2012

# Attachment Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

Erin A. Vogel
*Illinois Wesleyan University*

## Recommended Citation

Attachment Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

Erin A. Vogel

Illinois Wesleyan University

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between adults' attachment orientation and their exhibition of the sexual double standard. According to attachment theory, adults who score higher on measures of anxious attachment are more clingy, jealous, and fearful of abandonment. Those who are more avoidant are distrustful and uncomfortable with intimacy. The sexual double standard is the belief that men are rewarded for sexual activity while women are derogated for the same activity. Participants read about a male or female who has had either 12 sexual partners or 1 sexual partner. They then evaluated the person's popularity, success, intelligence, and values. Although this study did not find evidence of the double standard, results indicated that women who are insecurely attached to their mothers judge men with more partners more harshly than men with fewer partners, and men who are anxiously attached to their romantic partners judge men with more sexual partners more harshly than men with fewer sexual partners.

Attachment Theory and the Sexual Double Standard

When asked, most adults in Western society could quickly describe an incident, either from their own lives or from the media, in which a man is rewarded for his sexual experience. College students can recall young men bragging to one another about a young woman with whom they have had sex, often exaggerating the story. Just as easily, someone can describe the other side of the story: society's reactions to the woman's behavior. Across campus, the woman's friends are calling her a slut behind her back. It is a familiar tale.

The sexual double standard is the widespread belief that men are rewarded for sexual activity while women are derogated for the same activity (Greene & Faulkner, 2005; Marks, 2008). It is a popularly held notion that has been replicated in empirical research using experimental conditions that resemble real-life situations in which people judge others (e.g., Marks, 2005). For instance, the sexual double standard was exhibited in one study when participants performed an additional cognitive task (rehearsing a series of numbers) while reading about a target male or female who had varied numbers of sexual partners (Marks, 2008). The cognitive task served as a distraction similar to those that people encounter in the environment when forming first impressions of real individuals. When distracted, people often use shortcuts when evaluating others because their attention is divided. They may take small bits of information about a person, such as his or her sexual activity, and use it to make assumptions about the person (Marks, 2008).

The sexual double standard is also visible when sexual behaviors are less common and more taboo, such as threesomes (a type of group sex involving three people). Jonason and Marks (2009) manipulated the gender of a target individual and the type of threesome in which the target engaged based upon the genders of the other people involved. Overall, women who

participated in threesomes were evaluated more negatively than men who participated in

threesomes. The same paradigm, when used with monogamous sexual activity instead of

threesomes, did not reveal the sexual double standard. Results also showed that men tended to

positively evaluate men who were in a threesome with two women, but negatively evaluate men

whose threesome included another man, suggesting that homophobia may be a factor in

judgment (Jonason & Marks, 2009).

People also are more likely to exhibit the sexual double standard when they are asked to

make their judgments in a group setting with other individuals. Marks and Fraley (2007) asked

participants to evaluate a target individually and then assigned the participants to three-person,

same-sex focus groups. The groups came to a consensus on evaluative statements to describe the

target. While the sexual double standard did not emerge with the individual target evaluations, it

was evident in group evaluations. Notably, the group dynamics did not have a significant impact

in the values domain, which represents a person's perception of the target's morality. It is

possible that people hold their own deep moral convictions independently and they are less

susceptible to others' influence in this domain. The group context did have an impact on

participants' evaluation of targets' dominance, success, and intelligence. Specifically, highly

sexual men were evaluated more favorably than highly sexual women. When participants were

asked to evaluate the targets individually after the group evaluation, the group opinion influenced

their individual responses, meaning that participants exhibited the sexual double standard (Marks

& Fraley, 2007).

The finding of a double standard in only one or two evaluative domains is common.

Gentry (1998) found that while women were not considered promiscuous if they had many sex

partners, they were judged to be more liberal and assertive than average women. In other words,

information about a target's sexual activity appears to influence judgments in domains that are

not directly related to morality. For instance, the sexual double standard has been found in the

domains of dominance (Marks & Fraley, 2005; Marks & Fraley, 2007), intelligence (Marks &

Fraley, 2005; Marks & Fraley, 2007), and success (Marks & Fraley, 2007). Dominance and

success refer to a person's ability to earn money, be a leader, and influence others. An intelligent

person is considered to be a high achiever who makes few mistakes. In contrast, someone rated

highly on values is considered to be honest, trustworthy, and respected (Marks & Fraley, 2005).

These previous studies indicate that judgments of others are not simply positive or negative, but

rather more nuanced.

Because belief in the sexual double standard is so common (Marks & Fraley, 2005), there

may be an underlying, pervasive reason for a belief in its existence. Marks and Fraley (2006)

suggest that confirmation bias plays a role. Confirmation bias is the tendency to notice evidence

that is consistent with a person's expectations while ignoring evidence that is inconsistent with

expectations. People who believe that the sexual double standard exists might pay attention to

situations in which men are praised for sexual behavior and/or women are derogated for it. They

will also be less likely to remember situations that did not fit the sexual double standard. To

investigate this possibility, Marks and Fraley (2006) presented participants with a journal entry

from a target person in which the target wrote about his or her sexual behavior. Each entry

contained ten comments from other people in the target's life: five positive comments and five

negative comments. As hypothesized, participants remembered more positive comments about

men's sexual experience and more negative comments about women's sexual experience, even

though both types of comments were presented equally. These results are consistent with the

sexual double standard (Marks & Fraley, 2006).

To date, research has not come to a conclusion on whether or not the sexual double standard is really as pervasive as popular belief dictates. It is a relatively new and specific area of research. Some studies have found no support for it (Marks & Fraley, 2005). However, when experimental conditions are made to resemble real-life scenarios in which people judge others, several studies have found evidence of the sexual double standard (Jonason & Marks, 2009; Marks & Fraley, 2005; Marks & Fraley, 2006; Marks & Fraley, 2007). Importantly, little to no research has examined individual differences in the exhibition of the double standard—the purpose of the proposed study. More specifically, it seems reasonable to assume that not every male or female exhibits the double standard to the same degree and that characteristics of people, such as their personality traits, may play a role in their judgments of others' sexual activities. One personality trait that may impact whether one exhibits the sexual double standard is attachment orientation.

### An Overview of Adult Romantic Attachment

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973) posits that children develop consistent ways of interacting with their primary caregiver based on how this caregiver treats them. Bowlby defines attachment behavior as "any form of behavior that results in a person attaining or retaining proximity to some other differentiated and preferred individual, usually conceived as stronger and/or wiser" (Bowlby, 1973, p. 292). The preferred individual is often the mother. Ainsworth and colleagues (1978) observed attachment behavior in infants by examining their reactions to their mothers' departures and subsequent returns. The researchers then divided the children's behavior into three categories: secure, avoidant, or anxious-ambivalent. Infants who explored their world and used their parents as a safe base were labeled as securely attached. It was hypothesized that infants develop this form of security when parents are attentive to their needs.

Avoidant infants detached from caregivers. This detachment may be caused by caregivers who

typically do not have much contact with the infant and can be hostile. Anxious-ambivalent

infants cried and clung to their caregivers when their caregivers left and exhibited anger when

they returned, possibly as a result of inconsistent care. It was hypothesized that these infants did

not know whether or not the attachment figure would respond to their needs (Ainsworth et al.,

1978).

After Bowlby and Ainsworth paved the way for attachment theory, researchers began to

apply attachment theory to adult romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Researchers

noted similarities between infant-caregiver attachment and adult romantic relationships. For

instance, adults who are confident in their relationships will use their partner as a source of

comfort when going through a tough time, similar to infants who use their mother as a safe base.

