

Illinois Wesleyan University Digital Commons @ IWU

Honors Projects

Psychology

2012

# Life History Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

Yuliana Zaikman yzaikman@iwu.edu

# **Recommended** Citation

Zaikman, Yuliana, "Life History Theory and the Sexual Double Standard" (2012). *Honors Projects*. Paper 153. http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych\_honproj/153

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at Digital Commons @ IWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ IWU. For more information, please contact sdaviska@iwu.edu. ©Copyright is owned by the author of this document. Life History Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

Yuliana Zaikman

Illinois Wesleyan University

#### Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the potential relationship between life history theory and the sexual double standard. Life history theory posits that one's upbringing (e.g., whether one's parents are divorced or not; quality of relationship with one's father) may have physiological and psychological implications on one's future mating strategies, especially for women. The sexual double standard is the notion that men and women are judged differently depending on their sexual activities. For the present study, we hypothesized that participants who came from single parent households or who have had worse relationship with their parents would differentially exhibit the sexual double standard compared to participants from two parent households or who have had better relationship with their parents. Participants completed questionnaires regarding their relationships with their parents and then evaluated a target individual who reported having either 1 or 12 sexual partners. Results showed that female participants who come from divorced households evaluated highly sexually active men as less successful than less sexually active men. Additionally, female participants who reported worse relationships with their mothers evaluated highly sexually active men as less virtuous than less sexually active men. There was no relationship between a female's quality of relationship with her father and the exhibition of the double standard.

### Life History Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

In the movie "Sorority Boys" (2002), viewers watch as a sorority girl leaves a fraternity boy's bedroom the morning after they have had sex. When she exits the bedroom, she is greeted by a row of fraternity boys cheering while she takes the "walk of shame." The boys even take a picture of her and add it to their "Walk of Shame" wall. The fraternity boy is regarded with respect and admiration from his follow fraternity members for the fact that he had sexual relations with the girl. Similarly, in a recent episode of the TV show "How I Met Your Mother," the male characters sit on their house steps in the middle of New York City, enjoying the "walk of shame" the morning after Halloween. We can see only females taking this walk. In other words, it appears that this walk is a walk that only women, as opposed to men, take. On the other hand, what happens in the media when a man does not conform to the stereotype of a promiscuous male, eager to take part in one-night stands? In "The 40 year old Virgin," the viewer watches as the main character's friends find out he is a virgin and immediately react with shock, before setting out to help him lose his virginity.

The above examples illustrate that in popular culture women appear to be derogated for their sexual behavior, while men appear to be encouraged and rewarded for the same behavior. Given these portrayals, it is not surprising that many people believe that a sexual double standard exists between men and women (Milhansen & Herold, 1999). The purpose of the present research is to investigate potential individual differences in the exhibition of the sexual double standard. More specifically, the proposed study will investigate whether there is a relationship between one's rearing experience (i.e., the presence/absence of one's father and the strength of one's relationship with one's parents) and whether one judges women more harshly than men for their sexual activities.

#### An Overview of Life History Theory

Life history theory (Belsky, Steinberg & Draper, 1991), posits that children's early upbringing can have both physiological and behavioral implications. For example, growing up in an environment in which a father is absent, or emotional relationships with parents are strained, has been shown to affect a female's development. Girls who grow up in single parent households are more likely to experience stress which then may accelerate their maturation. More specifically, survey and experimental research has found that these girls will reach pubertal maturation at an earlier stage than girls who did not grow up in a single parent household (Moffit, Caspi, Belsky, & Silva, 1992; Surbey, 1990). Research also has suggested that the longer time the father has been absent, the sooner girls' menstruation begins (Surbey, 1990). The presence of stepfathers may play a role in maturation as well. Ellis and Garber (2000) found that there is a significant correlation between the timing of pubertal maturation in girls and the appearance of an unrelated father figure in their lives.

Importantly, research also has indicated a relationship between father-absence and females' reproductive strategies (Quinlan, 2003). For instance, women whose parents separated when they were less than six years old were more than four times as likely to engage in sexual intercourse at an earlier age compared to women whose parents did not separate. Moreover, women whose parents separated were more likely to have above the median number of sexual partners when compared with women who grew up in intact families (Quinlan, 2003). Results are similar concerning the presence of stepfathers: Living with a stepfather between birth and the age of 5 relates to earlier age of first intercourse and first pregnancy (Quinlan, 2003).

However, the presence or absence of a father is not the only factor that might affect development and future sexual activity, as the quality of the relationship with parents appears to be influential as well. If the quality of the relationship between children and parents is compromised, and the environment at home becomes stressful, it is hypothesized that these children also will learn to engage in more problematic behaviors (e.g., alcohol consumption and sexual promiscuity; Caspi & Moffitt, 1991). Ivan and Bereczkei (2006) were interested in examining whether life history theory and, in particular, parental bonding had an effect on risk taking behaviors. Results showed a significant association between parental care towards children and the probability of the children participating in risk taking behaviors. Similar resulted were observed regarding alcohol consumption and drug use; high levels of parental warmth were associated with less alcohol consumption and less drug use. Importantly, strained relationships with a parent also have been found to correlate with accelerated reproductive development and the earlier onset of sexual activity (Belsky et al., 2007; Ellis & Graber, 2000). Finally, it has been found that positive family support in preschool years predicts lower levels of pubertal maturation in girls in the seventh grade (Ellis & Essex, 2007). In sum, these studies demonstrate that the quality of the relationship with one's parents affects development and sexual behavior.

Although life history theory has primarily focused on relationships with one's father, research has suggested that relationships with one's mother may impact these developmental outcomes as well. Researchers conducted a longitudinal study in order to see whether there is a relationship between maternal harshness, earlier age of menarche, and higher levels of sexual risk taking (Belsky, Steinberg, Houts & Halpern-Felsher, 2010). The results of the study show that greater maternal harshness was correlated with earlier onset of menarche. Menarche was correlated with greater amount of sexual risk taking behavior but not with other risk taking behaviors, such as smoking, alcohol consumption and drug use. Moreover, greater maternal

#### LIFE HISTORY THEORY

harshness was correlated directly with an increased amount of other risk taking behaviors, but not with sexual risk taking behaviors. Overall, greater "maternal harshness exerted a significant indirect effect, via earlier menarche, on sexual risk taking" (Belsky et al., 2010, p. 120).

Why would parental relationships affect one's maturation and reproductive strategies? Researchers have hypothesized that growing up without a biological father present may signal to a developing female that two parents are not necessary for child rearing and survival, which might then cue "a mating effort strategy" consisting of early maturation and a tendency to seek out short term partners (Quinlan, 2003). Also, children who grow up in less stable homes (e.g., who experience harsh parenting, marital conflicts and problematic parent-child relationships) will learn that they cannot trust others because no one is there to support them. Therefore, they will learn that "the wisest strategy for achieving the (unconscious) evolutionary goal of passing one's genes on to future generations is to mature early, initiate sex early, have multiple and unstable partnerships, bear more rather than fewer offspring, and invest limited time and effort in caring for them" (Belsky et al., 2007, p. 1303). In other words, relationships can be unstable and resources scarce. As such, it may be more evolutionary adaptive to engage in short term mating behaviors as opposed to focusing on a long term relationship that would involve unlikely continual commitment.

#### An overview of the Sexual Double Standard

The sexual double standard is the notion that the same sexual behavior is judged differently in men and women. In other words, if a man and woman engage in the same sexual practices, men are viewed more positively than are women. Even though the majority of people believe that the sexual double standard exists (Milhansen & Herold, 1999), research thus far has found mixed results; some articles found empirical support for the presence of the sexual double standard (Marks & Fraley, 2007; Marks, 2008), whereas others found limited support (Gentry, 1998; Marks & Fraley, 2005).

For example, Milhansen and Herold (1999) found that women view both females and males in the same way if both engage in the same high levels of sexual activity. They also found that even though there seemed to be no significant difference between the perception of men and women, the participants in the study indicated that they were more likely to discourage female friends from dating a man who had a high number of sexual partners than to discourage male friends from dating a woman who had the same high number of sexual partners. In other words, there might be some underlying differences in evaluating promiscuous males versus promiscuous females.

Researchers have sought to extend the double standard research to include multiple domains of evaluation. For example, Marks and Fraley (2005) focused on people's perception of a target person (female or male) on different domains such as values, peer popularity, power/success, and intelligence. The researchers used a 2 (targeted person sex) by 6 (number of sexual partners of the targeted person: 0, 1, 3, 7, 12, or 19) between-subjects design and conducted the study using both subject pool and online participants. Results revealed no sexual double standard in any of the domains for the subject pool sample. For the online sample, results revealed a double standard for the domain of power/success only, such that participants viewed women as less powerful and less successful as the number of their sexual partners increased, whereas they valued men as more powerful and successful as the number of their sexual partners increased.

