ score of .740-.936 for 8 of 12 scales. After completion of the pilot test and the testing of reliability on the scales of the instrument, the next step was attaining permission to use the planned premises of university classrooms to distribute the instrument of the study.

After receiving permission from the university's institutional review board and conducting phone conferences with 3 professors of the university involved in the study, the primary researcher traveled to the location of the research study and personally explained the procedures of the study to the professors and 2 of their teaching assistants (TAs). The TAs were informed of their duties and instructed about how they were to assist in conducting the study. The primary researcher provided the TAs with 150 letters of information and consent forms for participation, diaries, questionnaires, and a written script of what to say when recruiting students.

The participants were asked by teaching assistants (TAs) within the cluster of at least 6 classrooms among 3 selected university professors' of sociology and psychology

to participate in a study; those who volunteered to participate were informed of the study by reading an information letter. Before distributing the survey, official consent of the participants was obtained by signing and initialing the consent letter agreeing to complete the diary and questionnaire. Afterwards, the consent letters for those willing to participate were collected by the TAs. The daily diaries asking for a record of the amount of time spent watching television and the number of hip hop music videos were distributed at the proposed public location, 6 classrooms and later completed in the comfort and privacy of the participants' residence; diaries were collected after 5 days of viewing television. After 5 days of completing the diaries, questionnaires were distributed in the classes and attached to the diaries before collection. Participating persons were asked to complete the questionnaire with no time constraints related to class time.

A drop box in the sociology department was set up for the participants to submit their completed questionnaires by the end of the day. No names were required on the questionnaires or diaries, and confidentiality was achieved by anonymously dropping the questionnaires in the completion box. A designated instructor of one of the university classes returned the set of completed surveys by mail. After receiving the instruments of the study by mail and entering the data, a major imbalance of participants due to gender, 46 females and 24 males, was discovered and had to be resolved for statistical analysis purposes.

To solve the problem, a second wave of data collection was employed later with the sole purpose of recruiting more male participants. The second attempt to collect data also involved a non-random procedure. Two months after entering data received from the

initial mailing, the primary researcher traveled to the location of the sample involved in the study and strategically recruited additional male participants from four social science classes during the following semester by personally socializing with them on a daily basis and observing their seriousness and will to participate in the study. With the permission of the class professors, the researcher spoke to students before class about the study and provided them with consent forms for participation. Those willing to participate read and signed the consent forms and agreed to begin the study by taking a 5-day diary and questionnaire. The researcher returned to the same classes a week later to collect completed questionnaires and attached diaries.

Data Analysis

The collected data from the questionnaires were organized and analyzed by using the application of frequencies and cross tabulations of responses on specific items to show frequencies and percentages; Pearson r correlation indicated the relationship between overall variables; t-test and ANOVAs were run to demonstrate differences between groups; and regression analysis indicated which predictor variables predicted the outcome variables. The frequency distribution of respondents was used to demonstrate the number and percentages of the sample and Pearson r tested for significant relationships between variables. To examine the mean difference between groups, independent t-test or ANOVAs were employed, and regression demonstrated variables ability to predict other variables; refer to chart in appendix to see analysis employed for each hypotheses. These analysis tests were used to test the following hypotheses:

1. When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.
2. When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.
3. When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.
4. When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.
5. There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering long-term romantic partners.
6. There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering short-term sexual partners.
7. There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a long-term romantic relationship.
8. There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a short-term sexual relationship.
9. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner.

10. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.

11. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner.

12. There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.

13. Long-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

14. Short-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

Summary

The method of research employed for this study involved the administering of a questionnaire and daily diary for 5 days. A convenient non-random sample of 80 participants was used for this study. The variables in this study consisted of preferred traits of individuals in the process of mate selection. The main outcome variables were long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection. The variables measured as predictors of both long-term and short-term mate selection were physical attractiveness,

social status, internal and external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure. The data collected from the questionnaires were grouped and analyzed by the following statistical tests: t-test, ANOVA, regression, Pearson correlation test.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The effect of hip hop music videos on African American young adults' perceptions of the ideal mate for long-term romantic relationships and short-term sexual relationships was investigated with a sample of students who attended a public university in Louisiana. The participants completed diaries listing the amount of time spent viewing hip hop related programming on television for 5 consecutive days and the number of hip hop music videos consumed for 5 consecutive days. Along with the diaries, the participants responded to a questionnaire consisting of 53 items using 5-point Likert scales to rate specific traits as desirable or not when selecting short-term sexual partners and another 53 items using the same 5-point Likert scales to rate traits considered desirable or not when choosing long-term romantic partners.

Participants

While 96 students agreed to participate in the study, data from only 70 (72.9% of the total) were used for analysis. Twenty-six respondents did not meet the study's criteria of single heterosexual African American young adults ages 18-35 who had never been married; 3 were excluded for not indicating single status, 3 were excluded for indicating not being heterosexual, 6 were excluded for not indicating being African American, 5 were excluded for indicating no age, and 1 was excluded for indicating an age greater than 35 years. Another 8 participants were excluded due to the incompleteness of their

questionnaires, resulting in 70 usable sets of data. Since only 24 of the 70 participants were male, 10 additional males were recruited and added to the study. Therefore, the total number of participants was 80, 34 males (42.5%) and 46 females (57.5%). The overall mean age of the participants was 21.21 years; the mean age of males was 21.82, and the mean age of females was 20.76.

Findings

Participants' responses to individual items were organized with frequency distributions and percentages, which can be viewed in Table A2 of Appendix B. The participants rated the importance of 40 statements about desirable traits of a long-term romantic partner involving physical attraction, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, and social homogamy. Participants also rated the degree of agreement with 13 statements about desirable traits of a long-term romantic partner involving sexual characteristics. The same 40 statements used to rate the importance of physical attraction, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, and social homogamy for a long-term romantic partner were also used to rate their importance for a short-term sexual partner; and the same 13 statements used to rate the degree of agreement of sexual characteristics for a long-term romantic partner were also used to rate the degree of agreement of sexual characteristics for a short-term sexual partner.

Physical Attractiveness

For the long-term and short-term physical attractiveness scales, a score of 5 indicated not at all attractive, 6-10 was not really attractive, 11-15 was slightly attractive, 16-20 was moderately attractive, and 21-25 was highly attractive. The long-term physical

attractiveness scale consisted of 5 items with a reliability of .823 (Cronbach's χ). When rating physical attractiveness for long-term partners, the mean score of the scale was 19.55, moderately attractive. The following table displays the long-term physical attractiveness scale.

Table 1 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Physical Attractiveness

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)	Cronbach's χ	Mean	
		80 (100)	.823	19.55	
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
9. My long-term romantic partner is really sexy looking.	24 (30)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	6 (7.5)	5 (6.3)
15. My long-term romantic partner really looks good.	28 (35)	25 (31.3)	16 (20)	7 (8.8)	4 (5)
26. My long-term romantic partner appears healthy.	50 (62.5)	22 (27.5)	7 (8.8)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
33. My long-term romantic partner is physically attractive.	29 (36.3)	35 (43.8)	10 (12.5)	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)
34. My long-term romantic partner looks athletic.	16 (20)	27 (33.8)	20 (25)	9 (11.3)	8 (10)

The results of the long-term physical attractiveness scale indicated 65% of participants rated a person as being really sexy looking as important when choosing a long-term romantic partner and only 13.8% rated it as not important for selecting a long-term romantic partner. In response to "my partner really looks good," 66.3% of participants rated looking good as important and 13.8% rated it as not important. Appearing healthy was rated as important by 90% of the participants and only 1.3% rated it as not important. Eighty percent of the participants rated being overall physically attractive as important and only 7.6% rated overall physical attraction as not important.

Regarding looking athletic, 53.8% of participants rated an athletic look as important and 21.3% rated it as not important.

The short-term physical attractiveness scale also consisted of 5 items, indicating a reliability of .813 (Cronbach's χ). When rating physical attractiveness for short-term partners, the mean score of the scale was 20.13, also moderately attractive. The following table displays the short-term physical attractiveness scale.

Table 2 African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Physical Attractiveness

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		80 (100)			.813	20.13
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important	
9. My short-term sexual partner is really sexy looking.	40 (50)	24 (30)	8 (10)	3 (3.8)	5 (6.3)	
15. My short-term sexual partner really looks good.	30 (37.5)	32 (40)	12 (15)	4 (5)	2 (2.5)	
26. My short-term sexual partner appears healthy.	45 (56.3)	23 (28.8)	11 (13.8)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	
33. My short-term sexual partner is physically attractive.	36 (45)	31 (38.8)	9 (11.3)	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	
34. My short-term sexual partner looks athletic.	16 (20)	19 (23.8)	28 (35)	11 (13.8)	6 (7.5)	

The results of the short-term physical attractiveness indicated 80% of participants rated appearing sexy as important when selecting a partner for the short-term and only 10.1% rated it as not important. As an indication of how important looking good is for selection of a short-term partner, 77.5% rated looking good as important and only 7.5% rated it as not important. When rating the importance of healthy appearance, 85.1% indicated it as important and only 1.3% rated it as not important. Overall physical

attractiveness was rated as important by 83.8% of the participants and only 5.1% rated it as not important. An athletic appearance was rated by 43.8% of the participants as important in comparison to 21.3% who rated it as not important.

Social Status

For both the long-term and short-term social status scales, a score of 6 indicated low social status, 7-12 was below average social status, 13-18 was average social status, 19-24 was above average social status, and 25-30 was high social status. The long-term social status scale consisted of 6 items with a reliability of .780 (Cronbach's χ). When rating social status for long-term romantic relationships, the mean score of the scale was 23.75, above average social status. The following table displays the long-term social status scale.

Table 3 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Social Status

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		80 (100)			.780	23.75
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important	
1. My long-term romantic partner has a well paid job.	37 (46.3)	33 (41.3)	8 (10)	0 (0)	2 (2.5)	
3. My long-term romantic partner is wealthy.	12 (15)	14 (17.5)	24 (30)	19 (23.8)	11 (13.8)	
8. My long-term romantic partner is a good financial prospect.	36 (45)	29 (36.3)	11 (13.8)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	
21. My long-term romantic partner has high educational attainment.	37 (46.3)	31 (38.8)	8 (10)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	
23. My long-term romantic partner has a favorable social status or rating.	23 (28.8)	30 (37.5)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)	6 (7.5)	
37. My long-term romantic partner has a good education.	39 (48.8)	34 (42.5)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	

When rating the importance of a long-term romantic partner having a well paid job, 87.6% rated having a well paying job as important and only 2.5% rated it as not important. Next, 32.5% of participants rated a long-term partner being wealthy as important and 37.6% rated it as not important. In response to “my partner is a good financial prospect,” 81.3% rated being a good financial prospect as important and only 5% rated it as not important. For high educational attainment, 85.1% of participants rated attaining much education as important and only 5% rated it as not important. Having a favorable social status or rating was rated as important by 66.3% of the participants and 16.3% rated it as not important. Generally having a good education was rated as important by 91.3% of participants and only 2.6% rated it as not important.

The short-term social status scale also consisted of 6 items, indicating a reliability of .821 (Cronbach’s χ). The mean score of the short-term social status scale was 19.78, also above average social status. The following table displays the short-term social status scale.

Table 4 African American Young Adults’ Rating of Short-term Social Status

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach’s χ	Mean
		Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
1. My short-term sexual partner has a well paid job.	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	18 (22.5)	8 (10)	18 (22.5)	
3. My short-term sexual partner is wealthy.	3 (3.8)	14 (17.5)	23 (28.8)	16 (20)	24 (30)	
8. My short-term sexual partner is a good financial prospect.	18 (22.5)	25 (31.3)	21 (26.3)	4 (5)	12 (15)	

21. My short-term sexual partner has high educational attainment.	24 (30)	23 (28.8)	19 (23.8)	5 (6.3)	9 (11.3)
23. My short-term sexual partner has a favorable social status or rating.	15 (18.8)	28 (35)	18 (22.5)	13 (16.3)	6 (7.5)
37. My short-term sexual partner has a good education.	28 (35)	26 (32.5)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)	8 (10)

In reference to a short-term sexual partner having a well paid job, 45.1% rated having a well paying job as important and 32.5% rated it as not important. As an indication of wealth's importance, 21.3% of participants rated a partner being wealthy as important and 50% rated a partner's wealth as not important. Being a good financial prospect was rated by 53.8% of participants as important and 20% rated it as not important. Having high educational attainment was rated by 58.8% of participants as important and 17.6% rated it as not important. Partners having a favorable social status or rating was rated by 53.8% of participants as being important and rated by 23.8% of participants as not being important. Generally having a good education was rated as important by 67.5% of participants and 13.8% rated it as not important.

Internal Attributes

On the long-term internal attributes scale and short-term internal attributes scale, a score of 21 indicated not a valued attribute, 22-42 was a lowly valued attribute, 43-63 was a somewhat valued attribute, 64-84 was a moderately valued attribute, and 85-105 was a highly valued attribute. The long-term internal attributes scale consisted of 21 items with a reliability of .948 (Cronbach's χ). On the long-term internal attributes scale, the mean score was 92.43, a highly valued attribute. The following table displays the long-term internal attributes scale.

Table 5 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Internal Attributes

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
				80 (100)	.948	92.43
2.	My long-term romantic partner is very dependable.	56 (70)	18 (22.5)	3 (3.8)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.5)
4.	My long-term romantic partner is easy going.	28 (35)	40 (50)	8 (10)	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)
6.	My long-term romantic partner is trustworthy.	71 (88.8)	6 (7.5)	2 (2.5)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
7.	My long-term romantic partner is intelligent.	45 (56.3)	27 (33.8)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.5)
11.	My long-term romantic partner is easy to talk to.	54 (67.5)	20 (25)	5 (6.3)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
12.	My long-term romantic partner is honest.	64 (80)	9 (11.3)	6 (7.5)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
13.	My long-term romantic partner is emotionally stable and mature.	62 (77.5)	14 (17.5)	3 (3.8)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
14.	My long-term romantic partner is romantic.	40 (50)	29 (36.3)	8 (10)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.3)
16.	My long-term romantic partner is ambitious.	40 (50)	26 (32.5)	13 (16.3)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
20.	My long-term romantic partner is capable of expressing feelings.	49 (61.3)	19 (23.8)	10 (12.5)	0 (0)	2 (2.5)
22.	My long-term romantic partner has a pleasant personality/character.	48 (60)	24 (30)	6 (7.5)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)
24.	My long-term romantic partner is flexible and adaptive.	29 (36.3)	37 (46.3)	12 (15)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)
27.	My long-term romantic partner and I can talk well to each other.	57 (71.3)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)
29.	My long-term romantic partner has a pleasing disposition.	28 (35)	24 (30)	22 (27.5)	4 (5)	2 (2.5)
30.	My long-term romantic partner is interesting to talk to.	44 (55)	30 (37.5)	4 (5)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)

31. My long-term romantic partner is hardworking and industrious.	45 (56.3)	28 (35)	6 (7.5)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
35. My long-term romantic partner has a good sense of humor.	46 (57.5)	26 (32.5)	6 (7.5)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)
36. My long-term romantic partner is friendly and sociable.	38 (47.5)	32 (40)	9 (11.3)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
38. My long-term romantic partner has an exciting personality.	38 (47.5)	28 (35)	13 (16.3)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)
39. My long-term romantic partner is creative.	25 (31.3)	36 (45)	15 (18.8)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)
40. My long-term romantic partner is a good listener.	53 (66.3)	20 (25)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)

In response to the statement, “my partner is very dependable,” 92.5% of participants rated a partner being very dependable as important and only 3.8% rated it as not important. Having an easy going partner was rated as important by 85% of the participants and not important by 5.1% of participants. Being trustworthy was rated as important by 96.3% of participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Having an intelligent partner was rated as important by 90.1% of participants and as not important by only 3.8% of participants. Having a partner who is easy to talk to was rated as important by 92.5% of participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Having an honest partner was rated as important by 91.3% of participants and as not important by only 1.3% of participants.

Having an emotionally stable and mature partner was rated as important by 95% of the participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Being romantic was rated as important by 86.3% of participants and rated as not important by 3.8% of participants. Having an ambitious partner was rated as important by 82.5% of participants and as not important by only 1.3% of participants. Having a partner who is capable of expressing

feeling was rated as important by 85.1% of participants; 2.5% rated it as not important. Possessing a pleasant personality/character was rated as important by 90% of participants; 2.6% rated it as not important. Being flexible and adaptive was rated by 82.6% of participants as important and rated by only 2.6% as not important. Talking well with a partner was rated as important by 88.8% of participants and as not important by only 2.6% of participants. Having a pleasing disposition was rated as important by 65% of all participants and as not important by 7.5% of participants.

Being interesting to talk to was rated as important by 87.5% of participants; only 2.6% rated it as not important. Having a hardworking and industrious partner was rated as important by 91.3% of the participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Ninety percent of the participants rated having a partner with a good sense of humor as important; only 2.6% rated it as not important. Having a friendly and sociable partner was rated as important by 87.5% of the participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Having an exciting personality was rated as important by 82.5% of the participants; only 1.3% rated it as not important. Having a creative partner was rated as important by 76.3% of the participants; 5% rated it as not important. Being a good listener was rated by 91.3% of the participants; only 2.6% rated it as not important.

The short-term internal attributes scale also consisted of 21 items, indicating a reliability of .938 (Cronbach's χ). For the short-term internal attributes scale, the mean score was 81.11, a moderately valued attribute. The following table displays the short-term internal attributes scale.

Table 6 African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Internal Attributes

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
				80 (100)	.938	81.11
2.	My short-term sexual partner is very dependable.					
	24 (30)	26 (32.5)	15 (18.8)	6 (7.5)	9 (11.3)	
4.	My short-term sexual partner is easy going.					
	19 (23.8)	33 (41.3)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)	8 (10)	
6.	My short-term sexual partner is trustworthy.					
	43 (53.8)	19 (23.8)	6 (7.5)	4 (5)	8 (10)	
7.	My short-term sexual partner is intelligent.					
	32 (40)	24 (30)	14 (17.5)	4 (5)	6 (7.5)	
11.	My short-term sexual partner is easy to talk to.					
	37 (46.3)	25 (31.3)	10 (12.5)	4 (5)	4 (5)	
12.	My short-term sexual partner is honest.					
	46 (57.5)	17 (21.3)	11 (13.8)	1 (1.3)	5 (6.3)	
13.	My short-term sexual partner is emotionally stable and mature.					
	38 (47.5)	26 (32.5)	9 (11.3)	5 (6.3)	2 (2.5)	
14.	My short-term sexual partner is romantic.					
	24 (30)	25 (31.3)	17 (21.3)	8 (10)	6 (7.5)	
16.	My short-term sexual partner is ambitious.					
	22 (27.5)	27 (33.8)	19 (23.8)	7 (8.8)	5 (6.3)	
20.	My short-term sexual partner is capable of expressing feelings.					
	22 (27.5)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	5 (6.3)	8 (10)	
22.	My short-term sexual partner has a pleasant personality/character.					
	31 (38.8)	35 (43.8)	10 (12.5)	3 (3.8)	1 (1.3)	
24.	My short-term sexual partner is flexible and adaptive.					
	19 (23.8)	36 (45)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)	2 (2.5)	
27.	My short-term sexual partner and I can talk well to each other.					
	36 (45)	22 (27.5)	13 (16.3)	2 (2.5)	7 (8.8)	
29.	My short-term sexual partner has a pleasing disposition.					
	18 (22.5)	28 (35)	27 (33.8)	4 (5)	3 (3.8)	
30.	My short-term sexual partner is interesting to talk to.					
	26 (32.5)	32 (40)	12 (15)	4 (5)	6 (7.5)	
31.	My short-term sexual partner is hardworking and industrious.					