Other adults are unusually clingy or distant in a relationship. According to attachment theory,

early attachment experiences do influence adult romantic relationships (Cassidy & Shaver,

1999). Hazan and Shaver (1987) theorized that adults exhibit secure, avoidant, and ambivalent

attachment styles just like infants do. Adults' early attachment relationships provide the basis for

their working models of relationships, which then affect their behavior and how they expect their

romantic partners to behave (Cassidy & Shaver, 1999).

Currently, researchers conceptualize adult attachment on a continuum. One variable is

attachment-related anxiety. A high anxiety score suggests that the person will cling to their

partner, need intimacy, and doubt that their partner loves and supports them (Fraley, Waller, &

Brennan, 2000). The other variable is attachment-related avoidance. High avoidance scores

indicate people's reluctance to be close to their partners, trust them, or rely on them. An

individual who is low on both dimensions will be trusting, comfortable with relying on a partner

for some aspects of life, and confident in the relationship. Research suggests that these variables are fairly stable throughout an adult's life, even in different close relationships, such as those with parents or best friends (Fraley & Waller, 1998).

Even when faced with the same situation in a relationship, different people will view the situation differently based on their attachment orientation. For example, an insecure (highly anxious or highly avoidant) individual is likely to take his or her partner's casual mention of an ex as evidence that the partner is cheating. Others would not view it as a threat. In other words, working models of relationships dictate how people will interpret situations that arise (Simpson, 1990). They also influence a person's response to a situation. Vicary and Fraley (2007) presented participants with a Choose Your Own Adventure story about a relationship in which participants were led to believe that their responses were influencing the course of their fictional relationship. Highly insecure individuals made choices throughout the fictional relationship that demonstrated mistrust in the partner and that were detrimental to the relationship, suggesting that they behave in response to their preconceived notions. In other words, if they believe that a relationship will go badly, they will behave in a manner that causes it to go badly. Even when the partner in the story always responded positively, insecure individuals continued to behave in ways that undermined the relationship (Vicary & Fraley, 2007).

The types of choices that undermine a relationship differ according to a person's attachment orientation. Jealousy is a prominent characteristic of anxious individuals. Their fear of abandonment and need for close physical proximity causes them to be nervous when their partners are out of their sight. For these people, excessive monitoring of a partner's activities can damage the relationship (Vicary & Fraley, 2007). For instance, in Vicary & Fraley's Choose Your Own Adventure study (2007), participants were presented with scenarios in which the

fictional partner insisted that his or her interaction with another person was not a threat to the

relationship with the participant. Participants could choose to accept their partners' explanation

or to continue to worry. Although individuals high in anxiety were more likely to choose a

negative course of action, when given the same choices, avoidant individuals were more likely to

accept their partners' explanation for interacting with another person. The study showed that

individuals high in avoidance still affect their relationships in negative ways, however, by not

meeting their partner's emotional needs, spending enough quality time with their partner, or

sharing their inner thoughts with their partner (Vicary & Fraley, 2007).

In sum, the dynamics of adult romantic relationships exist on a spectrum of attachment.

Some people are particularly private, aloof, and distant. They would be considered highly

avoidant. Highly anxious individuals are likely to be jealous and to need frequent reassurance of

their partner's love for them. Alternatively, an individual might be low on both dimensions,

indicating a healthy degree of attachment (Fraley, 2010). Importantly, people can have a

different attachment orientation for different people in their lives (Fraley, Heffernan, Vicary, &

Brumbaugh, 2011) and one's attachment orientation influences the interpretations and decisions

they make regarding romantic relationships (Vicary & Fraley, 2007).

**The Sexual Double Standard and Adult Romantic Attachment**

Given that individual differences in attachment can affect one's evaluation of a situation

and factors related to romantic relationship functioning, it is plausible that attachment orientation

affects how strongly people ascribe to the sexual double standard. In other words, people's

working models of attachment (sets of expectations based on important past relationships) may

relate to how they view others' sexual activities. Additionally, romantic attachment appears to

play a larger role in the development of first impressions than does parental attachment,

suggesting that romantic attachment may be the more reliable predictor of a person's judgment of others' sexual activity (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2007).

The sex lives and motives of highly anxious people tend to be complicated. They often use sex as a tool to influence their partners' emotions and behavior, especially when they feel that their relationships are threatened. During sex, they frequently acquiesce to a partner's wishes, ignoring their own desires in hopes of satisfying their partner and maintaining the relationship (Birnbaum, 2010). Their communication skills are weaker than those of their more securely attached peers (Greene & Faulkner, 2005). Some evidence suggests that people who are insecurely attached in general are more accepting of casual sex. However, other research has found that anxiously attached people tend to disapprove of sex outside of a committed relationship (Brassard, Shaver, & Lussier, 2007). One possible explanation for this finding is jealousy. Evolutionary theory posits that men have evolved to be concerned about the number of partners a woman has because paternity is always uncertain, and they may accidentally invest resources in other men's children rather than perpetuating their own lineages. Women needed the resources that men could provide, so they had to ensure that their men would not abandon them and their children (Duntley & Buss, 2011).

Anxiously attached people are, on average, prone to jealousy. They tend to keep a close watch on their partners' interactions with others, looking for signs of emotional or physical infidelity. They are hypervigilant to changes in facial cues, often misinterpreting others' expressions. These misunderstandings naturally evoke frustration in both partners, and hypervigilance creates tension in relationships (Fraley, Niedenthal, Marks, Brumbaugh, & Vicary, 2006).

The goal of this study is to test the hypothesis that, given that highly anxious individuals are hypervigilant and jealous, they will be wary of those who engage in casual sex because they will be afraid that they will lose their partners. Anxious men and women alike have reasons to judge women with many sexual partners more harshly than men with many sexual partners. Men may view highly sexual women as potentially unfaithful partners, and therefore evaluate them in a negative light. Women may view highly sexual women as potential competitors who threaten to steal their men. Consequently, this study aims to test the hypothesis that highly anxious people will exhibit the sexual double standard more so than less anxious people. A set of alternative hypotheses, however, is also warranted. Anxious men may have reason to exhibit the reverse of the sexual double standard, meaning that they would judge promiscuous men more harshly than promiscuous women. Their heightened jealousy may cause them to view sexually active men as competitors. If a man has reported having had many sexual partners, then women must be engaging in sexual activity with him, leaving open the possibility that these women could be carrying the promiscuous man's child, for whom the anxiously attached man would have to invest resources in protecting (Duntley & Buss, 2011). Similarly, it is also possible that anxious women will exhibit the reverse of the sexual double standard. They may judge promiscuous men more harshly because they view these men as less likely to be faithful to them.

Additionally, this study will explore the potential differences in evaluation of a target between male and female participants and between participants who are more or less anxiously or avoidantly attached to their mothers and fathers. The relationship with the romantic partner is hypothesized to be a better predictor of one's exhibition of the sexual double standard than is the relationship with the mother or father, because attachment in romantic relationships has been found to be more influential in judging others' sexual activity (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2007).

However, relationships with the mother and father are still very influential in most adults' lives and may impact their judgments of others.

Although highly anxious men and women alike are hypothesized to exhibit the sexual double standard more so than less anxious people, participants' sex may affect the ways in which they judge others' sexual activity according to the four evaluative domains used in this study (popularity, success, intelligence, and values). According to Sexual Strategies Theory (Buss & Schmitt, 1993), men and women have different motives and priorities when engaging in sexual behavior. Men take sexual infidelity very seriously because partners who cheat on them may become pregnant, and men do not want to provide for children who are not their own (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Therefore, they may concern themselves most with their partners' values. On the other hand, women must be attentive to their partners' abilities to provide necessary resources for themselves and their children (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Accordingly, they may emphasize their partners' success rather than their partners' values.