Another study that was conducted by Marks and Fraley (2006) investigated whether the presence of the sexual double standard might be due to confirmation bias. Confirmation bias is

the tendency to pay attention to details that confirm a certain earlier belief. In relation to the double standard, Marks and Fraley argued that people might think that the sexual double standard exists because people are more likely to pay attention to and remember information that confirms the sexual double standard. Participants were presented with vignettes supposedly that were comprised of different comments made by others regarding the target's sexual behavior. The number of positive and negative comments in the vignette was equal – the only difference was whether the targeted person was female or male. The participants were asked to recall the number of positive and negative remarks that they read. The results confirmed the hypothesis: Participants were more likely to remember negative remarks when the target was a woman rather than a man. However, it was unclear whether participants actually remembered more negative remarks about women than about men or whether they guessed based on their pre-existing idea that more negative remarks should correspond with women than with men. In other words, there might have been confirmation bias in participants' responses; they might have paid more attention to the negative comments made about females than about males because it confirmed their earlier belief that the sexual double standard exists.

In a second study, participants were asked to recall the specific remarks that were made about the person in the vignette without distinguishing between the negative and the positive. The results showed that participants indeed remembered more negative remarks about the female target than about the male target. This finding ties back to the idea of the confirmation bias: People might believe that there is a sexual double standard and will unconsciously pay attention to and better remember information that goes along with their beliefs. Moreover, people might remember more negative remarks about women than about men because of a belief that other people have more negative points of view on women than on men (Marks, 2008; Marks & Fraley, 2007).

One possible reason why the sexual double standard is not always apparent in a laboratory setting may be because there is some element that is missing that is present in real life and might contribute significantly to the presence of the sexual double standard. Marks (2008) theorized that in real life people rarely are able to devote their whole attention to evaluating people's sexual activity. The real world restricts the attentional resources that are available to people when they are processing information. When people devote their whole attention to evaluating a particular person, as has been done in previous studies, they might individualize that person instead of stereotyping him or her. As such, Marks investigated whether the sexual double standard would emerge when attention was divided. In one condition, participants read a vignette written by a male/female who had 1, 7 or 19 sexual partners. In the divided attention condition, the participants followed the same procedure, however, they had to recite an 8 digit number from the beginning of the experiment until the end every 3-4 seconds. The results showed that in the divided attention condition the participants evaluated highly sexually active men more positively than highly sexually active women. Furthermore, participants in the full attention condition did not exhibit the sexual double standard. This study showed that the lack of exhibition of the sexual double standard in the laboratory setting might be due to the low level of ecological validity (the ability to generalize the experiment's results to natural settings) and not because it does not exist.

Another study that tried to increase the resemblance of the laboratory setting to the real world was a study conducted by Marks and Fraley (2007). This study was conducted to determine whether social interaction (in particular group dynamics), might have an influence on

9

the sexual double standard. In real life, people might judge and evaluate others quite often in the presence of other people. In this study, participants individually read a vignette about a target person (male/female) who had either 1, 7 or 19 sexual partners. They were asked to evaluate the target person on four different domains: values, dominance, success and intelligence. Afterwards, participants were divided in groups of three (all were the same sex) and were asked to evaluate the target person again. They needed to arrive at a consensus, meaning all the group members had to agree on the same score to give. Later, they had to evaluate the target person again individually. Results showed that there was no sexual double standard present in the baseline condition. However, the sexual double standard emerged in the group condition in the dominance, success and intelligence domains (there was no sexual double standard found in the values domain). In addition, the sexual double standard continued to persist in the post-group condition (when the participants evaluated the targeted person again after taking part in the group deliberation). This experiment showed that the sexual double standard is more salient when people are in a group. Also, the emergence of the sexual double standard appears to persist even after one is separate from the group. The results of this study suggest that social interaction, such as participation in a group, might exert its influence on the appearance of the sexual double standard even after the participants are removed from the group.

In sum, research on the sexual double standard has suggested that it might be more nuanced than previously believed. Although some studies found no support for the double standard (Gentry, 1998; Marks & Fraley, 2005), others found the double standard exhibited under various conditions (Marks & Fraley, 2007; Marks, 2008). It appears that the double standard is not just a widely believed notion without empirical support but rather a legitimate issue that might affect people's perception of women in a negative way.

#### Life history theory and the sexual double standard

Given that a female's upbringing relates to her subsequent sexual activity, it seems reasonable to assume that a female's upbringing also may impact her views on others' sexuality. For example, girls who come from single-parent households or who have experienced less stable relationships with their fathers may be less likely to exhibit the sexual double standard than those who grew up with two-parent household and had more stable relationships with their parents because they have learned that resources are scarce and relationships cannot be trusted. Therefore, perhaps they will not "blame" another girl for taking part in more risky behavior. Indeed, Milhansen and Herold (1999) found that women who had a greater number of sexual partners were more likely to accept a dating partner who had a high number of sexual partners. Although Milhansen and Herold's research does not apply directly to the acceptance of the same sex's sexual behavior, it may indicate a basic notion that people who have greater sexual experience might be more accepting of other people who have greater sexual experience. On the other hand, it may be the case that girls who grew up in this type of environment will judge other girls more harshly, perhaps because they view them as competition for available men. The purpose of the present research is to investigate whether females who grow up in father-absence homes, or who have strained relationships with their fathers, are more or less likely to exhibit the double standard.

#### Method

#### **Participants**

Participants were 236 undergraduates who were recruited from the General Psychology course in exchange for course credit. The median age was 19 (M = 18.75, SD = .92). There were

11

slightly more female participants (52.5%) than male participants (43.2%). Ten participants did not specify their sex (see Table 1).

#### Measures

Participants completed the following measures in random order. Additionally, the questions for some of the measures were randomized as well.

*Demographics Questionnaire*. The participants were asked demographic questions such as their sex, age and year in school (see Table 1).

*Life History*. Participants completed the Attachment History Questionnaire (AHQ; Pottharst, 1990; see Appendix A), which is a measure of the quality of relationship one experienced with one's parents while growing up. For this study, eight specific questions were selected—four regarding one's relationship with one's mother and four regarding one's relationship with one's father. Sample items include "How often did you feel loved or cared for by your mother?" and "When you needed him, did your father spend time with you when he was home?" Responses ranged from (1) *Strongly disagree* to (7) *Strongly agree*. For the AHQ father scale, the reliability was .93 (Cronbach's *alpha*), while for the AHQ mother scale it was .90 (Cronbach's *alpha*; see Table 2 for means and standard deviations). Participants also were asked whether their parents were married or divorced (see Table 3 for more information).

*Previous Sexual Activity.* Participants provided information regarding their personal sexual practices by answering questions such as "With how many people have you engaged in sexual intercourse?", "Have you ever had a one night stand or sexual relations with someone whom you weren't exclusively dating?" and "With how many people have you engaged in sexual activity other than intercourse?" View Table 4 for more information.

*Sexual Double Standard.* After the experimental stimuli were presented (see details below), participants completed a questionnaire evaluating the target person on four domains: values, peer popularity, power/success and intelligence (Marks & Fraley, 2005; view Appendix B). Specifically, they were asked to rate 30 evaluative statements about the target person. Examples of the statements that were presented to them are "This person is popular" and "This person is physically attractive". Participants rated each item on a 5 point scale, (1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 5 = *Strongly Agree*). See Table 5 for means and standard deviations. Cronbach's alpha's for the present sample's subscales were .89 for values, .78 for popularity, .74 for success, and .64 for intelligence. See Table 6 for correlations between all the questionnaires and evaluative scales.

# Procedure

Participants completed the study in groups of two. They were informed that they were going to participate in a study on person perception. Specifically, they were told that they would complete questionnaires on the computer and that the program would then automatically present them with a person's feedback from a Facebook application study that was conducted the previous year.

After signing the informed consent form, each participant was placed in a private room. After completing the above measures on the computer (with the exception of the evaluation items), they viewed the Facebook application results page (see Appendix C). Each participant viewed the same profile (more specifically, feedback ostensibly given to the person about their personality) with the exception of the target person's sex and the target person's reported number of sexual partners. The four conditions were as follows: A female with 12 sexual partners, a female with 1 sexual partner, a male with 12 sexual partners, and a male with 1 sexual partner. Each participant viewed only one profile.