	24 (30)	21 (26.3)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)	12 (15)
35. My short-term sexual partner has a good sense of humor.	24 (30)	38 (47.5)	11 (13.8)	3 (3.8)	4 (5)
36. My short-term sexual partner is friendly and sociable.	30 (37.5)	34 (42.5)	11 (13.8)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.5)
38. My short-term sexual partner has an exciting personality.	26 (32.5)	31 (38.8)	17 (21.3)	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)
39. My short-term sexual partner is creative.	18 (22.5)	27 (33.8)	22 (27.5)	8 (10)	5 (6.3)
40. My short-term sexual partner is a good listener.	39 (48.8)	14 (17.5)	17 (21.3)	4 (5)	6 (7.5)

Responding to “my partner is very dependable,” 62.5% of participants rated having a very dependable partner as important and 18.8% rated it as not important. Having an easy going partner was rated as important by 65.1% of participants and as not important by 16.3% of participants. When rating the importance of having a trustworthy partner for a short-term sexual relationship, 77.6% of participants rated it as important and 15% rated it as not important. Seventy percent of participants rated having an intelligent partner as important; 12.5% rated it as not important. Having a partner who is easy to talk to was rated as important by 77.6% of the participants and as not important by 10% of the participants. Eighty percent of all participants rated a partner being emotionally stable and mature as important; 8.8% rated it as not being important.

Having a romantic partner for the short-term was rated as important by 61.3 of the participants; 17.5% rated it as not important. Being ambitious as an internal attribute of a short-term sexual partner was rated as important by 61.3% of participants and as not important by 15.1% of participants. Being capable of expressing feelings was rated as important by 62.5% of participants and as not important by 16.3% of participants. Having a pleasant personality/character was rated by 82.6% of participants; 5.1% of

participants rated it as not important. Having a flexible and adaptive partner was rated by 68.8% of the participants as important and rated by 7.5% as not important. Talking well with a partner for the short-term was rated as important by 72.5% of the participants; 11.3% of participants rated it as not important. Having a pleasing disposition was rated as important by 57.5% of participants and rated as not important by 8.8% of participants. Being interesting to talk to was rated important by 72.5% of participants and as not important by 12.5% of participants.

A short-term sexual partner being hardworking and industrious was rated as important by 56.3% of participants; 20% rated it as not important. Having a good sense of humor was rated as important by 77.5% of the participants and as not important by 8.8% of participants. Eighty percent of participants rated being friendly and sociable as important when choosing a partner for the short-term; only 6.3% rated it as not important. Having an exciting personality was rated by 71.3% of the participants as important and 7.6% rated it as not important. Having a partner who is creative was rated as important by 56.3% of participants and as not important by 16.3% of participants. Being a good listener was rated as important by 66.3% of the participants; 12.5% rated it as not important.

External Attributes

For both the long-term and short-term external attributes scales, a score of 12 indicated not a valued attribute, 13-24 was a lowly valued attribute, 25-36 was a somewhat valued attribute, 27-48 was a moderately valued attribute, and 49-60 was a highly valued attribute. The long-term external attributes scale consisted of 12 items with

a reliability of .847 (Cronbach's χ). On the long-term external attributes scale, the mean score was 46.24, a moderately valued attribute. The following table displays the long-term external attributes scale.

Table 7 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term External Attributes

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		80 (100)			.847	46.24
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important	
1. My long-term romantic partner has a well paid job.	37 (46.3)	33 (41.3)	8 (10)	0 (0)	2 (2.5)	
3. My long-term romantic partner is wealthy.	12 (15)	14 (17.5)	24 (30)	19 (23.8)	11 (13.8)	
8. My long-term romantic partner is a good financial prospect.	36 (45)	29 (36.3)	11 (13.8)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	
9. My long-term romantic partner is really sexy looking.	24 (30)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	6 (7.5)	5 (6.3)	
15. My long-term romantic partner really looks good.	28 (35)	25 (31.3)	16 (20)	7 (8.8)	4 (5)	
18. My long-term romantic partner is a good cook.	23 (28.8)	20 (25)	23 (28.8)	5 (6.3)	9 (11.3)	
21. My long-term romantic partner has high educational attainment.	37 (46.3)	31 (38.8)	8 (10)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	
23. My long-term romantic partner has a favorable social status or rating.	23 (28.8)	30 (37.5)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)	6 (7.5)	
32. My long-term romantic partner is a good housekeeper.	27 (33.8)	29 (36.3)	16 (20)	5 (6.3)	3 (3.8)	
33. My long-term romantic partner is physically attractive.	29 (36.3)	35 (43.8)	10 (12.5)	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)	
34. My long-term romantic partner looks athletic.	16 (20)	27 (33.8)	20 (25)	9 (11.3)	8 (10)	
37. My long-term romantic partner has a good education.	39 (48.8)	34 (42.5)	5 (6.3)	1(1.3)	1 (1.3)	

When rating the importance of a partner having a well paid job, 87.6% of participants rated it as important and only 2.5% rated it as not important. Having a

wealthy partner was rated as important by 32.5% of participants and as not important by 37.6% of participants. Being a good financial prospect was rated as important by 81.3% of the participants and rated as not important by 5% of the participants. Having a partner who is really sexy looking was rated as important by 65% of the participants, 13.8% rated it as not important. In response to the statement, “my partner really looks good,” 66.3% rated looking good as important for a partner and 13.8% rated it as not important. A partner being a good cook was rated as important by 53.8% of the participants; 17.6% of participants rated it as not important. Attaining a high level of education as an attribute in a long-term romantic partner was rated as important by 85.1% of the participants; only 5% rated high educational attainment as not important.

Having an overall favorable social status or rating was rated as important by 66.3% of participants and as not important by 16.3% of participants. Being a good housekeeper was rated by 70.1% of the participants as important and by 10.1% as not important. Having a partner who is physically attractive was rated as important by 80.1% of all participants and as not important by only 7.6% of the participants. Looking athletic as an external attribute was rated by 43.8% of participants as important; 21.3% of participants rated it as not important. A partner having a good education was rated as important by 91.3% of the participants; only 2.6% of participants rated it as not important.

The short-term external attributes scale also consisted of 12 items, indicating a reliability of .816 (Cronbach's χ). On the short-term external attributes scale, the mean score was 41.75, also a moderately valued attribute. The following table displays the short-term external attributes scale.

Table 8 African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term External Attributes

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		80 (100)			.816	41.75
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important	
1. My short-term sexual partner has a well paid job.	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	18 (22.5)	8 (10)	18 (22.5)	
3. My short-term sexual partner is wealthy.	3 (3.8)	14 (17.5)	23 (28.8)	16 (20)	24 (30)	
8. My short-term sexual partner is a good financial prospect.	18 (22.5)	25 (31.3)	21 (26.3)	4 (5)	12 (15)	
9. My short-term sexual partner is really sexy looking.	40 (50)	24 (30)	8 (10)	3 (3.8)	5 (6.3)	
15. My short-term sexual partner really looks good.	30 (37.5)	32 (40)	12 (15)	4 (5)	2 (2.5)	
18. My short-term sexual partner is a good cook.	10 (12.5)	17 (21.3)	27 (33.8)	11 (13.8)	15 (18.8)	
21. My short-term sexual partner has high educational attainment.	24 (30)	23 (28.8)	19 (23.8)	5 (6.3)	9 (11.3)	
23. My short-term sexual partner has a favorable social status or rating.	15 (18.8)	28 (35)	18 (22.5)	13 (16.3)	6 (7.5)	
32. My short-term sexual partner is a good housekeeper.	17 (21.3)	24 (30)	17 (21.3)	9 (11.3)	13 (16.3)	
33. My short-term sexual partner is physically attractive.	36 (45)	31 (38.8)	9 (11.3)	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	
34. My short-term sexual partner looks athletic.	16 (20)	19 (23.8)	28 (35)	11 (13.8)	6 (7.5)	
37. My short-term sexual partner has a good education.	28 (35)	26 (32.5)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)	8 (10)	

A partner for a short-term sexual relationship having a well paid job was rated by 45.1% of participants as important and 32.5% of participants as not important. Being wealthy as a partner was rated as important by only 21.3% of the participants; 50% of the

participants rated it as not important. Having a partner as a good financial prospect was rated as important by 53.7% of the participants and as not important by 20% of the participants. Having a partner who really looks good was rated as important by 77.5% of the participants and as not important by only 7.5% of participants. Being a good cook was rated by 33.8% of the participants as important and by 32.6% of the participants as not important. High educational attainment as an attribute was rated as important by 58.8% of the participants; 17.6% rated it as not important.

Having an overall favorable social status or rating was rated by 53.8% of the participants as important and by 23.8% of the participants as not important. A short-term sexual partner being a good housekeeper was rated as important by 51.3% of the participants; 27.6% rated it as not important. Having an overall physically attractive partner for the short-term was rated as important by 83.8% of the participants; only 5.1% rated it as not important. Having an athletic appearance was rated as important by 43.8% of the participants and as not important by 21.3% of the participants. A partner having a good education was rated by 67.5% of the participants as important; only 13.8% rated it as not important.

Social Homogamy

Social homogamy was defined as sharing or possessing similar social characteristics such as common interests or hobbies and religious, educational, political, socio-economical, and family backgrounds with a potential mate; being homogamous means having similar social characteristics. For both the long-term and short-term social homogamy scales, a score of 6 indicated not at all homogamous, 7-12 was not really

homogamous, 13-18 was slightly homogamous, 19-24 was moderately homogamous, and 25-30 was highly homogamous. The long-term social homogamy scale consisted of 6 items with a reliability of .771 (Cronbach's χ). On the long-term social homogamy scale, the mean score was 23.08, moderately homogamous. The following table displays the long-term social homogamy scale.

Table 9 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Social Homogamy

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)	Cronbach's χ Mean		
		80 (100)	.771	23.08	
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
5. My long-term romantic partner has similar time spending leisure.	24 (30)	29 (36.3)	17 (21.3)	7 (8.8)	3 (3.8)
10. My long-term romantic partner has similar hobbies.	20 (25)	26 (32.5)	19 (23.8)	10 (12.5)	5 (6.3)
17. My long-term romantic partner has a similar religious background.	44 (55)	12 (15)	12 (15)	9 (11.3)	3 (3.8)
19. My long-term romantic partner has a similar political background.	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	19 (23.8)	13 (16.3)	12 (15)
25. My long-term romantic partner is similar to my self in interests.	21 (26.3)	37 (46.3)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)	2 (2.5)
27. My long-term romantic partner and I can talk well to each other.	57 (71.3)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)

When rating similar time spending leisure, 66.3% of participants rated similar time with leisure as important and 12.6% rated it as not important. Having similar hobbies was rated by 57.5% of participants as important and rated by 18.8% of participants as not important. Seventy percent of all participants rated having a similar religious background with a partner as important; 15.1% rated it as not important. Having a similar political background as a long-term partner was rated as important by 45.1% of

the participants and as not important by 31.3% of the participants. In response to “my partner is similar to my self in interests,” 72.6% of participants rated similar interests as important and only 8.8% rated it as not important. Talking well with a long-term partner was rated as important by 88.8% of the participants; only 2.6% rated it as not important.

The short-term social homogeneity scale also consisted of 6 items, indicating a reliability of .824 (Cronbach’s χ). For the short-term social homogeneity scale, the mean score was 19.58, also moderately homogenous. The following table displays the short-term social homogeneity scale.

Table 10 African American Young Adults’ Rating of Short-term Social Homogeneity

Item	Frequency/Percentage		N (%)	Cronbach’s χ	Mean
			80 (100)	.824	19.58
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Not at all Important
5. My short-term sexual partner has similar time spending leisure.	12 (15)	23 (28.8)	21 (26.3)	10 (12.5)	14 (17.5)
10. My short-term sexual partner has similar hobbies.	10 (12.5)	25 (31.3)	21 (26.3)	14 (17.5)	10 (12.5)
17. My short-term sexual partner has a similar religious background.	26 (32.5)	16 (20)	18 (22.5)	7 (8.8)	13 (16.3)
19. My short-term sexual partner has a similar political background.	7 (8.8)	16 (20)	17 (21.3)	14 (17.5)	26 (32.5)
25. My short-term sexual partner is similar to my self in interests.	16 (20)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	7 (8.8)	12 (15)
27. My short-term sexual partner and I can talk well to each other.	36 (45)	22 (27.5)	13 (16.3)	2 (2.5)	7 (8.8)

For a short-term sexual partner, having similar time spending leisure was rated as important by 43.8% of the participants and as not important by 30% of the participants.

Having similar hobbies for the short-term was rated by 43.8% of the participants as

important and by 30% of the participants as not important. Having a similar religious background was rated as important by 52.5% of the participants and rated as not important by 25.1% of the participants. Only 28.8% of participants rated having a similar political background as important; 50% of the participants rated it as not important. Fifty-five percent of participants rated having similar interests with a short-term sexual partner as important; 23.8% rated it as not important. Talking well to a partner for the short-term was rated as important by 72.5% of the participants; 11.3% rated it as not important.

Sexual Characteristics

The items for the sexual characteristics scales are measured differently unlike the previous scales in which each item was measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “extremely important” to “not at all important”. The scale used for sexual characteristics, ranges from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” This 5-point Likert scale indicated the degree of agreement for each statement in reference to sexual characteristics as a desirable attribute for mate selection. For the long-term sexual characteristics scale and the short-term sexual characteristics scale, a score of 13 indicated not at all sexual, 14-26 was not really sexual, 27-39 was slightly sexual, 40-52 was moderately sexual, and 53-65 was highly sexual. The long-term sexual characteristics scale consisted of 13 items with a reliability of .860 (Cronbach’s χ). On the long-term sexual characteristics scale, the mean score was 46.20, moderately sexual. The following table displays the scale for long-term sexual characteristics.

Table 11 African American Young Adults' Rating of Long-term Sexual Characteristics

Item	Frequency/Percentage	N (%)			Cronbach's χ	Mean
		80 (100)			.860	46.20
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
41. My long-term romantic partner must be open to discussing sex.	39 (48.8)	30 (37.5)	8 (10)	3 (3.8)	0 (0)	
42. My long-term romantic partner must be open to different acts.	22 (27.5)	31 (38.8)	17 (21.3)	6 (7.5)	4 (5)	
43. My long-term romantic partner must be physically attractive.	25 (31.3)	35 (43.8)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.5)	
44. My long-term romantic partner must be knowledgeable about sex.	26 (32.5)	26 (32.5)	12 (15)	4 (5)	3 (3.8)	
45. My long-term romantic partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.	13 (16.3)	17 (21.3)	21 (26.3)	20 (25)	9 (11.3)	
46. My long-term romantic partner has to communicate desires.	31 (38.8)	28 (35)	13 (16.3)	4 (5)	4 (5)	
47. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused.	18 (22.5)	28 (35)	18 (22.5)	13 (16.3)	3 (3.8)	
48. I would like my long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily.	12 (15)	20 (25)	23 (28.8)	14 (17.5)	11 (13.8)	
49. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.	9 (11.3)	11 (13.8)	18 (22.5)	17 (21.3)	25 (31.3)	
50. I like my long-term romantic partner to take the dominant role during sex.	15 (18.8)	22 (27.5)	24 (30)	13 (16.3)	6 (7.5)	
51. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to have much sexual experience.	10 (12.5)	11 (13.8)	22 (27.5)	21 (26.3)	16 (20)	
52. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate.	33 (41.3)	27 (33.8)	14 (17.5)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)	
53. I would like my long-term romantic partner to have a high sex drive.	27 (33.8)	20 (25)	21 (26.3)	7 (8.8)	5 (6.3)	

In response to "my long-term romantic partner must be open to discussing sex,"

86.3% of participants agreed and 13.8% of the participants disagreed. For the statement,

“my partner must be open to different acts,” 60.1% of participants agreed and 12.5% disagreed. In response to “my partner must be physically attractive, 75.1% of participants agreed and only 6.3% disagreed. In response to “my partner must be knowledgeable about sex,” 76.3% of participants agreed and 8.8% disagreed. For the statement, “my partner needs to pay me compliments during sex, 37.6% of participants agreed and 36.3% of participants disagreed. In response to “my partner has to communicate desires,” 73.8% of participants agreed and only 10% of the participants disagreed.

The participants of the study responded to the statement, “I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused” with the result of 57.5% of them agreeing and 20.1% disagreeing. Forty percent of the participants agreed that they would like their long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily and 31.3% disagreed in reference to liking their partner to experience orgasm easily. In response to the statement, “I prefer my partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines, 25.1% of participants agreed and 52.6% disagreed. With a long-term romantic partner, 46.3% of participants agreed that they would like their partner to take the dominant role during sex; 23.8% disagreed about liking their partner to take the dominant role during sex. In response to the statement, “I prefer my partner to have much sexual experience,” 26.3% of participants agreed and 46.3% of participants disagreed. In reference to sexual passion, 75.1% of participants agreed that they would like their long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate. Far as sex drive, 58.8% of the participants agreed to the statement, “I would like my partner to have a high sex drive”; 15.1% of participants disagreed with the statement.

The short-term sexual characteristics scale also consisted of 13 items, indicating a reliability of .628 (Cronbach's χ). For the short-term sexual characteristics scale, the mean score was 46, also moderately sexual. The following table displays the short-term sexual characteristics scale.

Table 12 African American Young Adults' Rating of Short-term Sexual Characteristics

Item	Frequency/Percentage		N (%)		Cronbach's χ	Mean
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		
			80 (100)		.628	46.00
41. My short-term sexual partner must be open to discussing sex.	38 (47.5)	24 (30)	13 (16.3)	2 (2.5)		3 (3.8)
42. My short-term sexual partner must be open to different acts.	18 (22.5)	23 (28.8)	26 (32.5)	7 (8.8)		6 (7.5)
43. My short-term sexual partner must be physically attractive.	32 (40)	31 (38.8)	12 (15)	2 (2.5)		3 (3.8)
44. My short-term sexual partner must be knowledgeable about sex.	37 (46.3)	23 (28.8)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)		2 (2.5)
45. My short-term sexual partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.	14 (17.5)	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	17 (21.3)		13 (16.3)
46. My short-term sexual partner has to communicate desires.	23 (28.8)	31 (38.8)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)		6 (7.5)
47. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be easily sexually aroused.	15 (18.8)	24 (30)	28 (35)	8 (10)		5 (6.3)
48. I would like my short-term sexual partner to experience orgasm easily.	14 (17.5)	16 (20)	24 (30)	9 (11.3)		17 (21.3)
49. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.	11 (13.8)	9 (11.3)	23 (28.8)	15 (18.8)		22 (27.5)
50. I like my short-term sexual partner to take the dominant role during sex.	13 (16.3)	16 (20)	25 (31.3)	12 (15)		14 (17.5)
51. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to have much sexual experience.	13 (16.3)	12 (15)	25 (31.3)	15 (18.8)		15 (18.8)
52. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be sexually passionate.	32 (40)	21 (26.3)	21 (26.3)	2 (2.5)		4 (5)
53. I would like my short-term sexual partner to have a high sex drive.	27 (33.8)	24 (30)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)		6 (7.5)

Responding to the statement, “my short-term sexual partner must be open to discussing sex,” 77.5% of the participants agreed and only 6.3% disagreed. In response to “my partner must be open to different acts,” 61.3% of the participants agreed and 16.3% of participants disagreed. For a short-term sexual partner, 78.8% of participants agreed that their partner must be physically attractive and 6.3% disagreed that their partner must be physically attractive. In response to the statement, my partner must be knowledgeable about sex, 75.1% of the participants agreed and 6.3% of the participants disagreed. For the statement, “my short-term sexual partner needs to pay me compliments during sex,” 38.8% of participants agreed and 37.6% of participants disagreed. In response to “my sexual partner has to communicate desires,” 67.6% of the participants and agreed and 13.8% of the participants disagreed.