Rather than succumbing to jealousy, highly avoidant people are concerned about becoming too psychologically intimate with a partner. For many, this may manifest as a complete disregard for sex. For other avoidant people, sex is a casual, physical act that is enjoyable as long as it does not result in uncomfortable intimacy (Brassard, Shaver, & Lussier, 2007). Even in a monogamous relationship, highly avoidant individuals are not very emotionally affected by problems in their sex lives—they simply disengage (Birnbaum, 2010). A physically gratifying sex life is realistic for an avoidantly attached person because it can be accomplished with one night stands, friends with benefits relationships, or other casual sex practices that allow for physical pleasure without emotional intimacy. Because sex is not a deeply meaningful issue for highly avoidant people, this study will test the hypothesis that they will not endorse the

sexual double standard as strongly as will less avoidant individuals because they simply may be

more accepting of casual sex for both genders.

**Method**

*Participants*

Participants were 236 undergraduates from a Midwestern university who participated in

exchange for course credit. The median age was 19 ($M = 18.75$, $SD = .92$). Fifty-three percent of

participants were female. See Table 1 for additional demographic information.

*Materials and Procedure*

Participants first completed a demographics questionnaire. They then completed the 27-

item ECR-RS (Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire; Fraley et al., 2011; see Table 2

for means and standard deviations), which assesses current attachment relationship with mother,

father, and romantic partner. If participants did not have a romantic partner, they were asked to

answer in regards to how they would feel in a romantic relationship or how they have felt in one

in the past. Sample items include, "It helps to turn to this person in times of need", "I talk things

over with this person", and "I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about

him or her" (Fraley et al., 2011).

After completing these measures, participants viewed output from a purported personality

quiz said to have been administered on Facebook as part of a prior study (see Appendix A). The

output consisted of a results page that was supposedly given to an individual who participated in

the prior study. The target individual's answers were included in the results. Importantly, the

target's number of sexual partners was among the information presented in the results. The target

individual was fictitious and no picture was used. Participants were randomly assigned to one of

four conditions. Specifically, they either viewed information stating that the target individual is a

man who has had 1 sexual partner, a woman who has had 1 sexual partner, man who has had 12

sexual partners, or a woman who has had 12 sexual partners. Participants in all groups saw

Facebook results pages that were identical except for the sex of the fictional person and the

number of sexual partners.

Following their viewing of the Facebook results page, participants answered 30

evaluative statements (see Appendix B). Responses were recorded on a 1-5 scale, with 1 being

"strongly disagree" and 7 being "strongly agree." Evaluative statements fell into one of four

subscales: values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence. Sample items include,

"This person is immoral", "People like this person", "This person has a good job", and "This

person performs well in everything he/she does." The evaluative scale used in this study was

developed to measure the sexual double standard in previous research (Marks & Fraley, 2005).

Cronbach's alpha for the present sample's subscales were .89 for values, .78 for popularity, .74

for success, and .64 for intelligence. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations. See Table 4

for correlations among measures.

## Results

To determine whether participants in the present study exhibited the double standard, and

whether males or females exhibited it more strongly, I ran an ANOVA with target sex, target's

number of sexual partners (1 or 12) and participant sex as the fixed factors. Below are the results

for each of the four scales.

*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, indicating that

women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's popularity (see Table 5).

*Success*

An ANOVA revealed a main effect of number of sexual partners, such that targets with 12 sexual partners were rated as less successful than targets with 1 sexual partner (*M* for 12 partners = 24.11, *SD* = .33; *M* for 1 partner = 25.41, *SD* = .33), $F(1,218) = 7.63$, $p = .01$, $d = -3.94$. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant, meaning that the double standard did not emerge. Also, the three way interaction was not significant. This result reveals that women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's success (see Table 6).

*Intelligence*

An ANOVA revealed a main effect of number of sexual partners, such that targets with 12 sexual partners were rated as less intelligent than targets with 1 sexual partner (*M* for 12 partners = 16.60, *SD* = .21; *M* for 1 partner = 18.18, *SD* = .21), $F(1,218) = 29.18$, $p < .001$, $d = -.83$. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant, indicating that 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 7).

*Values*

An ANOVA revealed a main effect of number of sexual partners, such that targets with 12 sexual partners were rated as less successful than targets with 1 sexual partner (*M* for 12 partners = 28.65, *SD* = .46; *M* for 1 partner = 33.90, *SD* = .47), $F(1,218) = 64.46$, $p = .00$, $d = -11.29$. No other main effects or two way interactions were significant, indicating that the double

standard did not emerge. Also, the three way interaction was not significant. This result reveals that women versus men were not more or less likely to exhibit the double standard when considering the target's values (see Table 8).

*Attachment analyses*

All below hierarchical regression analyses for attachment variables (avoidance and anxiety) were conducted as follows. To determine whether one's attachment anxiety or avoidance with his or her father, mother, or partner relates to the exhibition of the sexual double standard, the attachment variable (avoidance or anxiety) was centered in relation to its mean. 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 evaluation score (popularity, success, intelligence, or values) was regressed on the target sex condition, the target partners condition, and the attachment variable (e.g., anxiety with mother, avoidance with father). In Step 2, the interactions between target sex and target partner, attachment variable and target sex, and attachment variable and target partner were entered. In step 3, the three-way interaction between target sex, target number of partners, and attachment variable was entered. The results concerning the three-way interaction are of most importance because they measure exhibition of the sexual double standard. For the sake of simplicity only these results will be focused upon in the current and subsequent analyses.

*Attachment with father*

No three-way interactions were found regarding avoidance with the father, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta = -.16$, $t[7,224] = -1.22$, *ns*), success ratings ($\beta = .06$, $t[7,224] = .43$, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta = .06$, $t[7, 224] = .46$, *ns*), or values

ratings ($\beta$ = .21, $t$[7,224] = 1.78, *ns*). In other words, participants who were more or less avoidant with their fathers were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 9-12.

Additionally, regression analyses revealed no three-way interactions between anxiety with the father, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta$ = -.07, $t$[7,224] = -.54, *ns*), success ratings ($\beta$ = -.03, $t$[7,224] = -.83, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta$ = -.12, $t$[7,224] = -.92, *ns*), or values ratings ($\beta$ = .03, $t$[7,224] = .26, *ns*). According to these results, participants who were more or less anxious with their fathers were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 13-18.

*Attachment with mother*

No three-way interactions were found regarding avoidance with the mother, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta$ = -.14, $t$[7,228] = -1.03, *ns*), success ratings, ($\beta$ = -.08, $t$[7,228] = -.56, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta$ = .04, $t$[7,228] = .27, *ns*), or values ratings ($\beta$ = .15, $t$[7,228] = 1.23, *ns*). In other words, participants who were more or less avoidant with their mothers were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 19-22.

Additionally, regression analyses revealed no three-way interactions between anxiety with the mother, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta$ = -.06, $t$[7,228] = -.44, *ns*), success ratings ($\beta$ = -.04, $t$[7,228] = -.28, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta$ = -.11, $t$[7,228], *ns*), or values ratings ($\beta$ = -.11, $t$[7,228] = -.86, *ns*). According to these results, participants who were more or less anxious with their mothers were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 23-26.

*Attachment with partner*

No three-way interactions were found regarding avoidance with the romantic partner, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta$ = -.09, $t$[7,220] = -.62, *ns*), success ratings ($\beta$ = .16, $t$[7,220] = 1.10, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta$ = -.22, $t$[7,220] = -1.54, *ns*), or values ratings ($\beta$ = .17, $t$[7,220] = 1.27, *ns*). These results indicate that participants who were more or less avoidant with their partner were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 27-30.