Participants then completed a questionnaire evaluating the target person on the four domains described above (the Facebook results page was available for them to look at on the computer screen while they completed the evaluation measure). Following their completion of the evaluation questionnaire, the participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

#### Results

#### Sexual Double Standard

A three-way ANOVA was conducted with the following independent variables: target's sex, target's number of sexual partners (in the future will be referred as "target's partners") and participant's sex in relation to the four different subscales (popularity, success, intelligence and values).

#### *Popularity*

No main effects or two way interactions were significant. In other words, the double standard did not emerge. Also, the three way interaction was not significant. In other words, women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's popularity (see Table 7).

#### Success

A main effect for target partners was revealed, such that targets with 12 sexual partners (M = 24.11, SD = .33) were rated as less successful than targets with 1 sexual partner (M = 25.41, SD = .33), F(1,218) = 7.63, p < .01, d = -3.94. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant. In other words, the double standard did not emerge. Also, the three

way interaction was not significant. In other words, women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's success (see Table 8). *Intelligence* 

A main effect for target partners was revealed, such that targets with 12 sexual partners (M = 16.60, SD = .20) were rated as less intelligent than targets with 1 sexual partner (M = 18.18, SD = .21), F(1,218) = 29.18, p < .001, d = .7.71. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant. In other words, the double standard did not emerge. Also, the three way interaction was not significant. In other words, women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's intelligence (see Table 9).

# Values

A main effect for target partners was revealed, such that targets with 12 sexual partners (M = 28.65, SD = .46) were rated as less values than targets with 1 sexual partner (M = 33.90, SD = .47), F(1,218) = 64.46, p < .001, d = -11.29. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant. In other words, the double standard did not emerge. Also, the three way interaction was not significant. In other words, women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's values (see Table 10).

#### Sexual History – Males and Females

To determine whether participants' number of sexual partners (the answer to the question "With how many people have you engaged in sexual intercourse?") relates to the exhibition of the sexual double standard, hierarchical regression was performed. The number of sexual partners was centered in relation to its mean and the conditions were dummy coded such that the "target female" condition was coded 1 and the "target male" condition was coded "0" and the "target 12 partners" was coded "1" and the "target 1 partner" was coded "0". In Step 1, the total

evaluative score was regressed on the sex of target condition (whether the target was male or female), the number of partners condition (whether the target reported 1 or 12 partners), and number of sexual partners that the participant reported for him or herself. In Step 2, the interactions between target sex and target partners, number of participant's sexual partners and target sex, and number of participant's sexual partners and target partners were entered. In step 3, the three way interaction between participant's number of sexual partners, target partners and target sex was entered. At this point participants sex was excluded, meaning males and females were analyzed together. For the sake of simplicity, only the three way interactions are focused upon below.

#### *Popularity*

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.09, t(7,222) = -.77, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between people who had many sexual partners and people who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their popularity (see Table 11).

#### Success

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.01, t(7,222) = -.08, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between people who had many sexual partners and people who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their success (see Table 12).

#### Intelligence

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$ = -.08, t(7,222) = -.79, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between people who had many sexual partners and people who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 13).

#### Values

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.07, t(7,222) = -.69, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between people who had many sexual partners and people who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their values (see Table 14).<sup>1</sup>

#### Sexual History – Females

Due to the fact that life history theory focuses primarily on females, I conducted similar analyses (reported below) considering female participants only.

#### *Popularity*

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.10, t(7,111) = -.73, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between females who had many sexual partners and females who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their popularity (see Table 15).

# Success

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.18, t(7,111) = -1.36, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between females who had many sexual partners and females who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their success (see Table 16).

### Intelligence

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.12, t(7,111) = -.95, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between females

who had many sexual partners and females who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus female targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 17).

#### Values

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × number of sexual partners interaction,  $\beta$  = -.15, t(7,111) = -1.40, *ns*. In other words, there was no significant difference between females who had many sexual partners and females who had few or no sexual partners on the evaluation of male versus targets regarding their values (see Table 18).<sup>2</sup>

#### Single vs. Two Parent Household – Males and Females

A three-way ANOVA was conducted with the following independent variables: target's sex, target partners and participants' parents' marital status (married vs. divorced) in relation to the four subscales (popularity, success, intelligence and values).

# *Popularity*

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,225) = .83, *ns*. In other words, participants with married parents versus participants with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's popularity (see Table 19).

# Success

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,225) = 3.17, *ns*. In other words, participants with married parents versus participants with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's success (see Table 20). *Intelligence* 

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,225) = 3.12, *ns*. In other words, participants with married parents versus participants with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's intelligence (see Table 21).

Values

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,225) = .51, *ns*. In other words, participants with married parents versus participants with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's values (see Table 22). *Single vs. Two Parent Household – Females only* 

The same analyses were performed with only female participants.

# *Popularity*

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,114) = .08, *ns*. In other words, females with married parents versus females with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's popularity (see Table 23).

#### Success

Three way interaction between target sex, target partners, and divorce was significant,  $F(1, 114) = 8.23, p = .005, \eta^2 = .014$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that women with divorced parents rated male targets with many partners as less successful than male targets with one partner (see Table 24).

### Intelligence

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,114) = .78, *ns*. In other words, females with married parents versus females with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's intelligence (see Table 25).

# Values

Three way interaction was not significant, F(1,114) = .52, *ns*. In other words, females with married parents versus females with divorced parents were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's values (see Table 26).

# Quality of relationship with father – Males and Females

Analyses were conducted in the manner described previously in order to examine the relationship between one's early relationship with his or her father (as indicated by scores on the Father subsection of the AHQ) in relation to the manifestation of the sexual double standard. *Popularity* 

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .14$ , t(7,227) = 1.01, *ns*. In other words, people who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from people who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their popularity (see Table 27).

# Success

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .03$ , t(7,227) = .25, *ns*. In other words, people who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from people who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their success (see Table 28).

# Intelligence

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .07$ , t(7,227) = .55, *ns*. In other words, people who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from people who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 29).

#### Values

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.06$ , t(7,227) = -.47, *ns*. In other words, people who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from people who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their values (see Table 30).

# Quality of relationship with father –Females only

The same analyses were performed with only female participants.

# **Popularity**

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .16$ , t(7,115) = .88, *ns*. In other words, females who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from females who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their popularity (see Table 31).

# Success

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .09$ , t(7,115) = .48, *ns*. In other words, females who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from females who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their success (see Table 32).

# Intelligence

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .17$ , t(7,115) = 1.01, *ns*. In other words, females who had better relationships with their fathers while growing up did not differ from females who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 33).

#### Values

Results revealed no target partners × target sex × Father AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .002$ , t(7,115) = .02, *ns*. In other words, females who had better relationships with their fathers while

growing up did not differ from females who had worse relationships with their fathers on the evaluation of targets regarding their values (see Table 34).

#### Quality of relationship with mother – Males and Females

Analyses were conducted in the manner described previously in order to examine the relationship between one's quality of relationship with his or her mother and the manifestation of the sexual double standard.

# **Popularity**

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.02$ , t(7,228) = -.11, *ns*. In other words, people who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from people who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their popularity (see Table 35).

# Success

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .11$ , t(7,228) = .75, *ns*. In other words, people who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from people who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their success (see Table 36).

#### Intelligence

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.03$ , t(7,228) = -.20, *ns*. In other words, people who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from people who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 37).

Values

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.17$ , t(7,228) = -1.35, *ns*. In other words, people who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from people who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their values (see Table 38).

#### Quality of relationship with mother – Females only

The same analyses were performed with only female participants.

# *Popularity*

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.05$ , t(7,116) = -.33, *ns*. In other words, females who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from females who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their popularity (see Table 39).

# Success

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = .06$ , t(7,116) = .43, *ns*. In other words, females who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from females who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their success (see Table 40).

#### Intelligence

Results revealed no target partner × target sex × Mother AHQ score interaction,  $\beta = -.09$ , t(7,116) = -.65, *ns*. In other words, females who have better relationships with their mothers while growing up do not differ from females who have worse relationships with their mothers on the evaluation of targets regarding their intelligence (see Table 41).

Values

The manipulated variables and attachment towards one's mother predicted a significant amount of variance when the values subscale was used as the dependent variable, F(7, 116) =9.74, p < .001,  $R^2 = .61$ . More specifically, the three-way interaction between relationship with mother, target sex, and target partners was significant,  $\beta = -.23$ , t(7,116) = -1.99, p < .05 (see Table 42). Simple slope analysis revealed that participants with poorer mother relationships rated men with many partners as less virtuous ( $\beta = .30$ , p < .05).