Concerning sexual arousal, 48.8% of participants agreed that they would like their short-term sexual partner to be easily aroused; 16.3% of participants disagreed that they would like their short-term sexual partner to be easily aroused. In reference to experiencing orgasms easily, 37.5% of the participants agreed that they would like their sexual partner to experience orgasm easily; 32.6% of the participants disagreed that they would like their sexual partner to experience orgasm easily. In response to the statement, “I prefer my partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines,” 25.1% of the participants agreed and 46.3% of the participants disagreed. For the statement, “I like my partner to take the dominant role during sex,” 36.3% of participants agreed and 32.5% of participants disagreed. In reference to sexual experience, 31.3% of the participants agreed that they prefer their partner for the short-term to have much sexual experience; 37.6%

disagreed that they prefer their partner for the short-term to have much sexual experience. Far as sexual passion, 66.3% of the participants agreed with the statement, “I would like my partner to be sexually passionate;” only 7.5% of the participants disagreed with the statement. For the statement, “I would like my partner to have a high sex drive,” 63.8% of the participants agreed and 12.5% of the participants disagreed.

Television Viewing and Hip Hop Music Video Exposure Open Scales

The daily diaries of the instrument recorded by the participants indicated the cumulative number of hours spent viewing television across a 5-day range and the number of hip hop music videos viewed in the same 5-day period. Television viewing and hip hop music video exposure served as 2 separate open scales. For the television viewing scale, 0-7 hours in 5 days indicated low television viewing, 8-14 hours in 5 days was medium television viewing, and 15 hours and more in 5 days was high television viewing. The mean number of hours of television viewing for the 5-day period was 7.74, categorized as medium television viewing. For the hip hop music video exposure scale, 0-29 viewed hip hop music videos in 5 days indicated low exposure, 30-58 viewed hip hop music videos in 5 days was medium exposure, and 59 and more viewed hip hop music videos was high exposure. The mean number of viewed hip hop music videos was 15.18, categorized as low exposure.

Long-term Mate Selection and Short-term Mate Selection

The 2 main scales, long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection were measured by the total score of all items on the questionnaire. There were 2 versions of the questionnaire; one version started with measuring attributes for long-term mate selection

and ended with measuring attributes for short-term mate selection, and the other version began with measuring attributes for short-term mate selection and concluded with measuring attributes for long-term mate selection. The purpose of having 2 versions was to randomize whether individuals started with long-term mate selection or short-term mate selection when rating attributes. On version A of the questionnaire, items 1-53 in parts I and II measured desirable attributes for a long-term romantic partner and items 1-53 in parts III and IV measured desirable attributes for a short-term sexual partner. On version B of the questionnaire, items 1-53 in parts I and II measured desirable attributes for a short-term sexual partner and items 1-53 in parts III and IV measured desirable attributes for a long-term romantic partner.

For both the long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection scales, a score of 53 indicated an extremely low number of attributes rated as important, 54-106 was a low number of attributes rated as important, 107-159 was a medium number of attributes rated as important, 160-212 was a high number of attributes rated as important, and 213-265 was an extremely high number of attributes rated as important. For the long-term mate selection scale, reliability for the 53 items was .936 (Cronbach's χ) and the mean score was 211.66, categorized as a high number of attributes rated as important. For the short-term mate selection scale, reliability for the 53 items was .914 (Cronbach's χ) and the mean score was 192.25, also categorized as a high number of attributes rated as important. The range, mean, standard deviation, and reliability of all scales of the instrument can be viewed in Table A3 of Appendix A. Table A4 demonstrates correlations between all scales of the instrument.

Hypothesis 1 Gender and Long-term Physical Attractiveness

When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.

To examine the difference of mean scores of long-term physical attractiveness between 2 groups, males and females, an independent t-test was employed. The following table displays the results for comparison between 34 males and 46 females.

Table 13 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Physical Attractiveness by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	19.85	20.00	3.85			
					.52	.57	.151
Female	46	19.33	17.00	4.29			

The results of the t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean responses of males and females concerning the rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable trait for a long-term romantic partner; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 2 Gender and Short-term Physical Attractiveness

When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and female's rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute.

To examine the difference of mean scores of short-term physical attractiveness between 2 groups, males and females, an independent t-test was employed.

Table 14 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Physical Attractiveness by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	20.79	10.00	2.75			
					1.16	1.34	.056
Female	46	19.63	20.00	4.49			

The results of the t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the responses of males and females in reference to rating physical attractiveness as a desirable trait for a short-term sexual partner; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 3 Gender and Long-term Social Status

When choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.

To examine the difference of mean scores of long-term social status between males and females, an independent t-test was employed.

Table 15 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Social Status by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	22.65	24.00	4.52			
					-1.92	-2.09	.967
Female	46	24.57	12.00	3.70			

The results of the t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference between males and females in reference to rating social status as a desirable trait for a long-term romantic partner; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 4 Gender and Short-term Social Status

When choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute.

To examine the difference of mean scores of short-term social status between males and females, an independent t-test was explored.

Table 16 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Social Status by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	18.59	22.00	5.59	-2.06	-1.65	.934
Female	46	20.65	23.00	5.49			

The results of the t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference between males and females in reference to rating social status as a desirable trait for a short-term sexual partner; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 5 Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering long-term romantic partners.

To examine the difference of individuals' mean scores of long-term internal attributes and long-term external attributes, a comparison of means was conducted with a means analysis and one-way ANOVA.

Table 17 Means Report for the Scoring of Long-term Internal and External Attributes by African American Young Adults

	Long-term Internal Attributes			Long-term External Attributes		
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Male	34	90.35	13.96	34	46.06	8.21
Female	46	93.96	10.08	46	46.37	7.74
Total	80	92.43	11.94	80	46.24	7.90

Table 18 Summary ANOVA for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Internal/External Attributes by African American Young Adults

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>
Internal Attributes					
Between	253.87	1	253.87	1.80	.184
Within	10999.68	78	141.02		
Total	11253.55	79			
External Attributes					
Between	1.89	1	1.89	.030	.863
Within	4924.60	78	63.14		
Total	4926.49	79			

ANOVA indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference between groups or within groups for internal attributes and external attributes as desirable traits for a long-term romantic

Partner. The data as seen in Table 17 indicated very close means for both long-term internal attributes and long-term external attributes, and the total mean for both the long-term internal attributes scale and the long-term external attributes scale received similar operational scores (see Table A1 of Appendix B) as shown in Table 18. The F ratios, 1.80 and .030 did not exceed the critical value of 4.00 for 1 and 78 degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 6 Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering short-term sexual partners.

To examine the difference of individuals' mean scores of short-term internal attributes and short-term external attributes, a comparison of means was conducted with a means analysis and one-way ANOVA. The results of the analysis are displayed in the following tables.

Table 19 Means Report for the Scoring of Short-term Internal and External Attributes by African American Young Adults

	Short-term Internal Attributes			Short-term External Attributes		
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Gender						
Male	34	78.85	13.57	34	41.38	7.65
Female	46	82.78	17.60	46	42.02	9.04
Total	80	81.11	16.03	80	41.75	8.43

Table 20 Summary ANOVA for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Internal/External Attributes by African American Young Adults

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>
Internal Attributes					
Between	301.90	1	301.90	1.18	.281
Within	20006.09	78	256.49		
Total	20307.99	79			
External Attributes					
Between	7.99	1	7.99	.11	.740
Within	5607.00	78	71.89		
Total	5615.00	79			

ANOVA indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference between groups or within groups for internal attributes and external attributes as desirable traits for a short-term sexual partner. Data in Table 19 indicated very close means for both short-term internal attributes and short-term external attributes, and the total mean for both the short-term internal attributes scale and the short-term external attributes scale received similar operational scores of being attributable; see Table A1 of Appendix B. Table 20 indicated the F ratios, 1.18 and .11, not exceeding the critical value of 4.00 for 1 and 78 degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 7 Gender and Long-term Sexual Characteristics

There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a long-term romantic relationship.

To examine the difference of means between 2 groups, males and females, an independent t-test was explored. Results of the t-test are displayed in the following table.

Table 21 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Long-term Sexual Characteristics by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	46.79	36.00	8.69			
					1.03	.50	.754
Female	46	45.76	45.00	9.33			

The t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference between males and females in reference to rating sexual characteristics as a desirable trait for a long-term romantic partner; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 8 Gender and Short-term Sexual Characteristics

There will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a short-term sexual relationship.

To examine the difference of means between males and females, an independent t-test was employed. The following table displays the results of the t-test.

Table 22 t-test for Comparing the Rating of Short-term Sexual Characteristics by African American Young Adult Males and Females

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	<i>SD</i>	Mean Difference	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	34	47.79	62.00	10.81			
					3.12	1.28	.483
Female	46	44.67	52.00	10.69			

The results of the t-test indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the responses of males and females concerning the rating of sexual characteristics as a desirable trait for a partner to have in a short-term sexual relationship; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 9 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic relationship.

To measure the relationship between the amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal and external attributes for a long-term romantic relationship, a Pearson correlation was performed. The relationships between the 3 variables are demonstrated in the following table.

Table 23 Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Television Viewing and Their Rating of Long-term External and Internal Attributes

	Television Viewing	External Attributes	Internal Attributes
Television Viewing	1.00	-.069	-.126
External Attributes		1.00	.674**
Internal Attributes			1.00

Note. ** = Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation indicated no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop television viewing and long-term external attributes or long-term internal attributes; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The Pearson indicated a significant ($p < .01$) relationship between long-term external attributes and long-term internal attributes.

Hypothesis 10 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.

To measure the relationship between the amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal and external attributes for a short-term sexual relationship, a

Pearson correlation was performed. The relationships between the 3 variables are demonstrated in the following table.

Table 24 Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Television Viewing and Their Rating of Short-term External and Internal Attributes

	Television Viewing	External Attributes	Internal Attributes
Television Viewing	1.00	-.009	-.035
External Attributes		1.00	.699**
Internal Attributes			1.00

Note. ** = Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation indicated no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop television viewing and short-term external attributes or short-term internal attributes; therefore the null hypothesis was retained. The Pearson indicated a significant ($p < .01$) relationship between short-term external attributes and short-term internal attributes.

Hypothesis 11 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner.

To measure the relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal and external attributes for a long-term romantic relationship, a

Pearson correlation was performed. The relationships between the 3 variables are demonstrated in the following table.

Table 25 Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Their Rating of Long-term External and Internal Attributes

	Hip Hop Exposure	External Attributes	Internal Attributes
Hip Hop Exposure	1.00	-.123	-.194
External Attributes		1.00	.674**
Internal Attributes			1.00

Note. ** = Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation indicated no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and long-term external attributes or long-term internal attributes; therefore the null hypothesis was retained. The Pearson indicated a significant ($p < .01$) relationship between long-term external attributes and long-term internal attributes.

Hypothesis 12 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

There will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner.

To measure the relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal and external attributes for a short-term sexual relationship, a

Pearson correlation was performed. The relationships between the 3 variables are demonstrated in the following table.

Table 26 Pearson Correlation between African American Young Adults' Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Their Rating of Short-term External and Internal Attributes

	Hip Hop Exposure	External Attributes	Internal Attributes
Hip Hop Exposure	1.00	-.133	-.224*
External Attributes		1.00	.699**
Internal Attributes			1.00

Note. * = Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); ** = Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation indicated a significant ($p < .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and short-term internal attributes, but there was no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and short-term external attributes. Due to the significant ($p < .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and short-term internal attributes, the null hypothesis was rejected. The Pearson correlation indicated a significant ($p < .01$) relationship between short-term external attributes and short-term internal attributes.

Hypothesis 13 Predictors of Long-term Mate Selection

Long-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

For hypothesis 13, a Stepwise Regression was conducted to discover any significant predictors of long-term mate selection. The 8 variables used in the equation were physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure. The results of the regression are displayed in the following table.

Table 27 Stepwise Regression for Predicting African American Young Adults' Long-term Mate Selection

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R ² Change	F for R ² Change
Step 1 (Constant)	83.42	8.96			
Long-term External Attributes	2.77	.191	.854***	.730	210.84***
Step 2 (Constant)	35.64	8.54			
Long-term External Attributes	1.70	.186	.524		
Long-term Internal Attributes	1.05	.123	.491***	.131	73.03***
Step 3 (Constant)	-.538	3.74			
Long-term External Attributes	1.25	.076	.384		
Long-term Internal Attributes	1.16	.048	.540		
Long-term Sexual Characteristics	1.03	.049	.361** *	.118	432.14***
Step 4 (Constant)	.030	1.36			
Long-term External Attributes	1.06	.029	.327		
Long-term					

Internal Attributes	.992	.019	.462		
Long-term					
Sexual Characteristics	1.022	.018	.360		
Long-term					
Social Homogamy	1.024	.046	.183***	.018	501.87***

Note. $R^2 = .730$ for Step 1; $R^2 = .861$ for Step 2; $R^2 = .979$ for Step 3; $R^2 = .997$ for Step 4; $\Delta R^2 = .267$ from Step 1-4 ($p < .01$). *** = $p < .001$

Eight variables were entered into the analysis, but only 4, long-term external attributes, long-term internal attributes, long-term sexual characteristics, and long-term social homogamy contributed significantly to the prediction of long-term mate selection. After step 1, with long-term external attributes in the equation, $R^2 = .730$, $F_{inc}(1, 78) = 210.84$, $p < .001$. After step 2, with long-term internal attributes added with long-term external attributes as a predictor, $R^2 = .861$, $F_{inc}(2, 77) = 73.03$, $p < .001$. After step 3, with long-term sexual characteristics added with long-term external attributes and long-term internal attributes as a predictor, $R^2 = .979$, $F_{inc}(3, 76) = 432.14$, $p < .001$. After step 4, with long-term social homogamy added with long-term external attributes, long-term internal attributes, and long-term sexual characteristics as a predictor, $R^2 = .997$, $F_{inc}(4, 75) = 501.87$, $p < .001$. The other 4 variables entered for the analysis did not significantly ($p > .05$) predict long-term mate selection. External attributes, internal attributes, sexual characteristics, and social homogamy all together explain 99.7% of the variance in long-term mate selection. The null hypothesis was rejected due to the 4 predictors.

Hypothesis 14 Predictors of Short-term Mate Selection

Short-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

For hypothesis 14, a Stepwise Regression was conducted to discover any significant predictors of short-term mate selection. The 8 variables used in the equation were physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure. The results of the regression are displayed in the following table.

Table 28 Stepwise Regression for Predicting African American Young Adults' Short-term Mate Selection

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R ² Change	F for R ² Change
Step 1					
(Constant)	47.87	8.41			
Short-term					
Internal Attributes	1.78	.102	.893***	.797	305.78***
Step 2					
(Constant)	11.17	6.29			
Short-term					
Internal Attributes	1.63	.066	.817		
Short-term					
Sexual Characteristics	1.07	.098	.359***	.123	118.75***
Step 3					
(Constant)	-.782	2.70			
Short-term					
Internal Attributes	1.14	.038	.571		

Short-term Sexual Characteristics	932	.041	.315		
Short-term External Attributes	1.38	.072	.365***	.066	364.82***
Step 4					
(Constant)	2.23	1.04			
Short-term Internal Attributes	.958	.017	.480		
Short-term Sexual Characteristics	1.01	.016	.342		
Short-term External Attributes	1.09	.031	.287		
Short-term Social Homogamy	1.03	.049	.186***	.012	451.94***

Note. $R^2 = .797$ for Step 1; $R^2 = .92$ for Step 2; $R^2 = .986$ for Step 3; $R^2 = .998$ for Step 4; $\Delta R^2 = .201$ from Step 1-4 ($p < .01$). *** = $p < .001$

Eight variables were entered into the analysis, but only 4, short-term internal attributes, short-term sexual characteristics, short-term external attributes, and short-term social homogamy contributed significantly to the prediction of short-term mate selection. After step 1, with short-term internal attributes in the equation, $R^2 = .797$, $F_{inc}(1, 78) = 305.78$, $p < .001$. After step 2, with short-term sexual characteristics added with short-term internal attributes as a predictor, $R^2 = .92$, $F_{inc}(2, 77) = 118.75$, $p < .001$. After step 3, with short-term external attributes added with short-term internal attributes and short-term sexual characteristics as a predictor, $R^2 = .986$, $F_{inc}(3, 76) = 364.82$, $p < .001$. After step 4, with short-term social homogamy added with short-term internal attributes, short-term sexual characteristics, and short-term external attributes as a predictor, $R^2 = .998$, $F_{inc}(4, 75) = 451.94$, $p < .001$. The other 4 variables entered for the analysis did not

significantly ($p > .05$) predict short-term mate selection. Internal attributes, sexual characteristics, external attributes, and social homogamy all together explain 99.8% of the variance in short-term mate selection. The null hypothesis was rejected due to the 4 predictors.

Summary

The findings of this study have indicated relationships between multiple variables in reference to both long-term and short-term mate selection. Comparisons by gender were conducted to assess any differences between males and females in reference to the degree of emphasis or level of desirability they indicated for variables involved in the mate selection process. Based on gender, desirable attributes for both a long-term romantic partner and a short-term sexual partner were compared. The main variables in which comparisons were made between the genders were physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, and sexual characteristics; all were rated in reference to their relationship with selecting a long-term romantic partner or short-term sexual partner. The relationship between hip hop television viewing and internal or external attributes for a long-term romantic partner and the relationship between hip hop television viewing and internal or external attributes for a short-term sexual partner were examined; also, the relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal or external attributes for a long-term romantic partner and the relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal or external attributes for a short-term sexual partner were examined. The variables of physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip

hip hop music video exposure were examined for their ability to predict both long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection.

The results of the study found no significant ($p > .05$) difference between males and females when rating physical attractiveness, social status, and sexual characteristics for their desirability as attributes for both long-term romantic partners and short-term sexual partners. No significant ($p > .05$) difference was found between how individuals rated internal and external attributes for a long-term romantic partner or between how individuals rated internal and external attributes for a short-term sexual partner. There was no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop television viewing and internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner or short-term sexual partner. There was no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal or external attributes for a long-term romantic partner. In reference to choosing a short-term sexual partner, there was no significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and external attributes; but there was a significant ($p < .05$) relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal attributes.