Additionally, regression analyses revealed no three-way interactions between anxiety with the partner, target sex, and target number of partners in terms of popularity ratings ($\beta$ = -.01, $t$[7,220] = -.06, *ns*), success ratings ($\beta$ = .01, $t$[7,220] = .12, *ns*), intelligence ratings ($\beta$ = -.07, $t$[7,220] = -.59, *ns*), or values ratings ($\beta$ = .05, $t$[7,220] = .45, *ns*). According to these results, participants who were more or less anxious with their partner were not any more or less likely to exhibit the double standard. See Tables 31-34.

*Results for men and women separately*

The regression analyses described above also were also conducted separately for male and female participants, yielding some significant results. Females' attachment with their mothers was found to be related to their evaluations of target men. More specifically, females who were highly anxiously attached to their mothers judged men with more sexual partners more harshly than men with fewer partners in terms of values, $\beta$ = -.26, $p$ < .05 (see Table 33). Additionally, females who were highly avoidantly attached to their mothers judged men with many partners more harshly than men with fewer partners in terms of values, $\beta$ = -.27, $p$ < .05 (see Table 34). Males' attachment to their romantic partners was also related to their judgments of the target men. Males who were anxiously attached to their partners judged men who had

many sexual partners less favorably than men who had fewer partner in terms of values, $\beta = -.45$, $p < .05$ (see Table 35).

## Discussion

Although the popular belief is that men are rewarded for having many sexual partners, the results of this study suggest that, in certain aspects of evaluation, they may be derogated for it. Importantly, attachment relationships with different people in one's life appear to relate to people's judgments of the sexual activities of their peers. For females, attachment to the mother greatly influences their judgments of others. For males, attachment to a romantic partner is more influential.

Females who are highly anxiously attached to their mothers judged the values of men with more sexual partners more harshly than the values of men with fewer partners. According to the sexual double standard, men are rewarded for sexual activity. However, in the present study, when judged by women who are anxiously attached to their mothers, they were not rewarded. These results support one of the hypotheses about anxiously attached women: That they judge highly sexual men harshly, possibly because they believe that these men will be unfaithful to them. However, this effect appeared only when considering females' attachment with their mothers (as opposed to their fathers or romantic partners).

Perhaps this relationship can be explained by examining how these women came to be anxiously attached to their mothers in the first place. Infants who are anxiously attached to their mothers often become this way because the mother sporadically responds to their needs, making them cautious of relying on her and fearful of abandonment (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Women who are less attuned to their infants' needs may behave this way because they are contending with their own major psychosocial challenges. For example, mothers who are addicted to drugs

often neglect their children as the drug becomes increasingly important to them. They often

become involved in abusive relationships with men, and their children are exposed to domestic

violence (Haight, Carter-Black, & Sheridan, 2009). If a girl grows up in a household in which

her mother has difficult relationships with men, she likely will learn that men cannot be trusted.

A distrustful woman is unlikely to believe that a man has strong values unless he has

demonstrated his ability to be faithful to one partner. He may be popular, successful, and

intelligent, but unless he is monogamous, his values will not be considered strong.

     It is noteworthy that although women who are highly avoidant with their mothers are

unlikely to be bothered by the emotional distance, they, like women who are highly anxious with

their mothers, judge the values of men with more partners more harshly than the values of men

with fewer partners. This contradicts the hypothesis that avoidant attachment will not be related

to someone's judgment of others' sexual activity on the grounds that avoidant people are

disinterested in others' activity. However, avoidance is often the result of the same maladaptive

mother-child relationship that causes anxious attachment, with even less attention paid to the

infant's needs. An infant whose needs are rarely or never met becomes aloof and disinterested in

the mother (Ainsworth et al., 1978). A mother who neglects her infant daughter may be

distracted by negative relationships with men, leading the daughter to avoid highly sexual men as

an adult.

     Males' attachment orientation also influenced their judgment of others' sexual activity,

but unlike females, differences in judgment were related to their attachment to their romantic

partners, not to their mothers. Men who were highly anxiously attached to their partners

evaluated men with many partners more harshly in their judgment of the man's values. This may

be due to competition. While women compete with one another for resources that will help them

care for their children, men focus on competing for mates (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). This effect

would be most pronounced in anxiously attached men, who worry that their partners will be

unfaithful and abandon them. Men who have already had many partners are more likely to take

others' partners than are men who have a history of monogamy. In addition to being more of a

threat to an anxiously attached man's relationship, a man who has had many partners most likely

attracted those partners because he has traits that many women find appealing. To obtain

resources that would make him appealing to women, a man would need to be intelligent and

successful, and his attractiveness would make him popular. If others view him that way, he

would be evaluated favorably in the domains of popularity, success, and intelligence by men and

women alike. Therefore, the negative evaluation is apparent when anxiously attached men

evaluate the values of men with many partners. Because anxiously attached men place great

importance on the emotional aspects of their monogamous relationships, they would not view a

promiscuous man as having strong values.

For the most part, negative evaluations of males with many partners came in the form of

value judgments. Participants' views of men's popularity, success, and intelligence appear to be

largely unaffected by the men's number of sexual partners. From an evolutionary perspective,

this makes sense for male participants, whose relationships with their partners were the most

significant attachment relationships. Men must choose partners who will be good parents. If

women do not care about the children, the children will be less likely to survive (Buss &

Schmitt, 1993). Women who have good values, such as morality and trustworthiness, would

most likely be caring, attentive mothers. Women also have good reason to evaluate men with

many partners negatively in terms of values. Men who attract large numbers of women may have

the resources women desire and the intelligence to gain those resources, making them popular in

their community and more likely to attract women. Their evaluations on these domains are likely

to be positive. Their values, however, may be comprised if their main goal is to obtain wealth.

Therefore, men and women alike judge the values of men with many partners more harshly than

those of men with fewer partners.

*Limitations and future directions*

This study had limitations, one of which was the relatively young age of the participants

($M = 19$). Because most of the participants have not had numerous sexual partners themselves ($M

= 1.69$), 12 partners may seem unusually high to them. Older adults may have a different frame

of reference and a different set of norms due to their own sexual experience and the experience

of their partners and peers. Different norms change the way that men and women alike

conceptualize sex, and consequently may change how they judge others' sexual activity. Using

older adult participants would provide a more accurate picture of how adults judge others.

Additionally, the sexual double standard was not evident in this study. Because

experimental conditions did not resemble real life first impressions (as we were more focused on

individual differences for the present study), this was to be expected. Manipulating the

experimental conditions to resemble the real world may yield more significant results and

provide a better understanding of the relationship between the sexual double standard and

attachment.

Future research could aim to substantiate the claim that women who are highly

avoidantly or anxiously attached to their mothers developed that attachment orientation because

of their mother's negative relationships with highly sexual men. Correlations between women's

mother's sexual relationships and women's attachment orientations could provide insight into

their judgments of others' sexual activity as well as their reasons for those judgments. Similar

research could be conducted on men who are anxiously attached to their romantic partners to determine their reasoning for judging men with many partners more harshly than men with fewer partners. Self-report measures regarding their competitive nature, in addition to the items on the ECR-RS that measure jealousy, could invalidate or corroborate the idea that men judge men with more partners harshly because they view such men as threats to their relationships. In addition to corroborating evolutionary explanations, future research could aim to explore other possible explanations for the results of the present study.

In sum, although this study did not find evidence of the sexual double standard, it revealed differences in the way that men and women evaluate men with many sexual partners. Attachment orientation appears to partially explain individual differences in the way that men and women judge others' sexual activity. Not all men are socially rewarded by their friends for their sexual conquests, and not all women are called sluts. People's judgments of others' sexual activities, positive or negative, may be partially determined by their own relationships with important people in their lives.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Birnbaum, G. E. (2010). Bound to interact: The divergent goals and complex interplay of attachment and sex within romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27,* 245-252. doi: 10.1177/0265407509360902

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger.* New York: Basic Books.