#### Discussion

Consistent with previous research, the sexual double standard did not emerge in our study (Gentry, 1998; Marks & Fraley, 2005). Earlier research showed the emergence of the sexual double standard only in cases when the laboratory setting resembled real life in some way (Marks, 2008; Marks & Fraley, 2007). The present study did not manipulate the laboratory setting to resemble real life; therefore it was not surprising that the sexual double standard did not emerge. It is important to note, however, that analyses revealed that people judge targets with 12 sexual partners significantly more negatively than targets with 1 sexual partner (regardless of the target's sex) on the success, intelligence and values scales. A possible explanation for these differences might be that people are aware of different risks (STDs and pregnancy) that are associated with having a greater number of sexual partners and therefore evaluate those individuals more negatively than those who have a lower number of sexual partners.

In regard to participants' sexual history, in particular females' sexual history the results were insignificant. I hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between highly sexually active females and less sexually active females with regards to their evaluation of female targets. Specifically, I hypothesized that females who have a higher number of sexual partners either will be less likely to exhibit the sexual double standard because they will sympathize with the female targets or will be more likely to exhibit the sexual double standard because they would view them as competition. This latter point of view is supported by the Competition Hypothesis (Clayton & Trafimow, 2007). This hypothesis states that females will negatively evaluate other females when competing for a mate. Additionally, females cannot engage in physical competition with other females over mates because they are the chief caretakers of their offspring so instead they engage in non-physical acts such as gossip and name-calling (Campbell, 1999 as cited in Clayton & Trafimow, 2007). However, the present study failed to find a relationship between female participants' own sexual history and the exhibition of the sexual double standard. Perhaps it is the case that some females with a greater number of sexual partners rate women lower (because of perceived competition) while others rate women higher (because of sympathy). In other words, perhaps both hypotheses are true and the results canceled each other out. Future research could attempt to tease apart whether there is a personality variable that differentiates women with a high number of sexual partners in their views of other highly sexually active females.

Results regarding the relationship between one's parents' marital status and the quality of relationship with one's parents on the target evaluations were interesting. When the participants' parents' marital status was analyzed in relation to the exhibition of the sexual double standard no significant results were observed. However, when only female participants were analyzed, there was a significant difference between females who came from two parent households (parents married) and females who came from one parent households (parents divorced) when evaluating targets regarding their success levels. Specifically, females whose parents were divorced evaluated men with 12 sexual partners as less successful than men with 1 sexual partner. Although this result is not the sexual double standard per se, it does appear to go against the

#### LIFE HISTORY THEORY

basic idea of the double standard. According to the sexual double standard, the more sexual experience (higher number of sexual partners) a man has the more he should be viewed in a positive way. Our results reveal the opposite effect; highly sexually active men were viewed as less successful than less sexually active men. A possible explanation is that if a female comes from a single parent household, she might have negative feelings towards her father who is perhaps more likely to have multiple sexual partners compared to a father who is married. Therefore, the girl is more likely to perceive her father as less successful than a female whose parents are still married and her father has only one sexual partner (her mother). It is unclear why similar results were not found in the domains of values, popularity, and intelligence.

According to life history theory, children's earlier upbringings have physiological and psychological implication on their future sexual strategies (Belsky, Steinberg & Draper, 1991). In particular, not only the actual presence or the absence of a father might affect the child but also the type of relationship one might have with her father. I hypothesized that if a female's relationship with her father might affect her physiological and psychological upbringing, it might also affect her perceptions of others' sexual activity. The results of this study did not support this hypothesis. There were no significant difference in the exhibition of the sexual double standard between participants who had better relationships with their father and participants who had

Even though the quality of relationship with the father did not reveal any significant results, the quality of relationship with the mother did. More specifically, female participants who had a lower quality of relationship with their mothers rated men with 12 sexual partners as less virtuous (having worse values) than men with 1 sexual partner. If a female has a strained relationship with her mother, she might be less trusting in general and view the men in her

#### LIFE HISTORY THEORY

mother's life as competition for her mother's attention and time (regardless of if her mother is married to her father). The values questionnaire had statements such as "This person is trustworthy" and "I would not like to know this person". Females with poor mother relationships therefore might view a highly sexual male as not having good values because if this male had 12 sexual partners, he is probably not that trustworthy. Additionally, a man with 12 sexual partners may be viewed as more likely to take away her mother's attention and love for her. On the other hand, a man who had only one sexual partner is more likely to value his romantic relationships and therefore could be considered as more trustworthy and respectful. If this man values his romantic relationships, he is more likely to value relationships in general and therefore will be more understanding of the female's relationship with the mother and will not try to steal the mother away from the daughter.

### Limitations

It is important to note that the study had several limitations. First, the experiment did not mimic real life, which has been shown to be necessary in order for the sexual double standard to be exhibited (Marks, 2008; Marks & Fraley, 2007). Because the purpose of the study was an investigation into individual differences, I was not as concerned with finding a general exhibition of the sexual double standard. Nonetheless, if the study would have had better conditions for the sexual double standard to be exhibited, perhaps our results would have been different. In other words, although individual difference variables were still found to affect the exhibition of the double standard in the present study, if conditions had been made to mimic real-life interactions, it is possible that, because the double standard would have been elicited more easily, the individual difference variables would have been shown to have an even greater effect.

Furthermore, our sample was a relatively limited sample in the sense that a majority of participants were freshmen (68%) and the mean number of sexual partners the participants had was relatively low (M=1.69). It would have been interesting to see the responses of participants who had a greater number of sexual partners. Their answers might have been different from the current, relatively not sexually experienced, sample. A possible solution might be to use a more diverse sample of older participants. Older participants might have had the chance to have a greater number of sexual partners and their perceptions might be different from the current sample.

Another possible limitation of the current study is the small number of participants whose parents were divorced (*N*=26). Due to the fact that only a small number of participants came from a one parent household, the power to detect effects is compromised. Future studies should focus on recruiting larger number of participants whose parents are divorced in order to have a better representation of this population. Moreover, it would be interesting to see if the presence of a stepfather or a father figure in the individuals' life might affect their perceptions of others. Research has shown that presence of a stepfather between birth and the age of 5 relates to earlier age of first intercourse and first pregnancy (Quinlan, 2003).

And finally, some of the measures that were used for this study were not highly reliable. For example, the intelligence subscale had only a .64 Cronbach's alpha. In the future the measures that are used to evaluate the target person could be refined for greater reliability.

Overall, it appears that females who come from a divorced household or who have strained relationships with their mothers evaluate sexually active men differently than do females with married parents or who have good relationships with their mothers. Perhaps next time when a highly sexual man is being judged favorably on a television show, we will know that not every female may agree with such a positive judgment.

#### References

- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: An evolutionary theory of socialization. *Child Development*, 62, 647-670. doi: 10.2307/1131166
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L. D., Houts, R. M., Friedman, S. L., DeHart, G., Cauffman, E., . . .
  NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, US. (2007). Family rearing antecedents of pubertal timing. *Child Development*, 78, 1302-1321. doi: 10.1111/j.1467
  8624.2007.01067.x
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., Houts, R. M., HalpernFelsher, B. L., & NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, US. (2010). The development of reproductive strategy in females: Early maternal harshness rightwards-arrow earlier menarche rightwards-arrow increased sexual risk taking. *Developmental Psychology*, 46, 120-128. doi:10.1037/a0015549
- Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (1991). Individual differences are accentuated during periods of social change: The sample case of girls at puberty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 157-168. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.1.157
- Clayton, K. D., & Trafimow, D. (2007). A test of three hypotheses concerning attributions toward female promiscuity. *The Social Science Journal*, 44, 677-686. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2007.10.003
- Ellis, B. J., Bates, J. E., Dodge, K. A., Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., Pettit, G. S., & Woodward, L. (2003). Does father absence place daughters at special risk for early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy? *Child Development*, *74*, 801-821. doi: 10.1111/1467 8624.00569