Long-term mate selection was predicted by external attributes, internal attributes, sexual characteristics, and social homogamy; all 4 served as significant predictors ($p < .001$), and external attributes was found to be the primary predictor alone indicating 73% of the variance with long-term mate selection. Short-term mate selection was predicted by internal attributes, sexual characteristics, external attributes, and social homogamy; all 4 served as significant predictors ($p < .001$), and internal attributes was found to be the primary predictor alone accounting for 79.7% of the variance with short-

term mate selection. Hip hop television viewing and hip hop music video exposure were found not to significantly ($p > .05$) predict long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection. No significant ($p > .05$) relationship between hip hop television viewing or hip hop music video exposure and long-term mate selection or short-term mate selection was found, but there was a significant ($p < .01$) relationship (positive correlation) between long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection (see Table A4 of Appendix B).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study examined the influence of hip hop music videos on African American young adults' perceptions of the ideal mate for both long-term romantic relationships and short-term sexual relationships. The purpose of the research was to investigate whether or not exposure to hip hop music videos influences choices among young African American adults for long-term mate selection defined as preferences for partners desired for steady dating, romantic cohabiting, or a marital relationship and short-term mate selection defined as preferences for partners desired for a one-night stand or brief sexual affair without commitment. The results of this research examined whether there were any differences between young African American males and females in reference to traits they desire in reference to choosing both a long-term romantic and short-term sexual partner. Results also compared the importance of internal attributes, defined as abstract inner features of a person such as personality, kindness, friendliness, humor, expressiveness, trustworthiness, intelligence, and the nature of their character; and the importance of external attributes, defined as concrete recognizable traits of a person such as physical possessions, socio-economic status, outward appearance, personal skills, and noticeable behavior, for selecting both long-term romantic partners and short-term sexual partners. The relationship between the amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal and external attributes in both long-term romantic and short-term sexual

partners was also examined as well as the relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal and external attributes in both long-term romantic and short-term sexual partners. The two main variables of the study, long-term mate selection and short-term mate selection, were examined for their predictability by the variables of physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure.

Strengths/Weaknesses

A major strength of this study was the overall high reliability of the scales employed for the instrument. Each scale used for measurement had an acceptable rating for its reliability as indicated by Cronbach's χ (see Table A3 of Appendix B). A pilot test, which was conducted prior to collecting data for the study, with only 9 participants indicated reliability of the scales, and the reliability increased with a much larger number (80) of participants used for analysis in the study. The study was also valid in its measurement by representing a sample of the population under investigation, young single heterosexual African American adults. The sample consisted of 80 heterosexual African Americans who had never been married ages 18-33 at a historically Black college/university in a rural area of the Southeast region of the United States.

A likely weakness of the study was the procedure used to recruit participants and collect data. A possible reason for not reaching the desired number of more than 100 participants for analysis may have been the strategy for recruitment. The primary researcher traveled to the research location and explained the procedure to the data

collectors, 2 teaching assistants and a professor, and provided 150 consent letters, diaries, and questionnaires to be distributed the following week. The participants were non-randomly asked by the teaching assistants in a cluster of 6 classrooms to participate in the study. The teaching assistants were given the task of providing consent/information letters of the study to students during class time and explaining the study; students who were interested in participating signed consent forms to participate and were given 5-day diaries to complete privately at their place of residence. Upon return to their classes after 5 days, students who had completed the diaries were given questionnaires to complete either in class or outside of class during their own time; after completing the questionnaires and attaching them to their diaries, the students placed their information in a drop box located in the faculty departmental office and a designated professor collected all completed diaries and questionnaires and returned them by mail to the primary researcher.

The procedure resulted in a slow return rate in which only 54 diaries and questionnaires were returned in the initial mailing which was anticipated as being the only delivery of mail. Over the span of a month, the remainder of diaries and questionnaires finally arrived by mail, bringing the total to 96 participants. However, there was still a problem with the number of participants after all data had been collected and entered; the male/female participant ratio (46 to 24) was highly imbalanced for analysis purposes after 26 participants did not meet sample criteria. As a result, a second wave of data collection was conducted during the following school term to increase the number of male participants by 10. The extra steps for data collection may have been

prevented and the number of students willing to participate could have been possibly improved by the primary researcher instead of just the teaching assistants being present at the location during the entire time of collection to better explain the study to the students and emphasize the importance of returning the information in a timely manner. More students may have been willing to participate if they felt more acquainted with the primary researcher and had clearer understanding and expectations about the study. Also, the data could have possibly been received much quicker if the primary researcher had been available at the location to collect all the data from the drop box immediately following the allotted time frame.

Discussion of Findings

Demographics

The total number of participants used for analysis in the study was 80, 34 males (42.5%) and 46 females (57.5%). The overall mean age of the participants was 21.21 years; the mean age of males was 21.82, and the mean age of females was 20.76. Age was the only demographic variable other than gender to be reported in the findings. Other personal data employed at the beginning of the questionnaire included marital status, sexual orientation, and ethnicity; all served as control variables in the exclusion of some participants. The study focused only on single heterosexual African American adults, ages 18-35 years, who had never been married; other demographic information was not pursued.

Hypothesis 1 Gender and Long-term Physical Attractiveness

Hypothesis 1 stated when choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute. The previous literature has indicated that men and women differ according to their rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute for long-term romantic relationships, men placing more value on physical attractiveness (Singh, 2004). Males were found to focus more on easily observable traits such as good looking facial and bodily features (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002), while women were more accepting of mates who were not as physically attractive (Buss, 1999); men were even found to rate female beauty as a must for long-term relationships and sacrifice other assets to achieve it (Li, Bailey, Kendrick, and Linsenmeier, 2002). In contrast to previous findings, the results of this study indicated no difference between how males and females rate the importance of physical attractiveness for long-term romantic relationships. A possible explanation for the difference may rest with the fact that this study employed a sample of only young African American adults, ages 18-35, engulfed in the environment of a small historically Black college/university instead of a sample reflective of a broader population of males and females across various ethnicities from a traditional perspective of gender roles.

When selecting a long-term romantic partner, most of the participants of this study preferred having a partner who appears sexy, good looking, and healthy. This study

demonstrated that regardless of gender, individuals want to have a long-term committed relationship with someone whom they find to be physically attractive. In essence, young African American adults of this study desire to settle down with someone who they are physically attracted to; looking a certain way was found to be definitely something of importance when deciding to be with someone for a long period of time. Many of the participants also valued how healthy persons look when considering them for a serious mate for the long-term. A healthy appearance was perceived as important, for individuals obviously desire the physical health of a partner who they intend on spending a long period of time in a relationship with.

Hypothesis 2 Gender and Short-term Physical Attractiveness

Hypothesis 2 stated when choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and female's rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute. A previous study (Singh, 2004) indicated both men and women prefer physically attractive mates in short-term sexual or non-committed relationships; therefore, no difference was found in reference to how males and females rate the importance of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute for short-term sexual relationships. The findings of this study are consistent with the previous study by indicating no difference between males and females in their rating of physical attractiveness as a desirable attribute for a short-term sexual partner. Both genders indicated being good looking and appearing sexy and healthy as major features of individuals whom they would like to have brief sexual encounters without commitment. When looking for sexual partners for short-term involvement, looks were considered very

important by the young African Americans of this study. Physical attraction to a person seemed to be of interest to the young individuals when pursuing others mainly for sexual relations.

Hypothesis 3 Gender and Long-term Social Status

Hypothesis 3 stated when choosing a long-term romantic partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute. Findings from the previous literature indicated more females than males rating earning potential and social status as important, especially when choosing marriage partners (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Women across cultures have been found to rate financial success as more important than men do, placing higher value on having partners who possess the ability to achieve success based on financial earnings, economic status, and social positions (Geary et al., 2004; Huston & Melz, 2004); this was evident mainly among women with low levels of education (Doosje, Rohan, & Fischer, 1999). The findings of this study do not support the previous literature by indicating no difference between males' and females' rating of social status as an important attribute for choosing a long-term romantic partner. A possible reason for the contrast in findings is the sample used. The previous studies examined men and women across various cultures but did not include many African Americans while this study examined only young African Americans in one specific higher educational environment.

Both young African American males and females in this study valued their long-term romantic partners having well paid jobs. The finding infers that these young individuals prefer to have a serious lasting committed relationship with a person who can

assist them financially; thus a partner's ability to monetarily contribute to the relationship consistently across a long extended period of time was deemed as important. However, the majority of the participants in this study did not rate a person's amount of monetary wealth as very important for a long-term romantic relationship. This gives evidence of the young African Americans who participated in the study not necessarily wanting spouses or long-term mates who are financially wealthy; they just want someone who can help them to have a secure stable financial status, which is supported by most of the participants rating being a good financial prospect as important. In relation to being a good financial prospect, the majority of participants considered their long-term romantic partner attaining higher education as important with receiving a good education in general.

Hypothesis 4 Gender and Short-term Social Status

Hypothesis 4 stated when choosing a short-term sexual partner, there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute. Previous findings have indicated that social status is not so important for both men and women in short-term sexual relationships (Singh, 2004). The findings of this study are consistent with that of the previous study (Singh): no significant difference between males' and females' rating of social status as a desirable attribute for selecting a short-term sexual partner. Young African American males and females of this study did not indicate any concern of whether their short-term sexual partner has a well paying job or not. When being briefly sexually involved with someone without any commitment, both genders in this study did not care about how much money their short-

term sexual partner could possibly earn. This may be the result of young adults not being interested in financial gain due to having no long-term plans of involvement with a short-term sexual partner. The inference is even more evident by few participants desiring a short-term sexual partner who is wealthy. In reference to educational attainment, the majority of participants rated having high educational attainment and a good education in general as important. This finding may be indicative of the young African American adults in the study being college students who either perceive higher education as important just because they are pursuing it or they may only consider attainment of higher education by their short-term sexual partners as important just because they may be more likely to choose partners in their college environment who are similar to them by pursuing higher education.

Hypothesis 5 Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 5 stated there will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering long-term romantic partners. Findings from the previous literature have indicated that both men and women tend to want potential mates who possess an array of positive internal qualities; the internal traits (expressive caring nature, humor, friendliness, sociability, fun personality, intelligence, honesty, and trustworthiness) for both genders were found to be more important than the external traits when considering a long-term romantic partner (Rgan et al., 2000). Oda (2001) and Waynforth (2001) found women to seek partners who provide emotional support and value family; being empathetic, kind, clever, intimate, emotionally satisfying, and safe providing were also desirable traits (Geary et al., 2004;

Geary & Flinn, 2001). Even though men highly valued physical beauty, they also highly valued internal traits such as intelligence, personality, friendliness, and understanding the same as women for long-term romantic relationships; women with good parenting skills were often preferred by men (Buss, 1999), and internal qualities were found to be more creditable than external features for long-term romantic relationships. Thus, the previous literature indicated internal attributes as being more desirable than external attributes by individuals when considering long-term romantic partners. In contrast, the findings of this study found no difference between individuals' rating of internal and external attributes for selecting long-term romantic partners. The discrepancy possibly may be accredited to the homogeneity of this study's participants as opposed to the diverse nature of participants across cultures in the previous studies; the young mean age of the sample may have contributed to the participants assigning equal value to internal and external attributes. Another explanation may be based on the fact that the previous literature has not studied African Americans alone in reference to long-term mate selection.

Participants of this study rated internal attributes as important traits for a long-term romantic partner to possess. Internal attributes such as being dependable, easy going, trustworthy, intelligent, easy to talk to, honest, emotionally stable and mature, romantic, ambitious, expressive of feelings, pleasant in personality, flexible and adaptive, interesting to talk to, hardworking and industrious, funny, friendly and sociable, exciting, creative, and attentive were all considered important by most of the participants. Regardless of gender, participants of this study value positive inner characteristics of a person whom they would like to be committed to romantically for a long period of time.

The findings are indicative of young African American adults wanting mates whom they can depend on and trust. They also prefer being committed to partners who are consistent with their behavior and communicate their feelings. It may be inferred that these individuals desire individuals who are fun and exciting as well as flexible and adaptive for socializing with others. The participants of this study definitely prefer not having boring partners whom they would spend much of their lives with, but simultaneously they would like those partners to be hardworking, ambitious, caring, and attentive to their needs.

The participants of this study also considered external attributes to be important in the selection of a long-term romantic partner. The outer more easily observable characteristics of a person were rated as important by more than half of all participants. Other than physical attractiveness which participants of this study rated as important, openly displayed skills such as cooking and cleaning and recognizable traits such as socio-economic status involving financial earnings and educational attainment were valued by participants of this study as essential features of a mate for the long term. This infers that the young African Americans of this study would like for someone whom they plan to spend a long time with in a relationship to have living skills and assets that may help provide for stable secure living conditions.

Hypothesis 6 Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 6 stated there will be no statistically significant difference between individuals' rating of internal attributes and external attributes when considering short-term sexual partners. Findings from the previous literature indicated that both men and

women rate external traits as more important than internal traits when considering short-term sexual relationships but tend to reverse the importance of external and internal traits when considering a long-term romantic relationship (Singh, 2004). Thus, external attributes have been found to be rated by individuals as more important than internal attributes for short-term sexual relationships. In contrast, the findings of this study found no difference between individuals' rating of internal and external attributes when selecting a short-term sexual partner. This discrepancy between the findings of the past research and this study may be related to the lack of diversity in the sample of this study due to the degree of homogeneity, especially the mean age of the participants. Furthermore, the samples of the previous literature did not focus on young African American adults, suggesting another possible reason for the difference in findings.

Participants of this study seemed to perceive the internal attributes of a short-term sexual partner as important similarly to the importance of internal attributes of a long-term romantic partner. This finding was interesting considering the assumption that the participants would rate the importance of internal attributes differently when selecting short-term sexual mates instead of long-term romantic mates. The young African Americans of this study considered internal qualities such as degree of dependability, easiness, trustworthiness, intelligence, friendliness and sociability, honesty, consistency, drive, determination, openness, good character, flexibility, industriousness, humor, creativity, and listening skills to be very important in selecting a short-term sexual partner. This may have been the case of these college students being careful with whom they decide to have sexual involvement of any kind given the risky nature of engaging in

sexual activity on college campuses. Even though the students may not want a committed relationship, they still may desire sex with individuals whom they are attracted to, and they still want to have a partner who is least likely to harm their well being given the negative consequences of contracting sexually transmitted diseases indicated in the literature (Ferguson et al., 2006; McCreary, 2004). Thus, the participants consider internal attributes important because they want to decrease their chances of risking their health by having partners who are honest, trustworthy, and open about their sexuality. Also, these college students still valued having interesting, fun, humorous, sociable, and exciting individuals as short-term sexual partners due to their desire to enjoy their young adulthood without being seriously committed to one particular person.

Some external attributes were also found to be important to the participants when choosing short-term sexual partners. The young African American students in this study did not care much about their short-term sexual partners being economically wealthy or having good paying jobs; this may have been indicative of the fact that they were all college students who did not expect anyone to have a good paying job, and being rich did not matter since they were interested in partners for the short term in which amount of money did not matter. Even though money appeared as not important for choosing a short-term sexual mate, many of the participants rated their partner being a good financial prospect as important, meaning that money did not matter presently but it may become important later. This implies according to the participants that money does not matter at the time of the short-time sexual relationship but it may be valued in the future; this may be the case of individuals anticipating a possible tie or more long-term relationship in the

future, given the chance that a short-term sexual relationship may somehow escalate to a more serious relationship depending on the consequences of the brief sexual encounter.

External features of a person such as looking sexy and being very good looking were also considered very important by the participants. As expected, appearance was valued by the participants as an attribute due to its role in persons being chosen for the main purpose of engaging in sexual activity. Individuals indicated that they want to have sex with others whom they find as physically and sexually attractive. Attainment of higher education was also considered important for short-term mate selection, given the fact that all the participants were university students. By being enrolled in higher education and residing in a college environment, participants in this study were more likely to desire sexual partners similar to themselves; therefore they perceived high attainment of education as an important attribute for a short-term sexual partner.

Hypothesis 7 Gender and Long-term Sexual Characteristics

Hypothesis 7 stated there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a long-term romantic relationship. The previous literature has indicated, when faced with selecting long-term romantic partners, men and women differ in how they rate the importance of having a sexually faithful partner, men placing more emphasis on sexual faithfulness (Geary et al., 2004). Geary et al. has indicated that even though both genders have been found to prefer partners who are sexually attractive for long-term romantic relationships, the finding has been more indicative of men. Men have been discovered to place more emphasis on having a long-term romantic partner who is physically attractive, easily reaches sexual

climax, and enjoys exploring sexual or erotic books or videos; in contrast women have been found to prefer long-term romantic partners who are sexually experienced, who understands how to provide pleasure, and who assumes the leading role during sex (Giotakos, 2004). McGuirl and Wiederman (2000) reported women being interested in a male who is open to sexual conversation, gives compliments during sex, and takes the dominant role. Therefore, men and women have been found to differ in reference to their preferred or desirable sexual characteristics of a partner in a long-term romantic relationship. The findings of this study contradict the previous findings by indicating no difference between males' and female' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a long-term romantic relationship. A possible explanation for the contrasting findings could be the different targeted populations for study; this study focused only on African American college students ages 18-35 in a rural university setting while the previous studies employed samples involving individuals across different ethnicities, ages, and historical traditional backgrounds, none focusing on large numbers of African Americans.

Regardless of gender, most participants considered being open to discussing sex and performing different acts as important qualities for their long-term romantic partner to have. This implies that these individuals want their long-term partners to be willing to talk about as well try new and different sexual activities. Due to the fact that they are committed to their partner for the long-term, it is suggested that individuals of this study want to prevent their sex lives with their partners from becoming dull, repetitive, predictable, or boring. The participants of this study also indicated that they would like their long-term partner to be knowledgeable about sex, communicate their desires, and be

easily aroused and sexually passionate. These sexual characteristics may be of importance due to the fact that individuals would like someone who will be their mate for a long time to know how to please them sexually in order to have a satisfying sex life.

Both males and females did not care about whether their long-term romantic partner gives them compliments or not during sex, whether they take the dominant role or not, or whether they desire erotic videos, books, or magazines. It can be inferred that the participants of this study consider these things not important and they only care about being satisfied by their long-term romantic partner. Few participants indicated wanting their partner to easily experience orgasm. This may be the case of individuals wanting their sexual activity to be fulfilling by lasting long enough to keep both partners engaged so the experience can be one of gratification. An interesting finding in relation to sexual experience is that few participants rated their long-term romantic partner having much sexual experience as important. This finding suggests that individuals want their partners to become good sexually satisfying partners and not already have much sexual experience prior to being with them. This may be evident of individuals wanting to be committed only to individuals who have not been sexually involved with many previous partners, thus reducing the threats of sexual problems.

Hypothesis 8 Gender and Short-term Sexual Characteristics

Hypothesis 8 states there will be no statistically significant difference between males' and females' preferred sexual characteristics of a partner for a short-term sexual relationship. The previous research supports the hypothesis; Regan et al. (2000) found both men and women prefer partners who demonstrate much sexual passion and sex drive

in short-term sexual relationships; in the selection of partners in casual sexual relationships, both men and women have been found to look for individuals who are sexually and physically appealing (Regan et al.). The findings of this study are consistent with those of the previous study. No difference between males and females was found in reference to preferred sexual characteristics of a short-term sexual partner.