Brumbaugh, C. C., & Fraley, R. C. (2007). Transference of attachment patterns: How important relationships influence feelings toward novel people. *Personal Relationships, 14,* 513-530.

Brassard, A., Shaver, P. R., & Lussier, Y. (2007). Attachment, sexual experience, and sexual pressure in romantic relationships: A dyadic approach. *Personal Relationships, 14,* 475-493.

Buss, D. M. & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective. *Psychological Review, 100*, 204-232.

Collins, N. L., Feeney, B. C. (2004). Working models of attachment shape perceptions of social support: Evidence from experimental and observational studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 363-383. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.363

Crowell, J. A., Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Measurement of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy, & P. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical application* (pp. 434-465). New York: The Guilford Press.

Duntley, J. D., & Buss, D. M. (2011). Homicide adaptations. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16,* 399-410. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.016

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. & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp 77-114). New York: Guilford Press.

Fraley, R. C., Heffernan, M., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2011). The experiences in close relationships-relationship structures questionnaire: A method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships. *Psychological Assessment*, *23,* 615-625.

Fraley, R. C., Niedenthal, P. M., Marks, M., Brumbaugh, C., & Vicary, A. (2006). Adult attachment and the perception of emotional expressions: Probing the hyperactivating strategies underlying anxious attachment. *Journal of Personality, 74,* 1163-1190.

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 350-365

Garner et al. (1982). The Eating Attitudes Test: Psychometric features and clinical correlates. Psychological Medicine, 12, 871-878

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.

Greene, K., & Faulkner, S. L. (2005). Gender, belief in the sexual double standard, and sexual

    talk in heterosexual dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 53*, 239-251. doi: 10.1007/s11199-

    005-5682-6

Haight, W. L., Carter-Black, J. D., & Sheridan, K. (2009). Mothers' experience of

    methamphetamine addiction: A case-based analysis of rural, Midwestern women.

    *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*, 71-77. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2008.05.011

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P.R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process.

    *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511-524.

Jonason, P. K., & Marks, M. J. (2009). Common vs. uncommon acts: Evidence for the sexual

    double standard. *Sex Roles, 60*, 357-365. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9542-z

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.

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 impact of social interaction on the sexual double

    standard. *Social Influence, 2,* 29-54.


Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self‐image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton

    University Press.

Simpson, J. A. (1990). The influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 971-980.

Vicary, A. M., & Fraley, R. C. (2007). Choose your own adventure: Attachment dynamics in a simulated relationship. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33,* 1279-1291. doi: 10.1177/0146167207303013

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

| Characteristic | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 102 | 45.1 |
| Female | 124 | 54.9 |
| Age | | |
| 17 years old | 2 | .8 |
| 18 years old | 113 | 47.9 |
| 19 years old | 79 | 33.5 |
| 20 years old | 30 | 12.7 |
| 21 years old | 9 | 3.8 |
| 22 years old | 3 | 1.3 |
| School year | | |
| Freshmen | 161 | 68.2 |
| Sophomore | 56 | 23.7 |
| Junior | 10 | 4.2 |
| Senior | 8 | 3.4 |

Table 2

*Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-RS)*

| Scale | Mean | St. Deviation |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mom Avoidance | 2.45 | 1.29 |
| Mom Anxiety | 1.39 | .88 |
| Dad Avoidance | 3.17 | 1.52 |
| Dad Anxiety | 1.70 | 1.33 |
| Partner Avoidance | 2.27 | 1.01 |
| Partner Anxiety | 3.32 | 1.71 |

Table 3

*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 |

Table 4

*Correlations among measures*

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participant Sex | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Mom Avoidance | -.17* | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Mom Anxiety | -.01 | .49** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Dad Avoidance | .02 | .30** | .20** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 5. Dad Anxiety | .02 | .11 | .34** | .67** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 6. Part. Avoidance | -.17* | .17** | .07 | .26** | .19** | 1 | | | | | |
| 7. Part. Anxiety | .04 | .12 | .17* | .27** | .23** | .47** | 1 | | | | |
| 8. Popularity | .07 | -.02 | -.09 | -.03 | -.12 | .09 | -.10 | 1 | | | |
| 9. Success | .07 | -.02 | .04 | -.00 | -.06 | -.12 | .06 | .77** | 1 | | |
| 10. Intelligence | .06 | -.19** | -.07 | -.04 | .08 | .15* | -.10 | .11 | .22* | 1 | |
| 11. Values | -.06 | -.14* | -.09 | .01 | .08 | -.10 | -.06 | .13 | .21 | .70** | 1 |

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

Table 5

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

*condition and participants' sex*

| Variable | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

*p < .05

Table 6

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

*condition and participants' sex*

| Variable | df | Mean Square | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

*$p < .05$

Table 7

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

*condition and participants' sex*

| Variable | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

*p < .05

Table 8

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

*condition and participants' sex*

| Variable | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

*p < .05

Table 9

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of avoidance with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .38 | .48 | .05 | .79 |
| Target Partners | .24 | .48 | .03 | .51 |
| Father Avoidance | -.07 | .24 | -.02 | -.30 |
| **Step 2** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .02 | .69 | .00 | .02 |
| Target Partners | -.09 | .63 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Father Avoidance | -.22 | .39 | -.06 | -.57 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .74 | .96 | .09 | .77 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | -.32 | .48 | -.06 | -.66 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .60 | .48 | .12 | 1.26 |
| **Step 3** | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.03 | .69 | -.00 | -.05 |
| Target Partners | -.11 | .63 | -.02 | -.17 |
| Father Avoidance | -.46 | .43 | -.13 | -1.06 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .74 | .96 | .09 | .77 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .27 | .68 | .05 | .40 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | 1.14 | .65 | .22 | 1.75 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Avoidance | -1.18 | .96 | -.16 | -1.22 |

$*p < .05$

Table 10

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

*avoidance with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.42 | .46 | -.06 | -.92 |
| Target Partners | -1.41 | .46 | -.20 | -3.10** |
| Father Avoidance | -.01 | .03 | -.02 | -.34 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.50 | .66 | -.07 | -.76 |
| Target Partners | -1.49 | .61 | -.21 | -2.44* |
| Father Avoidance | -.06 | .04 | -.16 | -1.54 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .19 | .92 | .02 | .21 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .51 | .46 | .10 | 1.10 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .53 | .46 | .11 | 1.15 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.49 | .66 | -.07 | -.73 |
| Target Partners | -1.48 | .61 | -.21 | -2.43* |
| Father Avoidance | -.05 | .05 | -.14 | -1.18 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .19 | .92 | .02 | .21 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .31 | .66 | .06 | .48 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .35 | .63 | .07 | .56 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Avoidance | .40 | .93 | .06 | .43 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 11

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of avoidance with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .37 | .29 | .08 | 1.27 |
| Target Partners | -1.59 | .29 | -.35 | -5.55** |
| Father Avoidance | -.02 | .02 | -.07 | -1.09 |
| **Step 2** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .36 | .42 | .08 | .88 |
| Target Partners | -1.60 | .38 | -.35 | -4.16** |
| Father Avoidance | -.04 | .03 | -.17 | -1.67 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .02 | .58 | .00 | .04 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .26 | .29 | .08 | .88 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .24 | .29 | .07 | .83 |
| **Step 3** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .38 | .42 | .08 | .90 |
| Target Partners | -1.59 | .39 | -.35 | -4.24** |
| Father Avoidance | -.04 | .03 | -.15 | -1.28 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .02 | .58 | .00 | .04 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .12 | .41 | .04 | .29 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .12 | .39 | .04 | .30 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Avoidance | .27 | .58 | .06 | .46 |