- Ellis, B. J., & Essex, M. J. (2007). Family environments, adrenarche, and sexual maturation: A longitudinal test of a life history model. *Child Development*, 78, 1799-1817. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01092.x
- Ellis, B. J., & Garber, J. (2000). Psychosocial antecedents of variation in girls' pubertal timing: Maternal depression, stepfather presence, and marital and family stress. *Child Development*, 71, 485-501. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00159
- Fraley, R. C. (2010). Adult attachment and the perception of emotional expressions: Probing the hyperactivating strategies underlying anxious attachment. Journal of Personality, 74, 1163-1190. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00406.x
- Fraley, R. C., Heffernan, M., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (in press). The experiences in close relationships-relationship structures questionnaire: A method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships. *Psychological Assessment*
- Gentry, M. (1998). The sexual double standard. The influence of number of relationships and level of sexual activity on judgments of women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 505-511.
- Ivan, Z., & Bereczkei, T. (2006). Parental bonding, risk-taking behavior and life history theory. Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology, 4, 267-275. doi: 10.1556/JCEP.4.2006.3-4.5
- Marks, M. J. (2008). Evaluations of sexually active men and women under divided attention: A social cognitive approach to the sexual double standard. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 84-91. doi: 10.1080/01973530701866664
- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2005). The sexual double standard: Fact or fiction? *Sex Roles*, 52, 175-186. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-1293-5

- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2006). Confirmation bias and the sexual double standard. *Sex Roles, 54*, 19-26. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-8866-9
- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2007). The effect of social interaction on the sexual double standard. *Social Influence*, *2*, 29-54.
- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (1999). Does the sexual double standard still exist? perceptions of university women. *Journal of Sex Research*, *36*, 361-368. doi: 10.1080/00224499909552008
- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (2001). Reconceptualizing the sexual double standard. *Journal* of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 13, 63-83.

doi: 10.1300/J056v13n02\_05

- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Belsky, J., & Silva, P. A. (1992). Childhood experience and the onset of menarche: A test of a sociobiological model. *Child Development*, 63, 47-58. doi: 10.2307/1130900
- Pottharst, K. (1990). The search for methods and measures. In K. Pottharst (Ed.), *Explorations in adult attachment* (pp. 9-37). New York: Peter Lang.
- Quinlan, R. J. (2003). Father absence, parental care, and female reproductive development. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 376-390. doi:10.1016/S1090-5138%2803%2900039-4
- Surbey, M. K. (1990). Family composition, stress, and the timing of human menarche. In T. E.Ziegler & F. B. Bercovitch (Eds.), *Socioendocrinology of primate reproduction*, 11-32.

# Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Similar analyses were performed regarding participants' number of one night stands and number of sexual activities other than intercourse. No significant three way interactions were revealed.

<sup>2</sup> Similar analyses were performed regarding female participants' number of one night stands and number of sexual activities other than intercourse. No significant three way interactions were revealed.

# LIFE HISTORY THEORY

Characteristic		Frequency	Percent
Sex			
	Male	102	45.1
	Female	124	54.9
Age			
	17 years old	2	0.8
	18 years old	113	47.9
	19 years old	79	33.5
	20 years old	30	12.7
	21 years old	9	3.80
	22 years old	3	1.30
School year			
	Freshmen	161	68.2
	Sophomore	56	23.7
	Junior	10	4.20
	Senior	8	3.40

Table 1Demographics of the participants

# LIFE HISTORY THEORY

# Table 2

Attachment History Questionnaire

		Mean	St. Deviation
AHQ with father			
	Both genders	22.97	5.67
	Female Participants	22.81	5.89
	Male Participants	23.17	5.35
AHQ with mother			
	Both genders	25.49	3.70
	Female Participants	25.69	3.85
	Male Participants	25.19	3.64
Frequency	Valid Percent		
-----------	---		
207	87.7		
26	11		
108	87.1		
14	11.3		
91	89.2		
10	9.8		
	Frequency 207 26 108 14 91 10		

Table 3Marital Status of Participants' Parents

Table 4Sexual History Questionnaire

Question		Mean	St. Deviation
Number of sexual partners			
	Both genders	1.69	2.85
	Female Participants	1.36	3.70
Number of one night stands	Male Participants	1.87	2.61
	Both genders	1.28	2.61
	Female Participants	.98	2.41
	Male Participants	1.47	2.52
Number of sexual activities other than intercourse			
	Both genders	4.32	7.07
	Female Participants	3.52	6.01
	Male Participants	4.92	8.12

Table 5	

Evaluative Scales

Scale		Mean	St. Deviation
Popularity			
	Both genders	3.59	.45
	Female Participants	3.63	.45
	Male Participants	3.56	.45
Success			
	Both genders	3.10	.44
	Female Participants	3.13	.47
	Male Participants	3.07	.41
Intelligence			
	Both genders	3.47	.46
	Female Participants	3.50	.42
	Male Participants	3.45	.50
Values	Both genders	3.46	.62
	Female Participants	3.44	.66
	Male Participants	3.51	.58

Correlations between variables.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Particiapant's Sex	1								
2. # of Sexual Partners	09	1							
3. Marital Status	.03	.19**	1						
4. AHQ Mother	.07	.01	00	1					
5. AHQ Father	03	05	29**	.22**	1				
6. Popularity	.07	16*	05	.07	.01	1			
7. Success	.07	09	07	05	.04	.31**	1		
8. Intelligence	.06	.03	.07	.15*	04	.06	.35**	1	
9. Values	06	.07	.08	.10	01	.03	.37**	.63**	1

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01

Note: For participant sex, 1 =female, 0 =male. For number of sexual partners, 1 = 12 sexual partners, 0 = 1 sexual partner. For marital status, 1 =divorced, 0 =married.

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Participant's Sex	1	13.101	.99	.32
Target Sex	1	10.13	.77	.38
Target Partners	1	5.54	.42	.52
Participant's Sex × Target Sex	1	6.29	.48	.49
Participant's Sex × Target Partners	1	7.25	.55	.46
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	10.80	.82	.37
Participant's Sex × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	4.05	.31	.58

condition and participants' sex.

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Р
Participant's Sex	1	13.64	1.13	.29
Target Sex	1	9.94	.82	.37
Target Partners	1	92.07	7.63	.006*
Participant's Sex × Target Sex	1	30.31	2.51	.11
Participant's Sex × Target Partners	1	3.21	.27	.61
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	.45	.04	.85
Participant's Sex × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	21.92	1.82	.18

condition and participants' sex.

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function of

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Participant's Sex	1	1.82	.39	.53
Target Sex	1	8.12	1.73	.19
Target Partners	1	136.88	29.18	.00*
Participant's Sex × Target Sex	1	.15	.03	.86
Participant's Sex × Target Partners	1	1.93	.41	.52
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	.11	.02	.88
Participant's Sex × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	2.13	.45	.50

condition and participants' sex.

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Participant's Sex	1	49.71	2.11	.15
Target Sex	1	74.36	3.16	.08
Target Partners	1	1518.8	64.46	.00*
Participant's Sex × Target Sex	1	8.41	.36	.55
Participant's Sex × Target Partners	1	78.98	3.35	.07
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	55.32	2.35	.13
Participant's Sex × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	17.27	.73	.39

condition and participants' sex.

# Table 11

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of condition and participants' number of sexual partners.

Effect	В	SE	β	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.37	.47	.05	.78
Target Partners	.32	.47	.05	.69
No. sexual partners	57	.235	16	-2.44*
Step 2				
Target Sex	.09	.68	.01	.12
Target Partners	.09	.63	.01	.15
No. sexual partners	96	.43	27	-2.24*
Target Sex × Target Partner	.58	.95	.07	.61
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.51	.48	.10	1.06
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.31	.49	.06	.64
Step 3				
Target Sex	.10	.68	.01	.14
Target Partners	.10	.63	.01	.16
No. sexual partners	-1.15	.50	32	-2.31*
Target Sex × Target Partner	.58	.95	.07	.61
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.85	.66	.16	1.30
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.65	.66	.12	.32
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	75	.97	09	.45

# Table 12

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

Effect	В	SE	β	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	40	.46	06	.38
Target Partners	-1.44	.46	20	-3.15*
No. sexual partners	28	.23	08	-1.23
Step 2				
Target Sex	38	.66	05	.57
Target Partners	-1.41	.61	20	-2.31*
No. sexual partners	20	.41	06	49
Target Sex × Target Partner	06	.93	.01	06
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	12	.47	02	26
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	04	.47	01	09
Step 3				
Target Sex	38	.66	05	57
Target # of Sex Partners	-1.41	.61	20	-2.31*
No. sexual partners	20	.41	06	.63
Target Sex × Target Partner	06	.93	01	06
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	09	.64	02	14
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	01	.64	00	01
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	08	.95	01	.93

condition and participants' number of sexual partners.