Males and females of this study indicated wanting short-term sexual partners who are open to discussing sex, who are physically attractive, who are knowledgeable about sex, who communicates desires, who are sexually passionate, and who have high sex drives. Most participants of this study rated these sexual characteristics as important for a short-term sexual relationship, thus implying they would like to be briefly sexually involved with persons who look good, know how to please sexually, and want to have sex frequently. This may be the case of individuals wanting to have good sex with others whom they are attracted to initially from appearance. However, participants of this study did not care about their short-term sexual partners being open to different acts or whether they give compliments during sex or not, and how easily their partner is sexually aroused. This is indicative of individuals not caring about how they engage in sexual activity with someone of a brief sexual encounter, not caring about what their sexual partner thinks or feels, or not caring about how ready their partner is for sexual activity; selfish concerns are of interest to individuals when dealing with someone who is not intended to be a partner for an extended period of time. Most participants of this study did not care if their short-term sexual partner experiences orgasm easily or not, whether they like erotic

material or not, whether they take the dominant role during sex or not, or whether they have much sexual experience or not.

Hypothesis 9 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 9 stated there will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic relationship. Findings of the previous literature have indicated that television, which highly features elements of hip hop culture, shapes individual's perceptions of ideal long-term romantic relationships; for example Segrin and Nabi (2002) found that adults who watch programs dealing with romantic relationships were more likely to have unrealistic beliefs about getting married. Consuming large quantities of romantically themed television programs was also found to be related to having more fantasy views of marriage (Segen & Nabi). As for external attributes, it was previously found that television reinforces valued traits such as slender and curved women and slim and muscular men as being more desirable for long-term romantic relationships (Eggermont, 2004). In reference to internal attributes, Eggermont also found that both male and female viewers of much television rated personality qualities highly as a necessity in a long-term romantic partner, indicating that the content of television affects the importance of both external features such as physical attraction and internal characteristics such as personality in the selection of long-term romantic partners. The previous findings indicate a relationship with hip hop television viewing and the importance of both external and internal attributes in long-term romantic relationships.

Findings of this study indicate no relationship between hip hop television viewing and internal or external attributes for long-term romantic relationships. An explanation for the difference may be that the previous studies focused more on television viewing in general while this study specifically focused only on television programming that was highly concentrated in hip hop culture. This suggests that television viewing as a whole may be more influential on long-term romantic relationships than just the viewing of hip hop related programming. Another fact about this study must also be taken into consideration for explaining why there was no relationship between hip hop television viewing and internal or external attributes for long-term romantic relationships. It is the evidence of the participants in this study not spending much time watching television as a whole; overall, participants watched less than 8 hours of television in a span of 5 days. This finding may be related to the fact of all participants of this study being fulltime college students; the students in this study may have spent a good amount of their time studying or completing assignments, or they may have just chosen other things to do with their spare time such as participating in college extracurricular activities, attending social events and parties, traveling on weekends, engaging in personal hobbies, dating, or sleeping instead of watching television. If the participants hardly watched television, then they could not help but to consume small amounts of hip hop related television. Therefore, the demanding schedule of a college student may have prevented them from watching as much hip hop related television as they normally would see on a daily basis.

Hypothesis 10 Hip Hop Television Viewing and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 10 states there will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop television viewing and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner. Findings of the previous literature indicate a relationship between the viewing of television with hip hop as an element in it and the importance of internal and external attributes for short-term sexual relationships. Similar to the finding involving the influence on long-term romantic relationships, Eggermont (2004) found that television also reinforces valued traits such as slender and curved women and slim and muscular men as being more desirable for short-term sexual relationships. It has been found that television places extra pressure on viewers to fit images portrayed as good looking or sexy, which is idealized as essential for being perceived by many as a desirable short-term sexual partner (Ward, 2005). The findings by Ward (2005) indicate a relationship between hip hop television viewing and the importance of external attributes for short-term sexual relationships; the literature did not indicate or mention a relationship between hip hop television viewing and the importance of internal attributes for short-term sexual relationships.

The results of this study indicated no relationship between hip hop television viewing and external or internal attributes for short-term sexual relationships. An explanation for this difference may also be the fact of the previous studies' focus more on

television viewing in general, while this study specifically focused only on television programming that was highly concentrated in hip hop culture. This suggests that television viewing as a whole may be more influential on short-sexual relationships than just the viewing of hip hop related programming. The relationship between hip hop television viewing and short-term external or internal attributes may be explained similarly to its relationship with long-term external or internal attributes. Many of the participants of this study did not watch high volumes of television in general, thus decreasing the amount of viewed hip hop related television.

Hypothesis 11 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Long-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 11 states there will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a long-term romantic partner. The previous research has not clearly focused on the relationship between exposure to hip hop music videos and the actual rating of internal or external attributes in the selection of long-term romantic partners, but there has been evidence of hip hop music videos affecting young adults' beliefs about sexual behavior indicating differences among individuals' views of sexual behavior in long-term romantic relationships in reference to the amount of hip hop music videos regularly viewed (Kalof, 1999). The findings of this study indicate no relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in long-term romantic partners. Thus, in this sample, the number of hip hop music videos viewed daily by individuals plays no part in influencing the traits they desire in a partner for a long-

term romantic relationship. Overall low hip hop music video exposure may have contributed to this finding; on average, the participants watched only 15 videos in the span of 5 days. This may have also been evident of college students of this study not viewing much television. Low daily consumption of television as a whole may determine how many hip hop videos are watched.

Hypothesis 12 Hip Hop Music Video Exposure and Rating of Short-term Internal and External Attributes

Hypothesis 12 states there will be no statistically significant relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal or external attributes in a short-term sexual partner. Previous research has indicated that hip hop music videos not only deliver messages about gender differences and sexual activity but also molds the attitudes of individuals about sexual behavior and their perceptions of what attributes of a person are desirable for short-term sexual relationships; for example, the music videos have been found to portray submission in women and sexual aggression and dominance in men as desirable internal attributes for short-term sexual partners (Andsager, 2003). As a result of those internal attributes being deemed as desirable in hip hop music videos, it has been found that those who consumed great quantities of hip hop music videos were twice as likely to have multiple sexual partners and 1.5 times as likely to be infected with a sexually transmitted disease (Wingwood et al., 2003). The previous literature has indicated a relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of internal attributes for short-term sexual relationships but has indicated no

evidence of a relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and the rating of external attributes for short-term sexual relationships.

The findings of this study present similar results by indicating a relationship between the amount of hip hop music video exposure and internal attributes in short-term sexual partners; but, there was no relationship between amount of hip hop music video exposure and external attributes in short-term sexual partners. Therefore, when choosing a short-term sexual partner according to this study, hip hop music videos play a role in affecting the internal attributes desired but not the external attributes desired. This could be the result of the messages conveyed about the type of inner traits desired by characters for short-term relationships presented in the hip hop music videos. Thus, individuals who view hip hop music videos focus on the internal features of characters in the hip hop music videos and pay less attention to the outer physical features of the characters as being the desired traits for a short-term sexual partner; in turn, these perceived desirable internal attributes become what viewers of hip hop music videos find desirable when pursuing short-term sexual partners in their lives.

Hypothesis 13 Predictors of Long-term Mate Selection

Hypothesis 13 states long-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure. According to the previous literature (Geary et al., 2004; Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002; Singh, 2004) physical attraction has been found to serve as a contributing variable in the selection of a mate for the long-term. Physical

attractiveness as a desirable attribute for long-term romantic partners has been more evident as a predictor of long-term mate selection for men more than it has been for women (Singh). Social status has also been found to be a predictor of long-term mate selection, primarily serving more as a predictor of women choosing their long-term romantic partners than for men (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly; Geary et al.) Both internal and external attributes have been found to be predictive of long-term mate selection with the literature indicating internal attributes as predictive of both males and females when choosing long-term romantic partners (Regan et al., 2000). For women more than men, external attributes such as financial earning potential, financial success associated with earnings, educational attainment, and socio-economic status as a whole have been very predictive of long-term mate selection (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly; Geary et al.).

According to previous findings, sexual characteristics were only predictive of long-term mate selection for men; sexual characteristics of a partner were found not to be valued as much by women when choosing a partner as a long-term mate (Regan et al., 2000). The previous literature also indicated social homogamy as being predictive of long-term mate selection; people tend to form long-term relationships with those who resemble them culturally and individuals have been found to marry with the same social group or approximately near their status (Kalmijn, 1998). Married couples have been matched according to their education, ethnicity, religion, career, and family socioeconomic background (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004). Television viewing was found to be predictive of shaping individuals' perceptions of ideal mates for long-term romantic

relationships (Brown, 2002; Segrin & Nabi, 2002). There was no evidence from the previous literature of hip hop music video exposure being predictive of long-term mate selection.

The results of this study indicated 4 of the 8 variables predicted long-term mate selection. Among the 4 variables that predicted long-term mate selection, the variable, external attributes, was found to be the most powerful sole predictor. When internal attributes, which was also a high predictor was added with external attributes for prediction, prediction of long-term mate selection increased even further, with external attributes outweighing internal attributes in strength of prediction. In a third step of prediction, sexual characteristics serving as a predictor was added with external attributes and internal attributes for prediction. As a result, the strength of predicting long-term mate selection increased again; but in step 3 with sexual characteristics added, internal attributes became the strongest predictor followed by external attributes and then sexual characteristics. In the fourth and final step of prediction, social homogamy, also serving as a major predictor, was added with external attributes, internal attributes, and sexual characteristics. With all 4 predictors, prediction of long-term mate selection was at its strongest; internal attributes was the strongest predictor followed by sexual characteristics, then external attributes, and lastly social homogamy. Separately, external attributes primarily predicted long-term mate selection alone by 73%, but combining it with internal attributes, sexual characteristics, and social homogamy accounted for the prediction of projected long-term mate selection by 99.7%. Thus, knowing individuals' values of external traits, internal traits, sexual characteristics, and similarities to that of

other persons determine the type of long-term romantic partner those individuals predict they will choose. Physical attractiveness, social status, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure were found to not contribute to the prediction of long-term mate selection.

Hypothesis 14 Predictors of Short-term Mate Selection

Hypothesis 14 states short-term mate selection will not be predicted by the following variables: physical attractiveness, social status, internal attributes, external attributes, sexual characteristics, social homogamy, television viewing, and hip hop music video exposure. According to the previous literature, physical attractiveness has been found to predict short-term mate selection; both men and women have been found to prefer physically attractive mates in short-term or non-committed relationships (Singh, 2004). Social status has not been evident as a predictor of short-term mate selection in the previous literature. For short-term mate selection, internal attributes and external attributes were not evident in the previous literature as predictors; internal and external attributes were not indicated as traits desirable in short-term sexual partners.

Findings of the previous literature have indicated sexual characteristics as a predictor of short-term mate selection. Sexual characteristics as a predictor of short-term mate selection has been evident by both men and women being found to prefer partners who demonstrate sexual passion and sex drive in short-term relationships (Regan et al., 2000). Both men and women have been found to look for individuals who are sexually and physically appealing when pursuing casual sexual partners; however men were found more than women to want partners who broadcast that they are open sexually, easily

engaged, and possess a high sex drive (Regan et al.). In regard to social homogamy as a predictor of short-term mate selection, the literature has not indicated it as being a predictor suggesting individuals are more willing to have short-term sexual partners who differ from them socially and culturally (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004). Television viewing has been found to be predictive of short-term mate selection, for it impacts perceptions of short-term sexual relationships, modeling aspects of sexuality, and partner selection (Ward, 2002). Eggermont (2004) found television to reinforce valued traits such as slender curved women and slim muscular men as desirable for short-term sexual relationships; television was found to apply extra pressure on viewers to seek idealized images portrayed as good looking or sexy as desirable short-term sexual partners (Ward, 2005). Findings from the previous literature have indicated hip hop music video exposure as predictive of short-term mate selection. Andsager (2003) found music videos to deliver messages about sexual behavior and shape perceptions of desirable partners for short-term sexual relationships.

The findings of this study indicated 4 of the 8 predictor variables in hypothesis 14 successfully predicted short-term mate selection. Internal attributes served as the primary predictor of short-term mate selection, accounting for 80% of the prediction. In the second step of predicting short-term mate selection, the variable, sexual characteristics which was also a major predictor, was added with internal attributes. As a result, the prediction of short-term mate selection increased with internal attributes outweighing sexual characteristics as the stronger of the 2 predictors. Step 3 included external attributes, another major predictor of short-term mate selection, with internal attributes

and sexual characteristics. Prediction of short-term mate selection increased even further with the 3 predictors; internal attributes continued to be the strongest predictor followed by external attributes, and thirdly sexual characteristics.

A fourth step was added to complete the prediction of short-term mate selection. In step 4, social homogamy was added as the final predictor with internal attributes, sexual characteristics, and external attributes. Once again, internal attributes emerged as the strongest predictor followed by sexual characteristics, then external attributes, and finally social homogamy. All 4 variables successfully predicted short-term mate selection accounting for 99.8% of its prediction. Internal attributes was the strongest indicator alone for short-term mate selection, accounting for 80% of the prediction. Thus, knowing the internal traits that individuals consider important is the best way of determining who they will most likely select as a short-term sexual partner. However knowing how well the internal traits, external traits, sexual characteristics and similarities to that of another person are all valued by individuals may determine what type of person they may choose as a short-term sexual partner. Physical attractiveness, social status, television viewing, and hip music video exposure did not account for any of the prediction of short-term mate selection.

Conclusion

Summary of Findings

The findings of this research have brought forth some evidence about how mate selection among young single heterosexual African Americans may vary in reference to the kind of relationship pursued, whether a long-term romantic relationship or short-term

relationship is desired. Further, the impact that hip hop music videos have on young African Americans' perceptions of the ideal mate for both long-term romantic relationships and short-term sexual relationships was discovered by conducting this study. Young African Americans were found to place similar emphasis on the internal and external attributes deemed as desirable traits for a mate to possess regardless if they were pursuing short-term or long-term involvement. Individuals of this study wanted to have short-term and long-term partners who are physically attractive, sexy, honest, trustworthy, ambitious, industrious, fun, exciting, sociable, friendly, kind, caring, dependable, intelligent, hardworking, flexible, humorous, and socio-economically stable.

The findings of this study also indicated no gender differences among young African Americans in reference to how important they perceived the physical attractiveness, social status, or sexual characteristics of a potential mate for both a short-term sexual relationship and a more committed long-term romantic relationship. In essence, young African Americans males and females in a college environment place the same amount of emphasis on physical features, social status, and sexual traits of a potential mate. The leading force behind the study, the influence of hip hop music videos on young African Americans' perceptions of the ideal mate, resulted in the discovery of exposure to hip hop music videos and viewing of hip hop related television programming not being related to the internal or external attributes desired for long-term romantic relationships. A reason for not finding a relationship between the amount of hip hop television viewed and the perception of traits desirable for a mate or a relationship between watching hip hop music videos and the perception of traits desired for a mate

may be the simple fact that the college students participating in this study did not watch large quantities of hip hop related television or hip hop music videos. Also, the fact that the participants were college students may have reduced their amount of time spent watching television in general. Being involved in other affairs during their spare time instead of watching television may have prevented them from consuming much television; that alone reduces the amount of hip hop television viewed and the number of hip hop music videos.

For short-term sexual relationships, a relationship was found for neither hip hop television viewing and internal attributes nor hip hop television viewing and external attributes; also for short-term sexual relationships, there was no relationship between hip hop video exposure and external attributes, but there was a relationship between hip hop music video exposure and internal attributes. Therefore, when choosing a short-term sexual partner according to this study, hip hop music videos play a role in affecting the internal attributes desired but not the external attributes desired. This could be the result of the messages conveyed about the type of inner traits desired by characters for short-term relationships presented in the hip hop music videos. Thus, individuals who view hip hop music videos focus on the internal features of characters in the hip hop music videos and pay less attention to the outer physical features of the characters as being the desired traits for a short-term sexual partner; in turn, these perceived desirable internal attributes become what viewers of hip hop music videos find desirable when pursuing short-term sexual partners in their lives.

Long-term mate selection was predicted by external attributes, internal attributes, sexual characteristics, and social homogamy; all 4 served as contributing predictors, and external attributes was found to be the primary predictor alone indicating 73% of the variance with long-term mate selection. Short-term mate selection was predicted by internal attributes, sexual characteristics, external attributes, and social homogamy; all 4 served as major predictors, and internal attributes was found to be the primary predictor alone accounting for 79.7% of the variance with short-term mate selection. Hip hop television viewing and hip hop music video exposure were found not to successfully predict long-term mate selection or short-term mate selection. No evident relationship between hip hop television viewing or hip hop music video exposure and long-term mate selection or short-term mate selection was found. Furthermore, knowing how well the internal traits, external traits, sexual characteristics and similarities to that of another person are all valued by individuals may determine what type of person they may choose as a mate. Physical attractiveness, social status, television viewing, and hip music video exposure did not account for any of the prediction of mate selection.

Implications of Study

The findings of this study are relevant for understanding and explaining the mate selection process of young single heterosexual African Americans involved in choosing long-term romantic partners versus short-term sexual partners. These findings contribute additional insight on the involvement of hip hop culture, which has been found to be a great socializing agent in the lives of young African Americans by way of hip hop music videos (Ward, 2005). According to this study, the only identifiable effect that watching

hip hop music videos tended to have on young African Americans was their perceptions of the desirability of internal attributes for short-term sexual relationships, which happened to be a negative relationship. This means the more hip hop videos are viewed by young African Americans, the less they tend to desire internal attributes in short-term sexual partners; the less hip hop videos are viewed by young African Americans, the more they tend to desire internal attributes in short-term sexual partners. With that finding, the impact of hip hop music videos on young African Americans has been supported with current evidence.

Additionally, the finding in reference to the viewing of hip hop music videos being related to young African American adults' perceptions of the importance of internal traits in the selection of short-term sexual partners demonstrates the strength of hip hop influencing social aspects of the African American community. If a high consumption of hip hop music videos on a daily basis teaches young viewers to down rate specific internal personal traits of individuals as not important when pursuing sexual partners, then the implied power of hip hop has been a source of negativity. This evidently suggests that the hip hop music video as a representative of hip hop culture conveys a message to members of the African American community, engulfed in hip hop music video visuals, that devalues past morals and norms associated with short-term mating or non-serious courtship. Justification of having short-term sexual relationships without consideration of internal character traits of a person may possibly lead to young adults having sexual relations with individuals whom they know little about and who could be detrimental to their well being. For instance brief sexual encounters such as one night

stands with a person of non-acquaintance may lead to a life of hardship and suffering (Cherlin, 2004; Oropesa & Lindale, 2004; Seltzer, 2004). Unwanted pregnancies and the transmission of life modifying and threatening sexually transmitted diseases are problems that may be avoided by individuals investing time to learn internal attributes about individuals whom they are attracted to for short-term sexual affairs. The avoidance of poor matched couples, problem filled relationships, struggling single mothers and uninvolved fathers, and children being raised without the presence of both parents and all problematic issues related with it may all reside in not becoming sexually involved with persons whom little is known, investing more quality time with them by dating, and discovering whether an individual may be a good prospect for a committed relationship for the long-term. The negative relationship between the number of hip hop music videos viewed and the rating of internal attributes as important for choosing a short-term sexual partner is indicative of hip hop's contribution to the acceptance of short-term sexual relationships without much regard for the character of individuals desired.