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

Table 12

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

*avoidance with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | 1.17 | .65 | .10 | 1.79 |
| Target Partners | -5.58 | .65 | -.50 | -8.61** |
| Father Avoidance | -.02 | .04 | -.03 | -.54 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .02 | .93 | .00 | .02 |
| Target Partners | -6.56 | .86 | -.58 | -7.63 |
| Father Avoidance | -.10 | .06 | -.16 | -1.71 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 2.29 | 1.29 | .17 | 1.77 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | .98 | .65 | .12 | 1.50 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | .59 | .65 | .07 | .91 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .11 | .93 | .01 | .12 |
| Target Partners | -6.52 | .86 | -.58 | -7.63 |
| Father Avoidance | -.05 | .06 | -.08 | -.73 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 2.29 | 1.29 | .17 | 1.77 |
| Target Sex × Father Avoidance | -.18 | .92 | -.02 | -.20 |
| Target Partners × Father Avoidance | -.47 | .88 | -.06 | -.53 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Avoidance | 2.31 | 1.30 | .21 | 1.78 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 13

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of anxiety with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .37 | .47 | .05 | .77 |
| Target Partners | .22 | .47 | .03 | .47 |
| Father Anxiety | -.11 | .06 | -.12 | -1.83 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.03 | .68 | -.00 | -.04 |
| Target Partners | -.12 | .63 | -.02 | -.19 |
| Father Anxiety | -.21 | .10 | -.24 | -2.12* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .78 | .95 | .09 | .82 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .37 | .48 | .07 | .76 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | .47 | .48 | .10 | .99 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.04 | .68 | -.01 | -.06 |
| Target Partners | -.12 | .63 | -.02 | -.20 |
| Father Anxiety | -.24 | .11 | -.27 | -2.13* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .78 | .95 | .09 | .82 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .67 | .74 | .12 | .91 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | .69 | .62 | .14 | 1.11 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Anxiety | -.52 | .97 | -.07 | -.54 |

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

Table 14

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as a function of anxiety with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.43 | .46 | -.06 | -.93 |
| Target Partners | -1.42 | .46 | -.20 | -3.12** |
| Father Anxiety | -.06 | .06 | -.07 | -1.02 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.49 | .65 | -.07 | -.75 |
| Target Partners | -1.48 | .60 | -.21 | -2.47* |
| Father Anxiety | -.26 | .10 | -.29 | -2.70** |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .15 | .91 | .02 | .16 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .57 | .46 | .11 | 1.25 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | .99 | .46 | .21 | 2.17* |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.50 | .65 | -.07 | -.76 |
| Target Partners | -1.49 | .60 | -.21 | -2.46* |
| Father Anxiety | -.27 | .11 | -.31 | -2.48* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .15 | .91 | .02 | .16 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .69 | .70 | .13 | .98 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | 1.07 | .60 | .23 | 1.80 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Anxiety | -.20 | .93 | -.03 | -.21 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 15

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of anxiety with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .39 | .29 | .08 | 1.34 |
| Target Partners | -1.56 | .29 | -.34 | -5.43** |
| Father Anxiety | .04 | .04 | .07 | 1.04 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .38 | .42 | .08 | .92 |
| Target Partners | -1.56 | .38 | -.34 | -4.09** |
| Father Anxiety | -.06 | .07 | -.11 | -.89 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .02 | .58 | .00 | .04 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .33 | .29 | .09 | 1.13 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | .24 | .29 | .08 | .84 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .37 | .42 | .08 | .89 |
| Target Partners | -1.57 | .38 | -.34 | -4.09** |
| Father Anxiety | -.06 | .07 | -.11 | -.89 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .02 | .58 | .00 | .04 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .64 | .45 | .18 | 1.44 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | .47 | .38 | .15 | 1.24 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Anxiety | -.55 | .59 | -.12 | -.92 |

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

Table 16

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

*anxiety with father*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | 1.20 | .65 | .11 | 1.84 |
| Target Partners | -5.53 | .65 | -.49 | -8.56** |
| Father Anxiety | .09 | .08 | .06 | 1.08 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .07 | .92 | .01 | .07 |
| Target Partners | -6.51 | .85 | -.58 | -7.69** |
| Father Anxiety | -.23 | .14 | -.16 | -1.71 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 2.23 | 1.28 | .17 | 1.75 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .91 | .64 | .11 | 1.42 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | 1.58 | .64 | .21 | 2.46* |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .07 | .92 | .01 | .08 |
| Target Partners | -6.50 | .85 | -.58 | -7.67 |
| Father Anxiety | -.21 | .15 | -.15 | -1.39 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 2.23 | 1.28 | .17 | 1.74 |
| Target Sex × Father Anxiety | .72 | .99 | .08 | .73 |
| Target Partners × Father Anxiety | 1.44 | .84 | .19 | 1.72 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Father Anxiety | .34 | 1.31 | .03 | .26 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 17

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of avoidance with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .40 | .47 | .06 | .84 |
| Target Partners | .25 | .47 | .04 | .53 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.01 | .03 | -.02 | -.36 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .06 | .68 | .01 | .09 |
| Target Partners | -.09 | .62 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.02 | .06 | -.05 | -.37 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .71 | .94 | .09 | .76 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | -.47 | .48 | -.10 | -.98 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | .59 | .48 | .13 | 1.24 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .10 | .68 | .01 | .15 |
| Target Partners | -.04 | .63 | -.01 | -.06 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.07 | .08 | -.15 | -.92 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .70 | .94 | .08 | .74 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .12 | .74 | .03 | .16 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | 1.15 | .72 | .24 | 1.59 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Avoidance | -.99 | .97 | -.14 | -1.03 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 18

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as a function of avoidance with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1** | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.38 | .45 | -.05 | -.84 |
| Target Partners | -1.35 | .45 | -.19 | -2.99** |
| Mother Avoidance | -.00 | .03 | -.01 | -.14 |
| **Step 2** | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.40 | .66 | -.06 | -.61 |
| Target Partners | -1.36 | .61 | -.20 | -2.26* |
| Mother Avoidance | .04 | .06 | .08 | .61 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .01 | .92 | .00 | .01 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | -.21 | .46 | -.04 | -.45 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | -.34 | .47 | -.07 | -.74 |
| **Step 3** | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.38 | .66 | -.05 | -.58 |
| Target Partners | -1.34 | .61 | -.19 | -2.21* |
| Mother Avoidance | .01 | .07 | .02 | .15 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .00 | .92 | .00 | .01 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .10 | .72 | .02 | .14 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | -.05 | .70 | -.01 | -.07 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Avoidance | -.52 | .94 | -.08 | -.56 |

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

Table 19

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of avoidance with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .39 | .28 | .09 | 1.39 |
| Target Partners | -1.47 | .28 | -.32 | -5.28** |
| Mother Avoidance | -.05 | .02 | -.17 | -2.86** |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .48 | .41 | .10 | 1.19 |
| Target Partners | -1.39 | .38 | -.30 | -3.69** |
| Mother Avoidance | -.08 | .04 | -.25 | -2.06* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.17 | .57 | -.03 | -.30 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .23 | .29 | .07 | .82 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | .09 | .29 | .03 | .32 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .48 | .41 | .10 | 1.17 |
| Target Partners | -1.39 | .38 | -.30 | -3.69** |
| Mother Avoidance | -.07 | .05 | -.23 | -1.47 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.17 | .57 | -.03 | -.29 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .14 | .45 | .05 | .32 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | .01 | .44 | .00 | .01 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Avoidance | .16 | .58 | .04 | .27 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 20