# Table 13

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.31	.29	.07	1.08
Target Partners	-1.53	.29	33	-5.32*
No. sexual partners	.11	.14	.05	.73
Step 2				
Target Sex	.34	.26	.07	.81
Target Partners	-1.53	.39	33	-3.98*
No. sexual partners	.22	.26	.10	.86
Target Sex × Target Partner	04	.58	01	07
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	33	.30	10	-1.11
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.08	.30	.02	.26
Step 3				
Target Sex	.35	.42	.08	.83
Target # of Sex Partners	-1.53	.39	33	-3.96*
No. sexual partners	.10	.30	.04	.33
Target Sex × Target Partner	04	.58	01	07
Target Sex × No. sexual partners	11	.40	03	28
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.29	.40	.09	.72
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	47	.60	08	79

of condition and participants' number of sexual partners.

# Table 14

\_

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	1.00	.65	.09	1.53
Target Partners	-5.53	.65	49	-8.53*
No. sexual partners	.53	.32	.09	1.62
Step 2				
Target Sex	.01	.93	.00	.01
Target Partners	-6.43	.86	57	-7.46*
No. sexual partners	.30	.58	.05	.50
Target Sex × Target Partner	2.02	1.30	.15	1.55
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	29	.66	04	44
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.83	.66	.10	1.26
Step 3				
Target Sex	.02	.94	.00	.02
Target # of Sex Partners	-6.42	.86	57	-7.45*
No. sexual partners	.06	.68	.01	.08
Target Sex × Target Partner	2.02	1.31	.15	1.55
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.13	.90	.02	.14
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	1.25	.90	.15	1.39
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	92	1.33	07	69

condition and participants' number of sexual partners.

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of condition and female participants' number of sexual partners.

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.02	.67	.00	.03
Target Partners	.63	.67	.09	.94
No. sexual partners	71	.33	20	-2.16*
Step 2				
Target Sex	.05	.94	.01	.05
Target Partners	.65	.91	.09	.71
No. sexual partners	96	.59	27	-1.63
Target Sex × Target Partner	.06	1.40	.01	.05
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.44	.72	.09	.61
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.08	.86	.10	.92
Step 3				
Target Sex	.05	.94	.01	.06
Target Partners	.69	.91	.09	.75
No. sexual partners	-1.10	.62	31	-1.77
Target Sex × Target Partner	30	1.47	03	21
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.67	.79	.14	.85
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.43	.98	.06	.44
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	-1.46	2.01	10	73

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

condition and	female	participants'	number of	of sexual	partners.
	<i>J</i> =	P			P

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.31	.70	.04	.44
Target Partners	-1.26	.70	17	-1.8
No. sexual partners	38	.34	10	12
Step 2				
Target Sex	.87	.98	.11	.89
Target Partners	73	.94	10	78
No. sexual partners	08	.61	02	14
Target Sex × Target Partner	-1.3	1.43	15	93
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	61	.75	12	82
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	03	.89	00	03
Step 3				
Target Sex	.88	.97	.12	.91
Target # of Sex Partners	66	.94	09	70
No. sexual partners	35	.64	09	55
Target Sex × Target Partner	-2.02	1.51	22	-1.34
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	18	.81	04	23
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.64	1.01	.09	.63
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	-2.8	2.10	18	-1.36

# Table 17

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.34	.37	.08	.91
Target Partners	-1.47	.37	35	-3.96*
No. sexual partners	.10	.18	.05	.54
Step 2				
Target Sex	.17	.52	.04	.33
Target Partners	-1.62	.50	38	-3.22*
No. sexual partners	.08	.33	.04	.26
Target Sex × Target Partner	.37	.76	.07	.48
Target Sex × No. sexual partners	.01	.40	.00	.02
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.08	.47	.02	.16
Step 3				
Target Sex	.18	.52	.04	.34
Target # of Sex Partners	-1.59	.50	38	-3.16*
No. sexual partners	02	.34	01	05
Target Sex × Target Partner	.11	.81	.02	.13
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	.17	.44	.06	.39
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.33	.54	.08	.60
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	-1.05	1.11	12	95

of condition and female participants' number of sexual partners.

# Table 18

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

l'4' l	f 1.		,	- £ 1	
conainon ana	тетаге	participants	numper a	эт ѕехиаі	pariners.
	,	P		· j ~ · · · · · · · · ·	P

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.61	.93	.05	.66
Target Partners	-6.79	.92	57	-7.35*
No. sexual partners	.28	.45	.05	.61
Step 2				
Target Sex	78	1.28	07	61
Target Partners	-7.99	1.23	67	-6.51*
No. sexual partners	.73	.80	.12	.91
Target Sex × Target Partner	2.78	1.87	.19	1.49
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	96	.98	12	98
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	.49	1.16	.04	.42
Step 3				
Target Sex	76	1.27	06	60
Target # of Sex Partners	-7.89	1.23	66	-6.44*
No. sexual partners	.36	.84	.06	.44
Target Sex × Target Partner	1.84	1.98	.13	.93
Target Sex $\times$ No. sexual partners	38	1.06	05	36
Target Partner × No. sexual partners	1.39	1.32	.12	1.05
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ No. sexual partners	-3.80	2.71	15	-1.40

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of

condition and	participants'	parents'	marital status.
---------------	---------------	----------	-----------------

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	1.96	.15	.69
Target Sex	1	1.78	.14	.71
Target Partners	1	28.53	2.21	.14
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	1.09	.09	.77
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	28.38	2.19	.14
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	16.62	1.29	.26
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	10.69	.83	.36

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

condition and participants' parents' marital sta
--

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	10.01	.84	.36
Target Sex	1	.31	.03	.87
Target Partners	1	17.55	1.47	.23
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	1.12	.09	.76
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	8.18	.69	.41
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	20.04	1.68	.19
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	37.82	3.17	.08

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function of

condition and	participants'	parents'	' marital status.
---------------	---------------	----------	-------------------

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	1.28	.27	.60
Target Sex	1	.19	.04	.84
Target Partners	1	35.44	7.53	.007*
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	2.99	.63	.43
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	3.10	.66	.42
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	9.11	1.93	.17
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	14.68	3.12	.08

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

condition and participants' parents' marital status.

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	34.17	1.45	.23
Target Sex	1	99.23	4.22	.04*
Target Partners	1	274.64	11.69	.001*
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	31.41	1.34	.25
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	102.79	4.38	.038*
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	5.53	.24	.63
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	12.05	.51	.48

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of

condition and female participants' parents' marital status.

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	.12	.01	.93
Target Sex	1	1.07	.08	.78
Target Partners	1	8.64	.62	.43
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	1.05	.08	.79
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	.62	.04	.83
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	1.84	.13	.72
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	1.08	.08	.78

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

condition and female participants' parents' marital status.

Variable		Mean Square	F	Р
Parents' Marital Status	1	41.16	3.06	.08
Target Sex	1	46.94	3.49	.06
Target Partners	1	33.66	2.50	.12
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	40.51	3.01	.09
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	3.42	.25	.62
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	47.11	3.49	.06
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	110.79	8.23	.005*

Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function of

condition and	female	participants'	parents'	marital	status.
---------------	--------	---------------	----------	---------	---------

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	р
Parents' Marital Status	1	12.04	3.07	.08
Target Sex	1	1.93	.49	.48
Target Partners	1	6.81	1.74	.19
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	.11	.03	.87
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	7.11	1.81	.18
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	.29	.07	.79
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	3.04	.78	.38

# Summary of ANOVA Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

condition and female participants' parents' marital status.

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Р
Parents' Marital Status	1	44.58	1.95	.17
Target Sex	1	140.36	6.14	.015*
Target Partners	1	310.79	13.60	.00*
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex	1	129.00	5.64	.019*
Parents' Marital Status × Target Partners	1	33.37	1.46	.23
Target Sex × Target Partners	1	70.51	3.09	.08
Parents' Marital Status × Target Sex × Target Partners	1	11.94	.52	.47

# Table 27

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of condition and participants' attachment to the father.