The information provided in this study can be beneficial by informing educators, counselors, therapists, sexologists, family scientists, sociologists, and social workers of the strength of hip hop when dealing with young African Americans in an attempt to help them identify and make healthier sexual decisions and avoid personal as well as social problems associated with not making good decisions regarding sexual relationships. Furthermore, these findings can aid with combating social problems and issues confronted by young African Americans and their families today in an African American community highly saturated with elements of hip hop culture that tends to communicate

acceptable behaviors such as down playing the importance of internal attributes when selecting short-term sexual partners that can lead to later negative consequences and social problems. Health and sex educators can employ strategies to teach young African Americans to make better sexual decisions than the ones demonstrated by negative characters portrayed in hip hop music videos when choosing sexual partners; they can communicate the difference between fantasy and reality and explain why certain behavior in reality may be detrimental to their survival. Social workers can take an approach to better prevent problems such as high divorce rates, imbalanced male-female ratios for marriage, financial issues related to single parent households, and high rates of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV among African Americans. Strategies created by educators can be implemented to better inform viewers of hip hop music videos to not imitate dramatization that places little value on internal attributes when pursuing short-term partners or promotes the idea of having numerous short-term sexual relationships across a brief period of time. Relationship and marriage counselors, therapists, and sexologists can employ the data to better understand the root of conflicting long-term romantic relationships, which may be the result of past involvement in short-term sexual relationships, highly reinforced in hip hop music videos, or simply a difference in traits that have been valued as desirable for relationships.

Recommendations for Future Research

The application of the data can be employed by both family scientists and sociologists and added to the already existing knowledge about African Americans and hip hop. The findings of this study can help provide additional information about life

within African Americans families and enrich the understanding of the relationship between African Americans as a group and hip hop, which is a major part of modern African American culture. The employment of this data can also benefit researchers of future studies by serving as a framework for further investigation with additional variables or as a source for investigating other populations. Further research can be directed toward other predictor variables such as socio-economic status, family and regional backgrounds, religious affiliation, sexual history, age, and ethnicity. Future researchers can expand this study across ethnic lines or examine a totally different ethnic group. Also, a study of this type can be conducted targeting homosexuals only, or research can be done to compare/contrast heterosexuals and homosexuals.

A recommendation for future research is to conduct a similar study in a different environment involving young African American adults who do not reside in a college/university setting. It would be interesting to discover how participants from a different setting respond to the same study; this would make available a comparison of young African American adults pursuing higher education and those who are not involved in the pursuit of a higher education. Another recommendation would be to conduct the study in different regions of the nation and seek comparisons of regional responses. Also, a similar study involving various age groups of African Americans is recommended. It may be of interest to examine the effect of hip hop music videos on different age groups' perceptions of the ideal mate. Finally, conducting this study with adolescents may be even more explanatory of hip hop's effect on perceptions of an ideal mate because teenagers possibly may be consumers of more television viewing.

For future studies, employing another data collection method other than diaries is recommended for increasing response rates in reference to assessing the amount of time spent consuming hip hop related television programs and music videos. Inclusion of a self-report item on the questionnaire for the calculation of time spent watching hip hop related television and music videos may be more appropriate for increasing completion of the instrument. Furthermore, it would be of interest to add a longitudinal component to the study by following up with participants in the future to examine whether they really choose partners whom they perceived as ideal from the rating of the variables on the questionnaire.

REFERENCES

- According to reports. (2005, July/August). *Crisis (The New)*, 112(4), 12.
- Amato, P. (2004). Tension between institutional and individual views of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 959-966.
- Andsager, J. (2003). What's your definition of dirty, baby? Sex in music video. *Sexuality & Culture*, 7(3), 79-97.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 61-90). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Blackwell, D., & Lichter, D. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(4), 719-737.
- Brown, J. (2002). Mass media influences on sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 39(1), 42-46.
- Buss, D. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypothesis tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.
- Buss, D. (1994). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York: Basic Books.
- Buss, D. (1999). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Buss, D., Abbott, M., Angleitner, A., Asherian, A., Biaggio, A., & Blanco-Villasenor, A.

- (1990). International preferences in selecting mates: A study of 37 cultures. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 21*, 5-47.
- Buss, D., & Schmitt, D. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100*, 204-232.
- Busselle, R., & Greenberg, B. (2000). The nature of television realism judgments: A reevaluation of their conceptualization and measurement. *Mass Communication & Society, 3*(2/3), 249-268.
- Cann, A., & Calhoun, L. (2001). Perceived personality associations with differences in sense of humor. *Humor: International Journal of Human Research, 14*, 117-130.
- Cherlin, A. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 848-861.
- Cobb, N., Larson, J., & Watson, W. (2003). Development of the attitudes about romance and mate selection scale. *Family Relations, 52*(3), 222-232.
- Cose, E., & Samuels, A. (2003, March 3). The Black gender gap: Once consigned to mostly menial work, Black women have ascended to the professional-managerial class. *Newsweek, 141*(9), 46-52.
- Cummings, M., & Roy, A. (2002). Manifestations of afrocentricity in rap music. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 13*, 59-76.
- Doosje, B., Rojahn, K., & Fischer, A. (1999). Partner preferences as a function of gender age, political orientation and level of education. *Sex Roles, 40*, 45-60.
- Dunkel, C., & Papini, D. (2005). The role of ego-identity status in mating preferences. *Adolescence, 40*(159), 489-502.

- Eagly, A., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences: Evolution versus social structure. *American Psychologist, 54*, 408-423.
- Eagly, A., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eggermont, S. (2004). Television viewing, perceived similarity, and adolescents' expectations of a romantic partner. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 48*(2), 244-265.
- Fennell, D. (1993). Characteristics of long-term first marriages. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15*, 446-460.
- Ferguson, Y., Quinn, S., Eng, E., & Sandelowski, M. (2006). The gender ratio imbalance and its relationship to risk of HIV/AIDS among African American women at historically Black colleges and universities. *AIDS Care, 18*(4), 323-331.
- Garcia, L. (2006). Perceptions of sexual experience and preferences for dating and marriage. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 15*(2), 85-94.
- Geary, D. (2000). Evolution and proximate expression of human paternal investment. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 55-77.
- Geary, D., & Flinn, M. (2001). Evolution of human parental behavior and the human family. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 1*, 5-61.
- Geary, D., Vigil, J., & Byrd-Craven, J. (2004). Evolution of human mate choice. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*(1), 27-43.

- Giotakos, O. (2004). Gender differences in the perceptions for the ideal sex partner. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 19*(4), 373-378.
- Haferkamp, C. (1999). Beliefs about relationships in relation to television viewing, soap opera viewing, and self-monitoring. *Current Psychology, 18*(2), 193-205.
- Hansen, C., & Hansen R. (2000). Music and music videos. In D. Zillmann & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Media entertainment* (pp. 175-196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hawkins, D., & Booth, A. (2005). Unhappily ever after: Effects of long-term, low-quality marriages on well-being. *Social Forces, 84*(1), 451-472.
- Hofshire, L. & Greenberg, B. (2001). Media's impact on adolescents' body dissatisfaction. In J. D. Brown, J. R. Steele, & K. Walsh-Childers (Eds.), *Sexual teens, sexual media: Investigating media's influence on adolescent sexuality* (pp. 125-152). London: Erlbaum.
- Huston, T., & Melz, H. (2004). The case for promoting marriage: The devil is in the details. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(4), 943-959.
- Isbell, L., & Tyler, J. (2005). Using students' personal ads to teach about interpersonal attraction and intimate relationships. *Teaching Psychology, 32*(3), 170-172.
- Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & Eagly, A. (2002). Another look at sex differences in preferred mate characteristics: The effects of endorsing the traditional female gender role. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 322-329.
- Johnson, J., Adams, M., Ashburn, L., & Reed, W. (1995). Differential gender effects of exposure to rap music on African American adolescents' acceptance of teen dating violence. *Sex Roles, 33*, 597-605.

- Kalmijn, M. (1998). Inter marriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 395-422.
- Kalof, L. (1999). The effects of gender and music video imagery on sexual attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(3), 378-385.
- Lacey, R., Reifman, A., Scott, J., Harris, S., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2004). Sexual-moral attitudes, love styles, and mate selection. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 41(2), 121-130.
- Larson, J. (1992). "You're my one and only": Premarital counseling for unrealistic beliefs about mate selection. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 20, 242-253.
- Larson, J. (2000). *Should we stay together? A scientific proven method for evaluating your relationship and improving its chance for long-term success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lederer, W., & Jackson, D. (1968). *The mirages of marriage*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Li, N., Bailey, J., Kenrick, D., & Linsenmeier, J. (2002). The necessities and luxuries of mate preference: Testing the tradeoffs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 947-955.
- Litzinger, S., & Gordon, K. (2005). Exploring relationships among communication, sexual satisfaction, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 31, 409-424.
- Living single, with kids. (2002, November). *American Demographics*, 24(10), 7.
- Lopoo, L., & Western, B. (2005). Incarceration and the formation and stability of marital unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 721-734.

- Luszyk, D. (2001). *Changes in mate selection preferences as a function of socioeconomic status*. Unpublished manuscript, Technical University of Dresden.
- McCreary, L., & Dancy, B. (2004). Dimensions of family functioning: Perspectives of low-income African American single-parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(3), 690-701.
- McGuirl, K., & Wiederman, M. (2000). Characteristics of the ideal sex partner: Gender differences and perceptions of the preferences of the other gender. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 26*, 153-159.
- Niehuis, S., Huston, T., & Rosenband, R. (2006). From courtship into marriage: A new developmental model and methodological critique. *The Journal of Family Communication, 6*(1), 23-47.
- Oropesa, R., & Landale, N. (2004). The future of marriage and Hispanics. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 901-920.
- Press, J. (2004). Cute butts and housework: A gynocentric theory of assortative mating. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 1029-1034.
- Provine, R. (2000). *Laughter: A scientific investigation*. New York: Viking.
- Regan, P., Levin, L., Sprecher, S., Christopher, F., & Cate, R. (2000) Partner preferences: What characteristics do men and women desire in their short-term sexual and long-term romantic partners? *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 12*(3), 1-21.
- Richardson, J., & Scott, K. (2002). Rap music and its violent progeny: America's culture of violence in context. *The Journal of Negro Education, 71*(3), 175-192.

- Roberts, D. (2000). Media and youth: Access, exposure, and privatization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 27*(2), 8-14.
- Robinson, R. (1999). Hip-hop history: The 20-year-old genre has evolved from underground street scene to anti-establishment fringe to mainstream entertainment. *Billboard, 111*(49), 38-41.
- Rosen-Grandon, J., Myers, J., & Hattie, J. (2004). The relationship between marital characteristics, marital interaction processes, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82*(1), 58-69.
- Sagarin, B., Becker, D., Guadagno, R., Nicastle, L., & Millevoi, A. (2003). Sex differences (and similarities) in jealousy: The moderating influence of infidelity experience and sexual orientation of infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*, 17-23.
- Segrin, C., & Nabi, R. (2002). Does television viewing cultivate unrealistic expectations about marriage? *Journal of Communication, 52*(2), 247-263.
- Seltzer, J. (2004). Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography, kinship, and the future. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 921-928.
- Simpson, J., & Gangestad, S. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 31-49.
- Singh, D. (2004). Mating strategies of young women: Role of physical attractiveness. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*(1), 43-55.
- Smith, S. (2005). From Dr. Dre to dismissed: Assessing violence, sex, and substance use on MTV. *Critical Studies in Media Communications, 22*(1), 89-98.

- Storey, R. (2003). Humor and sexual selection. *Human Nature*, 14(4), 319-336.
- Sweeney, M., & Cancian, M. (2004). Placing patterns of economic assortative mating complex: A reply to Press (2004) and England (2004). *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 1038-1042.
- Trudel, G. (2002). Sexuality and marital life: Results of a survey. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 28, 229-249.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *Marital status: 2000*. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Children and the households they live in: 2000*. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs>
- U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstracts of the United States. (2005). *Marital status of the population by sex and age: 2005*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/tables/07s0055>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2004, April). *Degrees conferred by degree-granting historically Black colleges and universities by level of degree and sex: 1976-77 to 2001-02*. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/AnnualReports/data/xls/A-26.xls>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2004, December). *Number and percentage of students enrolled in degree-granting institutions*. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section5/table.asp?tableID=295>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005, March).

Postsecondary participation rates by sex and race/ethnicity: 1974-2003.

Retrieved July 26, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005028.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005).

Total fall enrollment in degree granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex,

Attendance status, and level of student: Selected years, 1976-2004. Retrieved

June 7, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/05/tables/dt05_205.asp

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics.

(2006, July). *Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: Provisional data for 2005.*

Retrieved June 7, 2007, from

http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr54/nvsr54_20.pdf

Ward, L. (2002). Does television exposure affect emerging adults' attitudes and assumptions about sexual relationships? Correlational and experimental confirmation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*, 1-15.

Ward, L. (2005). Children, adolescents, and the media: The molding of minds, bodies, and deeds. *New Directions for Childhood and Adolescent Development*, *2005(109)*, 63-71.

Ward, L., Hansbrough, E., & Walker, E. (2005). Contributions of music video exposure to Black adolescents' gender and sexual schemas. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *20(2)*, 143-166.

Waynforth, D. (2001). Mate choice trade-offs and women's preference for physically attractive men. *Human Nature*, *12*, 207-219.

Wingwood, G., DiClemente, R., Bernhardt, J., & Harrington, K. (2003). A prospective

study of exposure to rap music videos and African American female adolescents' health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(3), 437-440.

Xie, Y., Raymo, J., Goyette, K., & Thornton, A. (2003). Economic potential and entry into marriage and cohabitation. *Demography*, 40, 351-367.

APPENDIX A
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Survey A

Preferences for the Ideal Mate

Demographics

- D1. Please indicate your marital status. married separated divorced widowed
 single
- D2. a) Please indicate your sexual orientation. heterosexual homosexual bisexual
b) Have you ever encountered sexual activity with someone of the same sex? yes no
- D3. Please indicate your gender. male female
- D4. Please indicate your ethnicity. White (non-Hispanic) African- American Hispanic
 Asian Native American Other
- D5. What is your age?

I. Please rate the importance of each of the features described in the following statements.

Indicate your response by circling one of the response categories (5="extremely important", 4="important", 3="undecided", 2= not important most of the time", 1="not at all important").

Long-term Romantic Partner

1. My long-term romantic partner has a well paid job.
5 4 3 2 1
2. My long-term romantic partner is very dependable.
5 4 3 2 1
3. My long-term romantic partner is wealthy.
5 4 3 2 1
4. My long-term romantic partner is easy going.
5 4 3 2 1
5. My long-term romantic partner has similar
time spending leisure.
5 4 3 2 1
6. My long-term romantic partner is trustworthy.
5 4 3 2 1
7. My long-term romantic partner is intelligent.
5 4 3 2 1

8. My long-term romantic partner is a good financial prospect.
5 4 3 2 1
9. My long-term romantic partner is really sexy looking.
5 4 3 2 1
10. My long-term romantic partner has similar hobbies.
5 4 3 2 1
11. My long-term romantic partner is easy to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
12. My long-term romantic partner is honest.
5 4 3 2 1
13. My long-term romantic partner is emotionally stable and mature.
5 4 3 2 1
14. My long-term romantic partner is romantic.
5 4 3 2 1
15. My long-term romantic partner really looks good.
5 4 3 2 1
16. My long-term romantic partner is ambitious.
5 4 3 2 1
17. My long-term romantic partner has a similar religious background.
5 4 3 2 1
18. My long-term romantic partner is a good cook.
5 4 3 2 1
19. My long-term romantic partner has a similar political background.
5 4 3 2 1
20. My long-term romantic partner is capable of expressing feelings.
5 4 3 2 1
21. My long-term romantic partner has high educational attainment.
5 4 3 2 1
22. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasant personality/character.
5 4 3 2 1
23. My long-term romantic partner has a favorable social status or rating.
5 4 3 2 1
24. My long-term romantic partner is flexible and adaptive.
5 4 3 2 1

25. My long-term romantic partner is similar to my self in interests.
5 4 3 2 1
26. My long-term romantic partner appears healthy.
5 4 3 2 1
27. My long-term romantic partner and I can talk well to each other.
5 4 3 2 1
28. My long-term romantic partner has similar education.
5 4 3 2 1
29. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasing disposition.
5 4 3 2 1
30. My long-term romantic partner is interesting to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
31. My long-term romantic partner is hardworking and industrious.
5 4 3 2 1
32. My long-term romantic partner is a good housekeeper.
5 4 3 2 1
33. My long-term romantic partner is physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
34. My long-term romantic partner looks athletic.
5 4 3 2 1
35. My long-term romantic partner has a good sense of humor.
5 4 3 2 1
36. My long-term romantic partner is friendly and sociable.
5 4 3 2 1
37. My long-term romantic partner has a good education.
5 4 3 2 1
38. My long-term romantic partner has an exciting personality.
5 4 3 2 1
39. My long-term romantic partner is creative.
5 4 3 2 1
40. My long-term romantic partner is a good listener.
5 4 3 2 1

II. Consider the extent to which you would like your partner to display each characteristic, and use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. *Please circle one of the scale's response categories:* (5="strongly agree", 4="agree", 3="undecided", 2="disagree", 1="strongly disagree").

Long-term Romantic Partner

41. My long-term romantic partner must be open to discussing sex.
5 4 3 2 1
42. My long-term romantic partner must be open to different acts.
5 4 3 2 1
43. My long-term romantic partner must be physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
44. My long-term romantic partner must be knowledgeable about sex.
5 4 3 2 1
45. My long-term romantic partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
46. My long-term romantic partner has to communicate desires.
5 4 3 2 1
47. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused.
5 4 3 2 1
48. I would like my long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily.
5 4 3 2 1
49. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.
5 4 3 2 1
50. I like my long-term romantic partner to take the dominant role during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
51. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to have much sexual experience.
5 4 3 2 1
52. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate.
5 4 3 2 1
53. I would like my long-term romantic partner to have a high sex drive.
5 4 3 2 1

III. Please rate the importance of each of the features described in the following statements.

Indicate your response by circling one of the response categories (5="extremely important", 4="important", 3="undecided", 2= not important most of the time", 1="not at all important").