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as a function of avoidance with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .40 | .47 | .06 | .84 |
| Target Partners | .25 | .47 | .04 | .53 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.01 | .03 | -.02 | -.36 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .06 | .68 | .01 | .09 |
| Target Partners | -.09 | .62 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.02 | .06 | -.05 | -.37 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .71 | .94 | .09 | .76 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | -.47 | .48 | -.10 | -.98 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | .59 | .48 | .13 | 1.24 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .10 | .68 | .01 | .15 |
| Target Partners | -.04 | .63 | -.01 | -.06 |
| Mother Avoidance | -.07 | .08 | -.15 | -.92 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .70 | .94 | .08 | .74 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .12 | .74 | .03 | .16 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | 1.15 | .72 | .24 | 1.59 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Avoidance | -.99 | .97 | -.14 | -1.03 |

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

Table 21

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of anxiety with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .37 | .47 | .05 | .80 |
| Target Partners | .26 | .46 | .04 | .56 |
| Mother Anxiety | -.12 | .09 | -.09 | -1.40 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .02 | .67 | .00 | .03 |
| Target Partners | -.04 | .62 | -.01 | -.06 |
| Mother Anxiety | -.22 | .15 | -.16 | -1.44 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .69 | .93 | .08 | .74 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .85 | .47 | .15 | 1.79 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | -.17 | .47 | -.04 | -.37 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .03 | .67 | .00 | .04 |
| Target Partners | -.04 | .62 | -.01 | -.07 |
| Mother Anxiety | -.25 | .17 | -.19 | -1.48 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .69 | .94 | .08 | .74 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | 1.08 | .72 | .19 | 1.51 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | .00 | .61 | .00 | .00 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Anxiety | -.42 | .95 | -.06 | -.44 |

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

Table 22

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as a function of anxiety with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.38 | .45 | -.05 | -.84 |
| Target Partners | -1.36 | .45 | -.20 | -3.03** |
| Mother Anxiety | .05 | .09 | .04 | .63 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.34 | .65 | -.05 | -.52 |
| Target Partners | -1.33 | .60 | -.19 | -2.21* |
| Mother Anxiety | -.03 | .15 | -.02 | -.22 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.07 | .91 | -.01 | -.08 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .44 | .46 | .08 | .96 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | .08 | .46 | .02 | .18 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.34 | .65 | -.05 | -.52 |
| Target Partners | -1.33 | .60 | -.19 | -2.21* |
| Mother Anxiety | -.05 | .17 | -.04 | -.32 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.07 | .91 | -.01 | -.08 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .59 | .70 | .11 | .84 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | .19 | .59 | .04 | .32 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Anxiety | -.26 | .93 | -.04 | -.28 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 23

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of anxiety with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .34 | .29 | .07 | 1.19 |
| Target Partners | -1.51 | .28 | -.33 | -5.31** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.05 | .05 | -.06 | -.91 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .38 | .41 | .08 | .93 |
| Target Partners | -1.47 | .38 | -.32 | -3.88** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.12 | .09 | -.14 | -1.34 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.08 | .57 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .27 | .29 | .07 | .92 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | .16 | .29 | .05 | .55 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .39 | .41 | .09 | .95 |
| Target Partners | -1.47 | .38 | -.32 | -3.88** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.17 | .10 | -.19 | -1.59 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.08 | .58 | -.02 | -.15 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .55 | .44 | .15 | 1.26 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | .36 | .37 | .12 | .97 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Anxiety | -.51 | .59 | -.11 | -.86 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 24

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

*anxiety with mother*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | 1.09 | .64 | .10 | 1.69 |
| Target Partners | -5.42 | .64 | -.49 | -8.49** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.15 | .12 | -.07 | -1.25 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .09 | .92 | .01 | .10 |
| Target Partners | -6.26 | .85 | -.56 | -7.39** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.25 | .21 | -.12 | -1.22 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.95 | 1.28 | .15 | 1.52 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .87 | .65 | .10 | 1.34 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | -.16 | .64 | -.02 | -.25 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .07 | .92 | .01 | .07 |
| Target Partners | -6.25 | .85 | -.56 | -7.38** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.15 | .23 | -.07 | -.65 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.96 | 1.28 | .15 | 1.53 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .20 | .98 | .02 | .21 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | -.64 | .83 | -.09 | -.77 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Anxiety | 1.19 | 1.31 | .10 | .91 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 25

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of avoidance with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .39 | .48 | .06 | .83 |
| Target Partners | .19 | .48 | .03 | .40 |
| Partner Avoidance | -.32 | .24 | -.09 | -1.34 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.08 | .68 | -.01 | -.12 |
| Target Partners | -.20 | .63 | -.03 | -.31 |
| Partner Avoidance | -1.02 | .38 | -.29 | -2.69** |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .92 | .96 | .11 | .96 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | .04 | .49 | .01 | .07 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | 1.27 | .49 | .26 | .59* |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.01 | .69 | -.00 | -.02 |
| Target Partners | -.21 | .64 | -.03 | -.34 |
| Partner Avoidance | .40 | .42 | -.32 | -2.70** |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .89 | .96 | .11 | .93 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | .40 | .76 | .07 | .52 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | 1.51 | .63 | .31 | 2.40* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | -.62 | 1.00 | -.09 | -.62 |

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

Table 26

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as a function of avoidance with the partner*

| Effect | *B* | *SE* | *β* | *t* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.43 | .46 | -.06 | -.93 |
| Target Partners | -1.35 | .47 | -.19 | -2.91** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.30 | .23 | -.09 | -1.30 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.41 | .67 | -.06 | -.61 |
| Target Partners | -1.33 | .63 | -.19 | -2.13* |
| Partner Avoidance | -.59 | .38 | -.17 | -1.57 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.04 | .95 | -.01 | -.04 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | .21 | .49 | .04 | .42 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | .36 | .48 | .08 | .75 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.53 | .68 | -.08 | -.78 |
| Target Partners | -1.30 | .63 | -.19 | -2.08* |
| Partner Avoidance | -.40 | .41 | -.11 | -.97 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .01 | .95 | .00 | .01 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | -.43 | .75 | -.08 | -.57 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | -.07 | .62 | -.02 | -.11 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | 1.09 | .99 | .16 | 1.10 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 27

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of avoidance with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .35 | .29 | .08 | 1.19 |
| Target Partners | -1.49 | .29 | -.32 | -5.07** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.11 | .15 | -.05 | -.71 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .42 | .42 | .09 | 1.01 |
| Target Partners | -1.42 | .39 | -.31 | -3.60** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.43 | .24 | -.19 | -1.82 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.15 | .59 | -.03 | -.26 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | .07 | .31 | .02 | .23 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | .54 | .30 | .17 | 1.79 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .53 | .43 | .12 | 1.25 |
| Target Partners | -1.44 | .39 | -.31 | -3.67** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.59 | .26 | -.26 | -2.30* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.19 | .59 | -.04 | -.33 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | .62 | .47 | .18 | 1.32 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | .92 | .39 | .29 | 2.36* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | -.95 | .62 | -.22 | -1.54 |

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

Table 28

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as a function of avoidance with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .97 | .66 | .09 | 1.47 |
| Target Partners | -5.41 | .66 | -.49 | -8.19** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.09 | .33 | -.02 | -.28 |
| **Step 2** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .18 | .95 | .02 | .19 |
| Target Partners | -6.11 | .88 | -.55 | -6.93** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.50 | .53 | -.09 | -.95 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.57 | 1.33 | .12 | 1.18 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | 1.00 | .69 | .12 | 1.46 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | -.03 | .68 | -.00 | -.05 |
| **Step 3** | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.03 | .96 | -.00 | -.03 |
| Target Partners | -6.07 | .88 | -.54 | -6.88** |
| Partner Avoidance | -.20 | .58 | -.04 | -.34 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.65 | 1.33 | .13 | 1.24 |
| Target Sex × Partner Avoidance | -.03 | 1.06 | .00 | -.03 |
| Target Partners × Partner Avoidance | -.74 | .88 | -.10 | -.84 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | 1.77 | 1.39 | .17 | 1.27 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 29