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.38	.47	.05	.80	
Target Partners	.25	.47	.04	.53	
AHQ with father	.05	.24	.01	.20	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.006	.68	.001	.008	
Target Partners	05	.63	007	08	
AHQ with father	.45	.47	.13	.94	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.75	.95	.09	.79	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	13	.48	02	27	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	53	.50	12	-1.05	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.08	.69	.01	.12	
Target Partners	03	.63	005	05	
AHQ with father	.78	.58	.22	1.35	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.71	.95	.08	.75	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	79	.81	14	97	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	-1.00	.69	23	-1.46	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	1.01	1.01	.14	1.01	

# Table 28

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

Effect	В	SE	β	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	39	.46	06	87	
Target Partners	-1.32	.45	19	-2.92*	
AHQ with father	.08	.23	.02	.35	
Step 2					
Target Sex	33	.66	05	49	
Target Partners	-1.25	.61	18	-2.06*	
AHQ with father	.49	.46	.14	1.07	
Target Sex × Target Partner	12	.92	01	13	
Target Sex × AHQ with father	39	.46	07	83	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	37	.48	09	76	
Step 3					
Target Sex	31	.66	04	47	
Target Partners	-1.25	.61	18	-2.05*	
AHQ with father	.56	.56	.16	1.02	
Target Sex × Target Partner	13	.92	02	14	
Target Sex × AHQ with father	54	.78	10	69	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	48	.66	11	72	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	.24	.97	.03	.25	

condition and participants' attachment to the father.

# Table 29

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.37	.29	.08	1.27	
Target Partners	-1.57	.29	34	-5.49*	
AHQ with father	19	.14	08	-1.3	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.42	.42	.09	1.01	
Target Partners	-1.52	.38	33	-3.97*	
AHQ with father	04	.29	02	13	
Target Sex × Target Partner	10	.58	02	17	
Target Sex × AHQ with father	13	.29	04	43	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	14	.31	05	47	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.44	.42	.10	1.06	
Target Partners	-1.51	.38	33	-3.94*	
AHQ with father	.07	.35	.03	.21	
Target Sex × Target Partner	11	.58	02	19	
Target Sex × AHQ with father	34	.49	10	69	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	30	.42	11	72	
Target Sex × Target Partner × AHQ with father	.34	.61	.07	.55	

of condition and participants' attachment to the father.

# Table 30

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

			D	ι	
Step 1					
Target Sex	1.16	.65	.10	1.8	
Target Partners	-5.57	.64	49	-8.66*	
AHQ with father	38	.32	07	-1.19	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.25	.93	.02	.27	
Target Partners	-6.32	.86	56	-7.39*	
AHQ with father	.29	.64	.05	.46	
Target Sex × Target Partner	1.80	1.29	.14	1.39	
Target Sex × AHQ with father	85	.65	099	-1.3	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	49	.68	07	.73	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.20	.93	.02	.22	
Target Partners	-6.33	.86	57	-7.39*	
AHQ with father	.09	.78	.02	.11	
Target Sex × Target Partner	1.82	1.29	.14	1.41	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	.44	1.10	05	39	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	19	.93	03	21	
Target Sex × Target Partner × AHQ with father	64	1.37	06	47	

condition and participants' attachment to the father.

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of

condition	and female	participants'	attachment to	the father.
	~			~

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.08	.67	.01	.12	
Target Partners	.69	.66	.09	1.05	
AHQ with father	.36	.32	.10	1.13	
Step 2					
Target Sex	01	.94	002	01	
Target Partners	.68	.89	.09	.76	
AHQ with father	.75	.63	.22	1.21	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.18	1.35	.02	.13	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	63	.65	13	96	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	16	.66	03	24	
Step 3					
Target Sex	004	.94	001	004	
Target Partners	.68	.89	.09	.76	
AHQ with father	1.15	.77	.33	1.49	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.19	1.36	.02	.14	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	-1.29	1.00	26	-1.29	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	76	.95	16	79	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	1.16	1.32	.16	.88	

# Table 32

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

condition	and female	participants'	attachment to	the father.
	./	, ,		./

Effect	В	SE	β	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.33	.69	.04	.48	
Target Partners	96	.69	13	-1.4	
AHQ with father	.19	.33	.05	.59	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.95	.97	.13	.98	
Target Partners	41	.92	06	45	
AHQ with father	.69	.64	.19	1.07	
Target Sex × Target Partner	-1.20	1.39	13	87	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	.39	.67	08	57	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	49	.68	10	72	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.96	.97	.13	.98	
Target Partners	.41	.92	06	45	
AHQ with father	.91	.79	.25	1.15	
Target Sex × Target Partner	-1.19	1.39	13	86	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	76	1.03	15	.74	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	.83	.98	17	85	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	.66	1.3	.09	.48	

# Table 33

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

01	f condition	and f	emale	participants <sup>*</sup>	' attachment te	o the father.
~,		···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		r		J

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.35	.36	.08	.97	
Target Partners	-1.48	.36	-3.5	-4.16*	
AHQ with father	38	.17	19	-2.24*	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.06	.51	.01	.11	
Target Partners	-1.74	.48	41	-3.6*	
AHQ with father	42	.34	21	-1.26	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.59	.73	.12	.82	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	.02	.35	.007	.05	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	.03	.36	.01	.09	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.06	.51	.01	.12	
Target Partners	-1.74	.48	41	-3.6*	
AHQ with father	18	.41	09	44	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.61	.73	.12	.83	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	39	.54	14	73	
Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	34	.51	13	67	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	.72	.71	.17	1.01	

# Table 34

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

condition and female p	participants'	attachment to	the father.
------------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

Effect	В	SE	β	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.79	.89	.07	.89	
Target Partners	-6.79	.89	57	-7.62*	
AHQ with father	71	.43	12	-1.65	
Step 2					
Target Sex	73	1.25	06	58	
Target Partners	-8.13	1.18	68	-6.87*	
AHQ with father	.05	.83	.01	.06	
Target Sex × Target Partner	3.22	1.79	.23	1.79	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	82	.87	10	94	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	75	.88	10	86	
Step 3					
Target Sex	73	1.26	06	58	
Target Partners	-8.13	1.19	68	-6.84*	
AHQ with father	.06	1.02	.01	.06	
Target Sex × Target Partner	3.22	1.80	.23	1.79	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with father	83	1.33	10	63	
Target Partner × AHQ with father	77	1.27	10	60	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with father	.03	1.76	.002	.02	

# Table 35

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of condition and participants' attachment to the mother.

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.40	.47	.06	.86	
Target Partners	.29	.47	.04	.61	
AHQ with mother	.28	.23	.08	1.18	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.05	.67	.007	.08	
Target Partners	004	.62	.000	006	
AHQ with mother	.79	.42	.22	1.88	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.67	.94	.08	.71	
.48Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	51	.47	10	-1.09	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	45	.48	10	94	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.05	.67	.006	.07	
Target Partners	005	.62	001	01	
AHQ with mother	.76	.48	.21	1.57	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.67	.94	.08	.71	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	45	.75	09	59	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	41	.64	09	63	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	10	.97	02	11	

# Table 36

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	40	.45	06	88	
Target Partners	-1.39	.45	20	-3.09*	
AHQ with mother	25	.23	07	-1.12	
Step 2					
Target Sex	38	.65	06	59	
Target Partners	-1.38	.60	20	-2.29*	
AHQ with mother	40	.41	11	99	
Target Sex × Target Partner	03	.91	003	03	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	.21	.46	.04	.46	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	.08	.46	.02	.18	
Step 3					
Target Sex	35	.65	05	54	
Target Partners	-1.37	.60	19	-2.27*	
AHQ with mother	23	.47	06	48	
Target Sex × Target Partner	04	.91	004	04	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	21	.73	04	29	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	23	.62	05	36	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	.69	.94	.11	.74	

condition and participants' attachment to the mother.

# Table 37

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.36	.28	.08	1.3	
Target Partners	-1.47	.28	32	-5.19*	
AHQ with mother	.29	.14	.13	2.09*	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.40	.41	.09	.99	
Target Partners	-1.43	.38	31	-3.78*	
AHQ with mother	.52	.25	.23	2.06*	
Target Sex × Target Partner	09	.57	02	16	
Target Sex × AHQ with mother	21	.29	06	72	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	22	.29	08	76	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.40	.41	.09	.97	
Target Partners	-1.43	.38	31	-3.77*	
AHQ with mother	.49	.29	.22	1.68	
Target Sex × Target Partner	09	.57	02	16	
Target Sex × AHQ with mother	13	.46	04	29	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	17	.39	06	43	
Target Sex × Target Partner × AHQ with mother	12	.59	03	20	

of condition and participants' attachment to the mother.

# Table 38

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

Effect	В	SE	β	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	1.12	.64	.10	1.74	
Target Partners	-5.38	.64	48	-8.41*	
AHQ with mother	.35	.32	.06	1.10	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.12	.92	.01	.13	
Target Partners	-6.25	.85	56	-7.34*	
AHQ with mother	.44	.57	.08	.78	
Target Sex × Target Partner	1.97	1.29	.15	1.52	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	52	.65	06	81	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	.26	.66	.04	.40	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.03	.92	.002	.03	
Target Partners	-6.28	.85	56	-7.39*	
AHQ with mother	002	.66	.00	003	
Target Sex × Target Partner	1.99	1.29	.15	1.55	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	.56	1.03	.07	.55	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	1.05	.88	.15	1.19	
Target Sex × Target Partner × AHQ with mother	-1.78	1.32	17	-1.35	

condition and participants' attachment to the mother.
# Table 39

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as function of condition and female participants' attachment to the mother.