Short-term Sexual Partner

1. My short-term sexual partner has a well paid job.
5 4 3 2 1

2. My short-term sexual partner is very dependable.
5 4 3 2 1
3. My short-term sexual partner is wealthy.
5 4 3 2 1
4. My short-term sexual partner is easy going.
5 4 3 2 1
5. My short-term sexual partner has similar time spending leisure.
5 4 3 2 1
6. My short-term sexual partner is trustworthy.
5 4 3 2 1
7. My short-term sexual partner is intelligent.
5 4 3 2 1
8. My short-term sexual partner is a good financial prospect.
5 4 3 2 1
9. My short-term sexual partner is really sexy looking.
5 4 3 2 1
10. My short-term sexual partner has similar hobbies.
5 4 3 2 1
11. My short-term sexual partner is easy to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
12. My short-term sexual partner is honest.
5 4 3 2 1
13. My short-term sexual partner is emotionally stable and mature.
5 4 3 2 1
14. My short-term sexual partner is romantic.
5 4 3 2 1
15. My short-term sexual partner really looks good.
5 4 3 2 1
16. My short-term sexual partner is ambitious.
5 4 3 2 1
17. My short-term sexual partner has a similar religious background.
5 4 3 2 1
18. My short-term sexual partner is a good cook.
5 4 3 2 1
19. My short-term sexual partner has a similar political background.
5 4 3 2 1
20. My short-term sexual partner is capable of expressing feelings.
5 4 3 2 1
21. My short-term sexual partner has high educational attainment.
5 4 3 2 1
22. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasant personality/character.
5 4 3 2 1

23. My short-term sexual partner has a favorable social status or rating.
5 4 3 2 1
24. My short-term sexual partner is flexible and adaptive.
5 4 3 2 1
25. My short-term sexual partner is similar to my self in interests.
5 4 3 2 1
26. My short-term sexual partner appears healthy.
5 4 3 2 1
27. My short-term sexual partner and I can talk well to each other.
5 4 3 2 1
28. My short-term sexual partner has similar education.
5 4 3 2 1
29. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasing disposition.
5 4 3 2 1
30. My short-term sexual partner is interesting to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
31. My short-term sexual partner is hardworking and industrious.
5 4 3 2 1
32. My short-term sexual partner is a good housekeeper.
5 4 3 2 1
33. My short-term sexual partner is physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
34. My short-term sexual partner looks athletic.
5 4 3 2 1

35. My short-term sexual partner has a good sense of humor.
5 4 3 2 1
36. My short-term sexual partner is friendly and sociable.
5 4 3 2 1
37. My short-term sexual partner has a good education.
5 4 3 2 1
38. My short-term sexual partner has an exciting personality.
5 4 3 2 1
39. My short-term sexual partner is creative.
5 4 3 2 1
40. My short-term sexual partner is a good listener.
5 4 3 2 1

IV. Consider the extent to which you would like your partner to display each characteristic, and use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Please circle one of the scale's response categories: (5="strongly agree", 4="agree", 3="undecided", 2="disagree", 1="strongly disagree").

Short-term Sexual Partner

41. My short-term sexual partner must be open to discussing sex.
5 4 3 2 1
42. My short-term sexual partner must be open to different acts.
5 4 3 2 1
43. My short-term sexual partner must be physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
44. My short-term sexual partner must be knowledgeable about sex.
5 4 3 2 1
45. My short-term sexual partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
46. My short-term sexual partner has to communicate desires.
5 4 3 2 1
47. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be easily sexually aroused.
5 4 3 2 1
48. I would like my short-term sexual partner to experience orgasm easily.
5 4 3 2 1
49. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.
5 4 3 2 1
50. I like my short-term sexual partner to take the dominant role during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
51. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to have much sexual experience.
5 4 3 2 1

52. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be sexually passionate.

5 4 3 2 1

53. I would like my short-term sexual partner to have a high sex drive.

5 4 3 2 1

Survey B

Preferences for the Ideal Mate

Demographics

- D1. Please indicate your marital status. married separated divorced widowed
 single
- D2. a) Please indicate your sexual orientation. heterosexual homosexual bisexual
b) Have you ever encountered sexual activity with someone of the same sex? yes no
- D3. Please indicate your gender. male female
- D4. Please indicate your ethnicity. White (non-Hispanic) African- American Hispanic
 Asian Native American Other
- D5. What is your age?

I. Please rate the importance of each of the features described in the following statements.

Indicate your response by circling one of the response categories (5="extremely important", 4="important", 3="undecided", 2= not important most of the time", 1="not at all important").

Short-term Sexual Partner

1. My short-term sexual partner has a well paid job.
5 4 3 2 1
2. My short-term sexual partner is very dependable.
5 4 3 2 1
3. My short-term sexual partner is wealthy.
5 4 3 2 1
4. My short-term sexual partner is easy going.
5 4 3 2 1
5. My short-term sexual partner has similar time spending leisure.
5 4 3 2 1
6. My short-term sexual partner is trustworthy.
5 4 3 2 1
7. My short-term sexual partner is intelligent.
5 4 3 2 1

8. My short-term sexual partner is a good financial prospect.
5 4 3 2 1
9. My short-term sexual partner is really sexy looking.
5 4 3 2 1
10. My short-term sexual partner has similar hobbies.
5 4 3 2 1
11. My short-term sexual partner is easy to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
12. My short-term sexual partner is honest.
5 4 3 2 1
13. My short-term sexual partner is emotionally stable and mature.
5 4 3 2 1
14. My short-term sexual partner is romantic.
5 4 3 2 1
15. My short-term sexual partner really looks good.
5 4 3 2 1
16. My short-term sexual partner is ambitious.
5 4 3 2 1
17. My short-term sexual partner has a similar religious background.
5 4 3 2 1
18. My short-term sexual partner is a good cook.
5 4 3 2 1
19. My short-term sexual partner has a similar political background.
5 4 3 2 1
20. My short-term sexual partner is capable of expressing feelings.
5 4 3 2 1
21. My short-term sexual partner has high educational attainment.
5 4 3 2 1
22. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasant personality/character.
5 4 3 2 1
23. My short-term sexual partner has a favorable social status or rating.
5 4 3 2 1
24. My short-term sexual partner is flexible and adaptive.
5 4 3 2 1
25. My short-term sexual partner is similar to my self in interests.
5 4 3 2 1
26. My short-term sexual partner appears healthy.
5 4 3 2 1
27. My short-term sexual partner and I can talk well to each other.
5 4 3 2 1
28. My short-term sexual partner has similar education.
5 4 3 2 1

29. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasing disposition.
5 4 3 2 1
30. My short-term sexual partner is interesting to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
31. My short-term sexual partner is hardworking and industrious.
5 4 3 2 1
32. My short-term sexual partner is a good housekeeper.
5 4 3 2 1
33. My short-term sexual partner is physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
34. My short-term sexual partner looks athletic.
5 4 3 2 1
35. My short-term sexual partner has a good sense of humor.
5 4 3 2 1
36. My short-term sexual partner is friendly and sociable.
5 4 3 2 1
37. My short-term sexual partner has a good education.
5 4 3 2 1
38. My short-term sexual partner has an exciting personality.
5 4 3 2 1
39. My short-term sexual partner is creative.
5 4 3 2 1
40. My short-term sexual partner is a good listener.
5 4 3 2 1

II. Consider the extent to which you would like your partner to display each characteristic, and use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Please circle one of the scale's response categories:
 (5="strongly agree", 4="agree", 3="undecided", 2="disagree", 1="strongly disagree").

Short-term Sexual Partner

41. My short-term sexual partner must be open to discussing sex.
5 4 3 2 1
42. My short-term sexual partner must be open to different acts.
5 4 3 2 1
43. My short-term sexual partner must be physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
44. My short-term sexual partner must be knowledgeable about sex.
5 4 3 2 1
45. My short-term sexual partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.
5 4 3 2 1

46. My short-term sexual partner has to communicate desires.
5 4 3 2 1
47. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be easily sexually aroused.
5 4 3 2 1
48. I would like my short-term sexual partner to experience orgasm easily.
5 4 3 2 1
49. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.
5 4 3 2 1
50. I like my short-term sexual partner to take the dominant role during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
51. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to have much sexual experience.
5 4 3 2 1
52. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be sexually passionate.
5 4 3 2 1
53. I would like my short-term sexual partner to have a high sex drive.
5 4 3 2 1

III. Please rate the importance of each of the features described in the following statements.

Indicate your response by circling one of the response categories (5="extremely important", 4="important", 3="undecided", 2= not important most of the time", 1="not at all important").

Long-term Romantic Partner

1. My long-term romantic partner has a well paid job.
5 4 3 2 1
2. My long-term romantic partner is very dependable.
5 4 3 2 1
3. My long-term romantic partner is wealthy.
5 4 3 2 1
4. My long-term romantic partner is easy going.
5 4 3 2 1
5. My long-term romantic partner has similar time spending leisure.
5 4 3 2 1
6. My long-term romantic partner is trustworthy.
5 4 3 2 1
7. My long-term romantic partner is intelligent.
5 4 3 2 1
8. My long-term romantic partner is a good financial prospect.
5 4 3 2 1
9. My long-term romantic partner is really sexy looking.
5 4 3 2 1

10. My long-term romantic partner has similar hobbies.
5 4 3 2 1
11. My long-term romantic partner is easy to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
12. My long-term romantic partner is honest.
5 4 3 2 1
13. My long-term romantic partner is emotionally stable and mature.
5 4 3 2 1
14. My long-term romantic partner is romantic.
5 4 3 2 1
15. My long-term romantic partner really looks good.
5 4 3 2 1
16. My long-term romantic partner is ambitious.
5 4 3 2 1
17. My long-term romantic partner has a similar religious background.
5 4 3 2 1
18. My long-term romantic partner is a good cook.
5 4 3 2 1
19. My long-term romantic partner has a similar political background.
5 4 3 2 1
20. My long-term romantic partner is capable of expressing feelings.
5 4 3 2 1
21. My long-term romantic partner has high educational attainment.
5 4 3 2 1
22. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasant personality/character.
5 4 3 2 1
23. My long-term romantic partner has a favorable social status or rating.
5 4 3 2 1
24. My long-term romantic partner is flexible and adaptive.
5 4 3 2 1
25. My long-term romantic partner is similar to my self in interests.
5 4 3 2 1
26. My long-term romantic partner appears healthy.
5 4 3 2 1

27. My long-term romantic partner and I can talk well to each other.
5 4 3 2 1
28. My long-term romantic partner has similar education.
5 4 3 2 1
29. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasing disposition.
5 4 3 2 1
30. My long-term romantic partner is interesting to talk to.
5 4 3 2 1
31. My long-term romantic partner is hardworking and industrious.
5 4 3 2 1
32. My long-term romantic partner is a good housekeeper.
5 4 3 2 1
33. My long-term romantic partner is physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
34. My long-term romantic partner looks athletic.
5 4 3 2 1
35. My long-term romantic partner has a good sense of humor.
5 4 3 2 1
36. My long-term romantic partner is friendly and sociable.
5 4 3 2 1
37. My long-term romantic partner has a good education.
5 4 3 2 1
38. My long-term romantic partner has an exciting personality.
5 4 3 2 1
39. My long-term romantic partner is creative.
5 4 3 2 1
40. My long-term romantic partner is a good listener.
5 4 3 2 1

IV. Consider the extent to which you would like your partner to display each characteristic, and use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Please circle one of the scale's response categories: (5="strongly agree", 4="agree", 3="undecided", 2="disagree", 1="strongly disagree").

Long-term Romantic Partner

41. My long-term romantic partner must be open to discussing sex.
5 4 3 2 1
42. My long-term romantic partner must be open to different acts.
5 4 3 2 1

43. My long-term romantic partner must be physically attractive.
5 4 3 2 1
44. My long-term romantic partner must be knowledgeable about sex.
5 4 3 2 1
45. My long-term romantic partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
46. My long-term romantic partner has to communicate desires.
5 4 3 2 1
47. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused.
5 4 3 2 1
48. I would like my long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily.
5 4 3 2 1
49. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.
5 4 3 2 1
50. I like my long-term romantic partner to take the dominant role during sex.
5 4 3 2 1
51. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to have much sexual experience.
5 4 3 2 1
52. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate.
5 4 3 2 1
53. I would like my long-term romantic partner to have a high sex drive.
5 4 3 2 1

Daily Hip Hop Television Viewing Diary

Hip hop – a subculture involving fashion, language, art, music, dance, and other forms of entertainment

Day 1

Hip Hop Related Television Shows Viewed

Amount of Time Viewed

Total Amount of Time Watching

Hip Hop Videos Viewed

Song

Artist

Total Number:

Daily Hip Hop Television Viewing Diary

Day 2

Hip Hop Related Television Shows Viewed

Amount of Time Viewed

Total Amount of Time Watching

Hip Hop Videos Viewed

Song

Artist

Total Number:

Daily Hip Hop Television Viewing Diary

Day 3

Hip Hop Related Television Shows Viewed

Amount of Time Viewed

Total Amount of Time Watching

Hip Hop Videos Viewed

Song

Artist

Total Number:

Daily Hip Hop Television Viewing Diary

Day 4

Hip Hop Related Television Shows Viewed

Amount of Time Viewed

Total Amount of Time Watching

Hip Hop Videos Viewed

Song

Artist

Total Number:

Daily Hip Hop Television Viewing Diary

Day 5

Hip Hop Related Television Shows Viewed

Amount of Time Viewed

Total Amount of Time Watching

Hip Hop Videos Viewed

Song

Artist

Total Number:

5 Day Total Amount of Time Watching:

5 Day Total Number of Viewed Hip Hop Videos:

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table A1 Measurement of Variables

Variable	Item Numbers	Questionnaire Items	Related Hypotheses	Analyses	Operationalization
Long-term & Short-term Physical Attractiveness	9, 15, 26, 33, 34	(5="extremely important," 4="important," 3="undecided," 2= not important most of the time," 1="not at all important") My partner is really sexy looking. My partner really looks good. My partner appears healthy. My partner is physically attractive. My partner looks athletic.	1 & 2; 13 & 14	t-Test Regression	21-25 = highly attractive 16-20 = moderately attractive 11-15 = slightly attractive 6-10 = not really attractive 5 = not at all attractive
Long-term & Short-term Social Status	1, 3, 8, 21, 23, 37	My partner has a well paid job. My partner is wealthy.	3 & 4; 13 & 14	t-Test Regression	25-30 = high social status 19-24 = above average social 13-18 = average social status 7-12 = below average social status 6 = low social status

My partner is a good financial prospect.
My partner has high educational attainment.
My partner has a favorable social status or rating.
My partner has a good education.

Long-term & Short-term
Internal Attributes

2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12
13, 14, 16, 20, 22
24, 27, 29, 30, 31
35, 36, 38, 39, 40

5 & 6; 9 & 10;
11 & 12; 13 & 14

ANOVA
Regression
Pearson r

85-105 = highly valued attribute
64-84 = moderately valued
43-63 = somewhat valued
22-42 = lowly valued
21 = not valued

My partner is very dependable.
My partner is easy going.
My partner is trustworthy.
My partner is intelligent.
My partner is easy to talk to.
My partner is honest.
My partner is emotionally stable and mature.

My partner is romantic.
 My partner is ambitious.
 My partner is capable of expressing feelings.
 My partner has a pleasant personality/character.
 My partner is flexible and adaptive.
 My partner and I can talk well to each other.
 My partner has a pleasing disposition.
 My partner is interesting to talk to.
 My partner is hardworking and industrious.
 My partner has a good sense of humor.
 My partner is friendly and sociable.
 My partner has an exciting personality.
 My partner is creative.
 My partner is a good listener.

Long-term & Short-term External Attributes

1, 3, 8, 9, 15
 21, 23, 32, 33
 34, 37

My partner has a well paid job.
 My partner is wealthy.
 My partner is a good financial prospect.
 My partner is really sexy looking.

9 & 10, 11 & 12
 13 & 14

ANOVA

Regression

Pearson r 49-60 = highly valued
 37-48 = moderately valued
 25-36 = somewhat valued
 13-24 = lowly valued
 12 = not valued

My partner really looks good.
My partner is a good cook.
My partner has high educational attainment.
My partner has a favorable social status or rating.
My partner is a good housekeeper.
My partner is physically attractive.
My partner looks athletic.
My partner has a good education.

Long-term & Short-term Social Homogamy

13 & 14

Regression 25-30 = highly homogamous
19-24 = moderately homogamous
13-18 = slightly homogamous
7-12 = not really homogamous
6 = not at all homogamous

171

5, 10, 19, 25,
27

My partner has similar time spending leisure.
My partner has similar hobbies.
My partner has a similar religious background.
My partner has a similar political background.
My partner is similar to my self in interests.
My partner and I can talk well to each other.

Long-term & Short-term Sexual Characteristics

7 & 8; 13 & 14 T-Test

41-53

(5="strongly agree," 4="agree," 3="undecided," 2="disagree," 1="strongly disagree")

My long-term romantic partner must be open to discussing sex.

My long-term romantic partner must be open to different acts.

My long-term romantic partner must be physically attractive.

My long-term romantic partner must be knowledgeable about sex.

My long-term romantic partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.

My long-term romantic partner has to communicate desires.

I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused.

I would like my long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily.

I prefer my long-term romantic partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.

I like my long-term romantic partner to take the dominant role during sex.

I prefer my long-term romantic partner to have much sexual experience.

I would like my long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate.

I would like my long-term romantic partner to have a high sex drive.

Television Viewing

Diary (Amount of Time)

Regression

53-65 = highly sexual

40-52 = moderately

27-39 = slightly

14-26 = not really

13 = not at all sexual

9 & 10, 13 & 14 Pearson r

Regression

15 hours or more in 5 days = high viewing

8-14 hours in 5 days = medium viewing

0-7 hours in 5 days = low viewing

Hip Hop Music
Video Exposure

11 & 12, 13 & 14 Pearson r

Diary (Number of Hip Hop Videos)

Regression

59 & more videos in 5 days = high exposure
30-58 in 5 days = medium exposure
0-29 in 5 days = low exposure

Gender

Demographic #3

1 & 2, 3 & 4, 7 & 8 t-Test

1 = male
2 = male

Long-term
Mate Selection

173

13

Regression

213-265 = extremely high number of attributes rated as important
160-212 = high number of attributes rated as important
107-159 = medium number of attributes rated as important
54-106 = low number of attributes rated as important
53 = extremely low number of attributes rated as important

1-53

Short-term
Mate Selection

14

Regression

1-53

213-265 = extremely high number of attributes rated as important

160-212 = high number of attributes rated as important

107-159 = medium number of attributes rated as important

54-106 = low number of attributes rated as important

53 = extremely low number of attributes rated as important

Table A2 Item Response Frequency and Percentage

Item	Frequency (Percentage)					Range	Mean	
Long-term Mate Selection								
1. My long-term romantic partner has a well paid job.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.29
37 (46.3)	33 (41.3)	8 (10)	0 (0)		2 (2.5)	80		
2. My long-term romantic partner is very dependable.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.56
56 (70)	18 (22.5)	3 (3.8)	1 (1.3)		2 (2.5)	80		
3. My long-term romantic partner is wealthy.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	2.96
12 (15)	14 (17.5)	24 (30)	19 (23.8)		11 (13.8)	80		
4. My long-term romantic partner is easy going.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.11
28 (35)	40 (50)	8 (10)	1 (1.3)		3 (3.8)	80		
5. My long-term romantic partner has similar time spending leisure.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.80
24 (30)	29 (36.3)	17 (21.3)	7 (8.8)		3 (3.8)	80		
6. My long-term romantic partner is trustworthy.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.83
71 (88.8)	6 (7.5)	2 (2.5)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80		

	7. My long-term romantic partner is intelligent.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.40	
	45 (56.3)	27 (33.8)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)		2 (2.5)	80			
	8. My long-term romantic partner is a good financial prospect.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.19	
	36 (45)	29 (36.3)	11 (13.8)	2 (2.5)		2 (2.5)	80			
	9. My long-term romantic partner is really sexy looking.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.75	
	24 (30)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	6 (7.5)		5 (6.3)	80			
	10. My long-term romantic partner has similar hobbies.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.58	
	20 (25)	26 (32.5)	19 (23.8)	10 (12.5)		5 (6.3)	80			
176	11. My long-term romantic partner is easy to talk to.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.58	
	54 (67.5)	20 (25)	5 (6.3)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80			
	12. My long-term romantic partner is honest.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.69	
	64 (80)	9 (11.3)	6 (7.5)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80			
	13. My long-term romantic partner is emotionally stable and mature.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.70	
	62 (77.5)	14 (17.5)	3 (3.8)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80			
	14. My long-term romantic partner is romantic.									
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.31	

	40 (50)	29 (36.3)	8 (10)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.3)	80			
	15. My long-term romantic partner really looks good.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.83
	28 (35)	25 (31.3)	16 (20)	7 (8.8)		4 (5)	80		
	16. My long-term romantic partner is ambitious.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.30
	40 (50)	26 (32.5)	13 (16.3)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80		
	17. My long-term romantic partner has a similar religious background.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.06
	44 (55)	12 (15)	12 (15)	9 (11.3)		3 (3.8)	80		
177	18. My long-term romantic partner is a good cook.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.54
	23 (28.8)	20 (25)	23 (28.8)	5 (6.3)		9 (11.3)	80		
	19. My long-term romantic partner has a similar political background.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.20
	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	19 (23.8)	13 (16.3)		12 (15)	80		
	20. My long-term romantic partner is capable of expressing feelings.								
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.41
	49 (61.3)	19 (23.8)	10 (12.5)	0 (0)		2 (2.5)	80		
	21. My long-term romantic partner has high educational attainment.								