Effect	В	SE	В	t
Step 1				
Target Sex	.03	.66	.003	.04
Target Partners	.64	.66	.09	.97
AHQ with mother	.38	.32	.11	1.19
Step 2				
Target Sex	09	.92	01	10
Target Partners	.51	.88	.07	.58
AHQ with mother	.86	.49	.25	1.75
Target Sex × Target Partner	.45	1.33	.05	.34
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	79	.68	13	-1.17
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	52	.65	10	81
Step 3				
Target Sex	10	.92	01	11
Target Partners	.51	.88	.07	.58
AHQ with mother	.79	.54	.03	1.48
Target Sex × Target Partner	.50	1.35	.06	.37
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	61	.88	10	69
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	38	.78	07	49
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	46	1.4	05	33

## LIFE HISTORY THEORY

# Table 40

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as function of

condition and female participants' attachment to the mo	other.
---	--------

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.43	.68	.06	.63	
Target Partners	95	.67	13	-1.42	
AHQ with mother	56	.32	15	-1.72	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.89	.95	.12	.95	
Target Partners	52	.90	07	58	
AHQ with mother	60	.51	17	-1.19	
Target Sex × Target Partner	-1.01	1.37	11	74	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	.18	.70	.03	.26	
Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	01	.66	002	02	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.90	.95	.12	.95	
Target Partners	52	.90	07	58	
AHQ with mother	51	.55	14	93	
Target Sex × Target Partner	-1.08	1.38	12	78	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	06	.90	01	07	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	20	.80	04	25	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	.62	1.44	.06	.43	

# Table 41

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as function

Effect	В	SE	В	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.29	.36	.07	.81	
Target Partners	-1.43	.36	34	-3.99*	
AHQ with mother	.19	.17	.09	1.10	
Step 2					
Target Sex	.09	.50	.02	.18	
Target Partners	-1.63	.48	39	-3.39*	
AHQ with mother	.34	.27	.17	1.27	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.50	.73	.10	.69	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	43	.37	12	-1.15	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	03	.35	01	09	
Step 3					
Target Sex	.09	.51	.02	.17	
Target Partners	-1.63	.48	39	-3.38*	
AHQ with mother	.27	.29	.13	.92	
Target Sex × Target Partner	.56	.74	.11	.75	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	23	.48	07	49	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	.12	.43	.04	.28	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	49	.77	09	65	

## LIFE HISTORY THEORY

# Table 42

Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as function of

condition	and female	participants'	attachment to	the mother.
-----------	------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

Effect	В	SE	β	t	
Step 1					
Target Sex	.64	.90	.05	.71	
Target Partners	-6.68	.89	53	-7.48*	
AHQ with mother	.46	.43	.08	1.07	
Step 2					
Target Sex	76	1.24	06	62	
Target Partners	-7.99	1.18	67	-6.77*	
AHQ with mother	.36	.66	.06	.54	
Target Sex × Target Partner	3.00	1.79	.21	1.67	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	85	.92	09	92	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	.79	.87	.09	.92	
Step 3					
Target Sex	82	1.22	07	67	
Target Partners	-7.97	1.17	67	-6.84*	
AHQ with mother	18	.71	03	25	
Target Sex × Target Partner	3.41	1.78	.24	1.91	
Target Sex $\times$ AHQ with mother	.62	1.17	.06	.53	
Target Partner × AHQ with mother	1.94	1.03	.23	1.88	
Target Sex $\times$ Target Partner $\times$ AHQ with mother	-3.71	1.86	23	-1.99*	

## Appendix A

### Attachment History Questionnaire

Questions are answered on a 1-7 scale, with 1 being never and 7 being always.

Instructions: Base your answers to the following questions on the period of time when you were living with your parents.

- 1. How often did your parents argue while you were living at home?
- 2. How often did your parents threaten to separate or divorce?
- 3. Do you now, or have you ever felt in the past, that you are in some way responsible for either parent's safety?
- 4. Did you ever feel that you were responsible for either of your parent's expectations?
- 5. How often were you afraid to attend school in your life?
- 6. How often did you feel you could not live up to your parents expectations?
- 7. How often were you afraid to go to school and leave your mother and father at home?
- 8. How often did you feel loved or cared for by your mother?
- 9. How often did you feel loved or cared for by your father?
- 10. How often did your parents make you feel unwanted?
- 11. How often did you feel lonely?
- 12. As a young child, how often did you feel helpless?
- 13. As a young child, how often did your parents show you that they were proud of you?
- 14. How often did your parents tell you they were proud of your school work?
- 15. How often did your parents make you feel ashamed or guilty?
- 16. How often did you feel you could trust your parents?
- 17. How often did your parents embarrass you in front of your friends?
- 18. When you were young, did your mother help you in times of difficulty?
- 19. When you were young, did your father help you in times of difficulty?
- 20. In the past, how often could you depend on your mother to help you?
- 21. In the past, how often could you depend on your father to help you?
- 22. When you needed him, did your father spend time with you when he was home?
- 23. When you needed her, did your mother spend time with you when she was home?

# Appendix B

# Evaluation of people

Please rate the person you viewed information about using the following statements

Subscale: Popularity	Strongly				Strongly
	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
This person is popular	1	2	3	4	5
This person has lots of friends	1	2	3	4	5
This person is fun at parties	1	2	3	4	5
People like this person	1	2	3	4	5
This person would be fun to hang out with	1	2	3	4	5
This person is physically attractive	1	2	3	4	5
People listen to this person	1	2	3	4	5
No one likes this person	1	2	3	4	5

Subscale: Success	Strongly				Strongly
	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
This person makes a lot of money	1	2	3	4	5
This person will hold a job with lots of power	1	2	3	4	5

This person is in charge of many people	1	2	3	4	5
This person has a good job	1	2	3	4	5
This person would make a good leader	1	2	3	4	5
This person is successful	1	2	3	4	5
This person often takes control of situations	1	2	3	4	5
This influences others	1	2	3	4	5

Subscale: Intelligence	Strongly				Strongly
	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
This person is intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
This person is a failure	1	2	3	4	5
This person performs well in everything he/she does	1	2	3	4	5
This person makes a lot of mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
This person did well in school	1	2	3	4	5

Subscale: Values	Strongly				Strongly
	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
This person is trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5

This person is respectful	1	2	3	4	5
This person would make someone a good boyfriend/girlfriend	1	2	3	4	5
This person would make someone a good husband/wife	1	2	3	4	5
This person is immoral	1	2	3	4	5
This person is dishonest	1	2	3	4	5
This person is careless	1	2	3	4	5
I could be friends with this person	1	2	3	4	5
I would not like to know this person	1	2	3	4	5

### Appendix C

### Vignettes

There are four different vignettes that a participant might see: a female with 12 sexual partners, a

female with 1 sexual partner, a male with 12 sexual partners and a male with 1 sexual partner.

Female Target/12 Sexual Partners Example

#### **Demographics:**

Sex: *Female* Age: 19 Ethnicity: White

Feedback presented to participant:

### Extraversion

Your extraversion score is 4.12 out of 5.0. This score was determined in part because you indicated having over 400 Facebook friends. Although you also indicated that you don't mind spending weekend nights at home, research by Brumbaugh & Nelson suggests that the number of Facebook friends one has should factor in to a large extent in determining one's extraversion score. The fact that you have 400 friends accounted for 20% of your extraversion score.

### Agreeableness

Your agreeableness score was 4.08 out of 5.0. This score was determined in part because you indicated that you volunteer at least once every three months. Although you also indicated that you don't always get along with your roommate, research by Keyes & Upholz suggests that the amount of volunteering one does should factor in to a large extent in determining one's agreeableness score. The fact that you volunteer at least once every three months accounted for 15% of your agreeableness score.

### **Openness**

Your openness score is 4.3 of out 5.0. This score was determined in part because you indicated having had 12sexual partners thus far in your life. Although you also indicated that you don't always enjoy attending fine arts exhibits or watching documentaries, research by Fraley & Marks suggests that the number of sexual partners one has had should factor in to a large extent in determining one's openness score. *The fact that you have had 12 sexual partners accounted for 15% of your openness score*.