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.24
37 (46.3)	31 (38.8)	8 (10)	2 (2.5)		2 (2.5)	80		
22. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasant personality/character.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.46
48 (60)	24 (30)	6 (7.5)	1 (1.3)		1 (1.3)	80		
23. My long-term romantic partner has a favorable social status or rating.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.71
23 (28.8)	30 (37.5)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)		6 (7.5)	80		
24. My long-term romantic partner is flexible and adaptive.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.15
29 (36.3)	37 (46.3)	12 (15)	1 (1.3)		1 (1.3)	80		
25. My long-term romantic partner is similar to my self in interests.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.88
21 (26.3)	37 (46.3)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)		2 (2.5)	80		
26. My long-term romantic partner appears healthy.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.50
50 (62.5)	22 (27.5)	7 (8.8)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80		
27. My long-term romantic partner and I can talk well to each other.								
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.56
57 (71.3)	14 (17.5)	7 (8.8)	1 (1.3)		1 (1.3)	80		

28. My long-term romantic partner has similar education.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.80
27 (33.8)	28 (35)	14 (17.5)	4 (5)		7 (8.8)	80		

29. My long-term romantic partner has a pleasing disposition.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.90
28 (35)	24 (30)	22 (27.5)	4 (5)		2 (2.5)	80		

30. My long-term romantic partner is interesting to talk to.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.44
44 (55)	30 (37.5)	4 (5)	1 (1.3)		1 (1.3)	80		

31. My long-term romantic partner is hardworking and industrious.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.45
45 (56.3)	28 (35)	6 (7.5)	0 (0)		1 (1.3)	80		

32. My long-term romantic partner is a good housekeeper.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.90
27 (33.8)	29 (36.3)	16 (20)	5 (6.3)		3 (3.8)	80		

33. My long-term romantic partner is physically attractive.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.05
29 (36.3)	35 (43.8)	10 (12.5)	3 (3.8)		3 (3.8)	80		

34. My long-term romantic partner looks athletic.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.42
16 (20)	27 (33.8)	20 (25)	9 (11.3)		8 (10)	80		

35. My long-term romantic partner has a good sense of humor.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.44
---------------------	-----------	-----------	---------------	------------------	----------------------	-------	---	------

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.98
25 (31.3)	35 (43.8)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.5)	80		

44. My long-term romantic partner must be knowledgeable about sex.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.08
26 (32.5)	26 (32.5)	12 (15)	4 (5)	3 (3.8)	80		

45. My long-term romantic partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.06
13 (16.3)	17 (21.3)	21 (26.3)	20 (25)	9 (11.3)	80		

46. My long-term romantic partner has to communicate desires.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.98
31 (38.8)	28 (35)	13 (16.3)	4 (5)	4 (5)	80		

181 47. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be easily sexually aroused.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.56
18 (22.5)	28 (35)	18 (22.5)	13 (16.3)	3 (3.8)	80		

48. I would like my long-term romantic partner to experience orgasm easily.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.10
12 (15)	20 (25)	23 (28.8)	14 (17.5)	11 (13.8)	80		

49. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	2.53
9 (11.3)	11 (13.8)	18 (22.5)	17 (21.3)	25 (31.3)	80		

50. I like my long-term romantic partner to take the dominant role during sex.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.34
15 (18.8)	22 (27.5)	24 (30)	13 (16.3)	6 (7.5)	80		

51. I prefer my long-term romantic partner to have much sexual experience.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	2.73
10 (12.5)	11 (13.8)	22 (27.5)	21 (26.3)	16 (20)	80		

52. I would like my long-term romantic partner to be sexually passionate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.08
33 (41.3)	27 (33.8)	14 (17.5)	5 (6.3)	1 (1.3)	80		

53. I would like my long-term romantic partner to have a high sex drive.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.71
27 (33.8)	20 (25)	21 (26.3)	7 (8.8)	5 (6.3)	80		

Short-Term Mate Selection

182	1. My short-term sexual partner has a well paid job.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.11
	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	18 (22.5)	8 (10)	18 (22.5)	80		

2. My short-term sexual partner is very dependable.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.63
24 (30)	26 (32.5)	15 (18.8)	6 (7.5)	9 (11.3)	80		

3. My short-term sexual partner is wealthy.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	2.45
3 (3.8)	14 (17.5)	23 (28.8)	16 (20)	24 (30)	80		

4. My short-term sexual partner is easy going.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.63
19 (23.8)	33 (41.3)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)	8 (10)	80		

5. My short-term sexual partner has similar time spending leisure.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.11
12 (15)	23 (28.8)	21 (26.3)	10 (12.5)		14 (17.5)	80		

6. My short-term sexual partner is trustworthy.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.06
43 (53.8)	19 (23.8)	6 (7.5)	4 (5)		8 (10)	80		

7. My short-term sexual partner is intelligent.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.90
32 (40)	24 (30)	14 (17.5)	4 (5)		6 (7.5)	80		

8. My short-term sexual partner is a good financial prospect.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.41
18 (22.5)	25 (31.3)	21 (26.3)	4 (5)		12 (15)	80		

9. My short-term sexual partner is really sexy looking.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.14
40 (50)	24 (30)	8 (10)	3 (3.8)		5 (6.3)	80		

10. My short-term sexual partner has similar hobbies.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.14
10 (12.5)	25 (31.3)	21 (26.3)	14 (17.5)		10 (12.5)	80		

11. My short-term sexual partner is easy to talk to.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.09
37 (46.3)	25 (31.3)	10 (12.5)	4 (5)		4 (5)	80		

12. My short-term sexual partner is honest.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.23
46 (57.5)	17 (21.3)	11 (13.8)	1 (1.3)		5 (6.3)	80		

13. My short-term sexual partner is emotionally stable and mature.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.16
38 (47.5)	26 (32.5)	9 (11.3)	5 (6.3)		2 (2.5)	80		

14. My short-term sexual partner is romantic.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.66
24 (30)	25 (31.3)	17 (21.3)	8 (10)		6 (7.5)	80		

15. My short-term sexual partner really looks good.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.05
30 (37.5)	32 (40)	12 (15)	4 (5)		2 (2.5)	80		

16. My short-term sexual partner is ambitious.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.68
22 (27.5)	27 (33.8)	19 (23.8)	7 (8.8)		5 (6.3)	80		

17. My short-term sexual partner has a similar religious background.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.44
26 (32.5)	16 (20)	18 (22.5)	7 (8.8)		13 (16.3)	80		

18. My short-term sexual partner is a good cook.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	2.95
10 (12.5)	17 (21.3)	27 (33.8)	11 (13.8)		15 (18.8)	80		

19. My short-term sexual partner has a similar political background.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	2.55
7 (8.8)	16 (20)	17 (21.3)	14 (17.5)		26 (32.5)	80		

20. My short-term sexual partner is capable of expressing feelings.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.64
22 (27.5)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	5 (6.3)		8 (10)	80		

21. My short-term sexual partner has high educational attainment.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.60
24 (30)	23 (28.8)	19 (23.8)	5 (6.3)		9 (11.3)	80		

185

22. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasant personality/character.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.15
31 (38.8)	35 (43.8)	10 (12.5)	3 (3.8)		1 (1.3)	80		

23. My short-term sexual partner has a favorable social status or rating.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.41
15 (18.8)	28 (35)	18 (22.5)	13 (16.3)		6 (7.5)	80		

24. My short-term sexual partner is flexible and adaptive.

Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.83
19 (23.8)	36 (45)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)		2 (2.5)	80		

25. My short-term sexual partner is similar to my self in interests.

	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.36
	16 (20)	28 (35)	17 (21.3)	7 (8.8)	12 (15)	80		
	26. My short-term sexual partner appears healthy.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.39
	45 (56.3)	23 (28.8)	11 (13.8)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	80		
	27. My short-term sexual partner and I can talk well to each other.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.98
	36 (45)	22 (27.5)	13 (16.3)	2 (2.5)	7 (8.8)	80		
	28. My short-term sexual partner has similar education.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.40
	20 (25)	24 (30)	17 (21.3)	6 (7.5)	13 (16.3)	80		
186	29. My short-term sexual partner has a pleasing disposition.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.68
	18 (22.5)	28 (35)	27 (33.8)	4 (5)	3 (3.8)	80		
	30. My short-term sexual partner is interesting to talk to.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.85
	26 (32.5)	32 (40)	12 (15)	4 (5)	6 (7.5)	80		
	31. My short-term sexual partner is hardworking and industrious.							
	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.51
	24 (30)	21 (26.3)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)	12 (15)	80		

32. My short-term sexual partner is a good housekeeper.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.29	
17 (21.3)	24 (30)	17 (21.3)	9 (11.3)		13 (16.3)	80			
33. My short-term sexual partner is physically attractive.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.20	
36 (45)	31 (38.8)	9 (11.3)	1 (1.3)		3 (3.8)	80			
34. My short-term sexual partner looks athletic.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.35	
16 (20)	19 (23.8)	28 (35)	11 (13.8)		6 (7.5)	80			
35. My short-term sexual partner has a good sense of humor.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.94	
24 (30)	38 (47.5)	11 (13.8)	3 (3.8)		4 (5)	80			
36. My short-term sexual partner is friendly and sociable.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	4.09	
30 (37.5)	34 (42.5)	11 (13.8)	3 (3.8)		2 (2.5)	80			
37. My short-term sexual partner has a good education.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.79	
28 (35)	26 (32.5)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)		8 (10)	80			
38. My short-term sexual partner has an exciting personality.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.92	
26 (32.5)	31 (38.8)	17 (21.3)	3 (3.8)		3 (3.8)	80			
39. My short-term sexual partner is creative.									
Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.56	
18 (22.5)	27 (33.8)	22 (27.5)	8 (10)		5 (6.3)	80			

40. My short-term sexual partner is a good listener.	Extremely Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Most of the Time	Not at All Important	Total	4	3.95
	39 (48.8)	14 (17.5)	17 (21.3)	4 (5)		6 (7.5)	80		
41. My short-term sexual partner must be open to discussing sex.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.15
	38 (47.5)	24 (30)	13 (16.3)	2 (2.5)		3 (3.8)	80		
42. My short-term sexual partner must be open to different acts.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.50
	18 (22.5)	23 (28.8)	26 (32.5)	7 (8.8)		6 (7.5)	80		
43. My short-term sexual partner must be physically attractive.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.09
	32 (40)	31 (38.8)	12 (15)	2 (2.5)		3 (3.8)	80		
44. My short-term sexual partner must be knowledgeable about sex.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.13
	37 (46.3)	23 (28.8)	15 (18.8)	3 (3.8)		2 (2.5)	80		
45. My short-term sexual partner needs to pay me compliments during sex.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.03
	14 (17.5)	17 (21.3)	19 (23.8)	17 (21.3)		13 (16.3)	80		
46. My short-term sexual partner has to communicate desires.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.75
	23 (28.8)	31 (38.8)	15 (18.8)	5 (6.3)		6 (7.5)	80		
47. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be easily sexually aroused.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.45
	15 (18.8)	24 (30)	28 (35)	8 (10)		5 (6.3)	80		

	48. I would like my short-term sexual partner to experience orgasm easily.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.01
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	17 (21.3)	80		
	14 (17.5)	16 (20)	24 (30)	9 (11.3)				
	49. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to like erotic videos, books, or magazines.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	2.65
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	22 (27.5)	80		
	11 (13.8)	9 (11.3)	23 (28.8)	15 (18.8)				
	50. I like my short-term sexual partner to take the dominant role during sex.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.03
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	14 (17.5)	80		
	13 (16.3)	16 (20)	25 (31.3)	12 (15)				
	51. I prefer my short-term sexual partner to have much sexual experience.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	2.91
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	15 (18.8)	80		
	13 (16.3)	12 (15)	25 (31.3)	15 (18.8)				
681	52. I would like my short-term sexual partner to be sexually passionate.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	3.94
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	4 (5)	80		
	32 (40)	21 (26.3)	21 (26.3)	2 (2.5)				
	53. I would like my short-term sexual partner to have a high sex drive.				Strongly Disagree	Total	4	4.38
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	6 (7.5)	80		
	27 (33.8)	24 (30)	19 (23.8)	4 (5)				

Table A3 Scale Reliability Test

Scale	<i>N</i>	Range	Mean	SD	Cronbach's χ
Long-term PA	80	20	19.55	4.09	.823
Short-term PA	80	20	20.13	3.87	.813
Long-term SS	80	24	23.75	4.15	.780
Short-term SS	80	23	19.78	5.60	.821
Long-term EA	80	48	46.24	7.90	.847
Short-term EA	80	46	41.75	8.43	.816
Long-term IA	80	84	92.43	11.94	.948
Short-term IA	80	84	81.11	16.03	.938
Long-term SC	80	45	46.20	9.02	.860
Short-term SC	80	84	46.00	10.79	.628
Long-term SH	80	24	23.08	4.57	.771
Short-term SH	80	24	19.58	5.75	.824
LTMS	80	169.00	211.68	25.64	.936
STMS	80	204.00	192.25	31.97	.914

Table A4 Variable Correlations

	LPA	SPA	LSS	SSS	LIA	SIA	LEA	SEA	LSC	SSC	LSH	SSH	TV	HHMVE	LTMS	STMS
Long-term Physical Attraction	1	.235*	.655**	.085	.592**	.104	.881**	.174	.286*	.082	.494**	.123	-.127	-.158	.754**	.147
Short-term Physical Attraction		1	.123	.123	-.049	.262*	.212	.555**	.295**	.343**	-.071	.193	-.121	.081	.135	.442**
Long-term Social Status			1	.238*	.676**	.206	.890**	.213	.222*	.061	.569**	.175	-.013	-.106	.792**	.215
Short-term Social Status				1	.040	.743**	.207	.864**	.297**	.142	.364**	.749**	.051	-.203	.264*	.795**
Long-term Internal Attributes					1	.161	.674**	-.036	.125	.092	.637**	.007	-.126	-.194	.844**	.099
Short-term Internal Attributes						1	.162	.699**	.357**	.211	.258*	.749**	-.035	-.224*	.302**	.893**
Long-term External Attributes							1	.267*	.296**	.100	.601**	.186	-.069	-.123	.854**	.221*
Short-term External Attributes								1	.368**	.265*	.233*	.720**	-.009	-.133	.248*	.847**
Long-term Sexual Characteristics									1	.576**	.155	.312**	.014	-.067	.542**	.533**

	Short-term Sexual Characteristics	1	-.018	.066	.011	-.093	.285*	.532**
	Long-term Social Homogamy		1	.462**	-.040	-.199	.729**	.276*
	Short-term Social Homogamy			1	-.056	-.234*	.262*	.775**
	Television Viewing				1	.389**	-.087	-.021
	Hip Hop Music Video Exposure					1	-.187	-.214
192	Long-term Mate Selection						1	.363**
	Short-term Mate Selection							1

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

APPENDIX C
CONSENT LETTER OF INFORMATION

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title: The Effect of Hip Hop Music Videos on African American Young Adults' Perceptions of the Ideal Mate for Long-term Romantic Relationships and Short-term Sexual Relationships

Investigator: Joe Bradshaw
Advisor: Lillian Chenoweth, Ph.D

Explanation and Purpose of the Research

You are being asked to participate in a research study for Mr. Bradshaw's dissertation at Texas Woman's University. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of hip hop music videos on African American young adults' perceptions of ideal mates, both short-term sexual partners and long-term romantic partners. In particular, this study will describe how exposure to hip hop culture by watching hip hop videos influences young African Americans' choice of partners for sexual or romantic relationships. The study will focus on findings derived from single heterosexual African Americans between the ages of 21 and 35 who have never been married. If you do not meet the criteria, your participation is not necessary.

Research Procedures

For this study, the investigator, through your university class professor's TA, will conduct a survey of African American 3rd and 4th year students (juniors and seniors). The survey will consist of both a daily diary for 5 days completed in the privacy of residence and a questionnaire following the 5 day period to be completed by choice in either the university classroom or alone afterwards in your own privacy, totaling a commitment of 6 days. Upon receiving the administered questionnaire, you are to attach your diary to the questionnaire and complete it. A drop box will be set up in the departmental office for you to submit your combined completed diary and questionnaire by the end of the day.

The diary will ask you to write the name of all television shows viewed each day over a range of 5 days and record the amount of time spent viewing each show. At the end of

Participant Initials
Page 1 of 2

each day, you are to record the total amount of time spent watching television. Also, you are to keep count of the number of hip hop music videos viewed for each day by writing down the name of each song/video viewed as well as the name of the artist of each song. After 5 consecutive days of watching television, you are to total the amount of time spent watching television and the number of viewed hip hop music videos for all 5 days. The diaries are to be used on your own time across 5 days and the questionnaire will take no more than 20-30 minutes of your time. The questionnaire to be completed following the 5 days of diary recording will ask you questions concerning your personal views of an ideal mate for both a long-term romantic partner and a short-term sexual partner. You will be asked to rate the importance of features you would like your partner to possess. Some of the features asked to rate will involve social and financial status, similar interests, and internal and external personal characteristics. The questionnaire will also require you to rate sexual characteristics that you may or may not find desirable in your ideal partner.

Potential Risks

A possible risk to you as a result of your participation in this study is the release of confidential information. By participating, you also risk losing some personal time, feeling a degree of embarrassment and awareness of your current views and behavior due to the nature of some of the questions, and reevaluating your personal relationship and possibly terminating it. Confidentiality will be protected to the extent that is allowed by law. Your diary and questionnaire will be placed in a drop box and later placed in an envelope sealed for mailing.

Participation and Benefits

Your involvement in this research study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw from participation at any time. The only benefit of this study to you is that upon completion of the study a summary of the results will be provided to you upon request by contacting the researchers by phone or email.

Questions Regarding the Study

If you have any questions about the research study, you may ask the researchers; their phone numbers and email addresses are at the top of this cover letter. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research or the way this study has been conducted, you may contact the Texas Woman's University Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 940-898-3378 or via e-mail at IRB@twu.edu.

Signature of Participant

Date

Page 2 of 2