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on popularity scale as a function of anxiety with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .40 | .48 | .06 | .84 |
| Target Partners | .13 | .47 | .02 | .26 |
| Partner Anxiety | -.34 | .24 | -1.0 | -1.43 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .26 | .68 | .04 | .39 |
| Target Partners | -.09 | .64 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Partner Anxiety | -1.03 | .37 | -.29 | -2.76** |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .66 | .96 | .08 | .69 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .55 | .50 | .09 | 1.10 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | 1.05 | .48 | .21 | 2.20* |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .26 | .68 | .04 | .38 |
| Target Partners | -.09 | .64 | -.01 | -.14 |
| Partner Anxiety | -1.04 | .41 | -.29 | -2.54* |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | .66 | .96 | .08 | .69 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .58 | .71 | .10 | .81 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | 1.08 | .60 | .21 | 1.78 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | -.06 | 1.00 | -.01 | -.06 |

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

Table 30

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on success scale as a function of anxiety with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.41 | .46 | -.06 | -.89 |
| Target Partners | -1.44 | .46 | -.20 | -3.11** |
| Partner Anxiety | -1.7 | .23 | -.05 | -.72 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.19 | .67 | -.03 | -.29 |
| Target Partners | -1.51 | .63 | -.21 | -2.4* |
| Partner Anxiety | -.47 | .36 | -.13 | -1.29 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.06 | .94 | -.01 | -.07 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | -.52 | .49 | -.09 | -1.07 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | 1.00 | .47 | .20 | 2.13* |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.19 | .67 | -.03 | -.29 |
| Target Partners | -1.51 | .63 | -.21 | -2.39* |
| Partner Anxiety | -.45 | .40 | -.13 | -1.12 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.06 | .94 | -.01 | -.07 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | -.58 | .69 | -.10 | -.83 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | .96 | .59 | .19 | 1.62 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | .11 | .97 | .01 | .11 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 31

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on intelligence scale as a function of anxiety with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .36 | .29 | .08 | 1.21 |
| Target Partners | -1.52 | .29 | -.33 | -5.24** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.03 | .15 | -.01 | -.22 |
| **Step 2** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .51 | .42 | .11 | 1.21 |
| Target Partners | -1.42 | .40 | -.31 | -3.55** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.25 | .23 | -.11 | -1.09 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.19 | .60 | -.03 | -.31 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .14 | .31 | .04 | .45 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | .33 | .30 | .10 | 1.10 |
| **Step 3** | | | | |
| Target Sex | .51 | .42 | .11 | 1.20 |
| Target Partners | -1.43 | .40 | -.31 | -3.56** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.32 | .25 | -.14 | -1.24 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | -.18 | .60 | -.03 | -.31 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .32 | .44 | .09 | .74 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | .46 | .38 | .14 | 1.23 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | -.37 | .62 | -.07 | -.59 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 32

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

*anxiety with the partner*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .96 | .66 | .09 | 1.47 |
| Target Partners | -5.42 | .65 | -.49 | -8.32** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.15 | .33 | -.03 | -.47 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.04 | .95 | .00 | -.05 |
| Target Partners | -6.11 | .89 | -.55 | -6.85** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.17 | .52 | -.03 | -.32 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.84 | 1.33 | .14 | 1.38 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .80 | .69 | .09 | 1.16 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | -.40 | .67 | -.05 | -.60 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.04 | .95 | .00 | -.04 |
| Target Partners | -6.09 | .89 | -.55 | -6.82** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.06 | .57 | -.01 | -.11 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.84 | 1.34 | .14 | 1.38 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .48 | .99 | .05 | .49 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | -.63 | .84 | -.08 | -.75 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Avoidance | .63 | 1.38 | .05 | .45 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Table 33

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

*anxiety with mother in females only*

| Effect | *B* | *SE* | *β* | *t* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | 1.09 | .64 | .10 | 1.69 |
| Target Partners | -5.42 | .64 | -.49 | -8.49** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.40 | .32 | -.07 | -1.25 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .09 | .92 | .01 | .10 |
| Target Partners | -6.26 | .85 | -.56 | -7.39** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.66 | .54 | -.12 | -1.22 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.95 | 1.28 | .15 | 1.52 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .87 | .65 | .10 | 1.35 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | -.16 | .64 | -.02 | -.25 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .07 | .92 | .01 | .07 |
| Target Partners | -6.25 | .85 | -.56 | -7.38** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.40 | .62 | -.07 | -.65 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.96 | 1.28 | .15 | 1.53 |
| Target Sex × Mother Anxiety | .20 | .98 | .02 | .21 |
| Target Partners × Mother Anxiety | -.64 | .83 | -.09 | -.77 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Anxiety | 1.19 | 1.31 | .10 | .91 |

*p < .05   **p < .01

Table 34

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as a function of avoidance with mother in females only*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | 1.18 | .64 | .11 | 1.85 |
| Target Partners | -5.37 | .63 | -.48 | -8.47** |
| Mother Avoidance | -.68 | .32 | -.12 | -2.14* |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .26 | .92 | .02 | .28 |
| Target Partners | -.61 | .85 | -.55 | -7.22** |
| Mother Avoidance | -1.19 | .63 | -.21 | -1.874 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.80 | 1.28 | .14 | 1.41 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | .83 | .65 | .11 | 1.23 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | .15 | .65 | .02 | .23 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .20 | .92 | .02 | .22 |
| Target Partners | -6.19 | .85 | -.55 | -7.29** |
| Mother Anxiety | -.59 | .80 | -.11 | -.74 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.83 | 1.28 | .14 | 1.43 |
| Target Sex × Mother Avoidance | -.12 | 1.01 | -.02 | -.12 |
| Target Partners × Mother Avoidance | -.75 | .98 | -.10 | -.77 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Mother Avoidance | 1.62 | 1.31 | .15 | 1.23 |

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

Table 35

*Summary of Regression Analyses: Predicting evaluative score on values scale as a function of anxiety with romantic partner in males only*

| Effect | B | SE | β | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Target Sex | .96 | .66 | .09 | 1.47 |
| Target Partners | -5.42 | .65 | -.49 | -8.32** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.15 | .33 | -.03 | -.47 |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.04 | .95 | .00 | -.05 |
| Target Partners | -6.12 | .89 | -.55 | -6.85** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.17 | .52 | -.03 | -.32 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.84 | 1.33 | .14 | 1.38 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .80 | .69 | .09 | 1.16 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | -.40 | .67 | -.05 | -.60 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| Target Sex | -.04 | .95 | .00 | -.04 |
| Target Partners | -6.09 | .89 | -.55 | -6.82** |
| Partner Anxiety | -.06 | .57 | -.01 | -.11 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner | 1.84 | 1.34 | .14 | 1.38 |
| Target Sex × Partner Anxiety | .48 | .99 | .05 | .49 |
| Target Partners × Partner Anxiety | -.63 | .84 | -.08 | -.75 |
| Target Sex × Target Partner × Partner Anxiety | .63 | 1.38 | .05 | .45 |

*p < .05    **p < .01

Appendix A

*Facebook personality quiz results page*

Participants were randomly assigned to view one of four purported results pages from a

personality quiz said to be administered on Facebook: That of a female with 12 sexual partners, a

female with 1 sexual partner, a male with 12 sexual partners, or a male with 1 sexual partner. In

this example, results regarding number of partners are italicized for emphasis.


Female Target/12 Sexual Partners Example

**Demographics:**
Sex: *Female*
Age: 19
Ethnicity: White

**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 12 sexual 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.*

Appendix B

*Evaluative statements*

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

| Subscale: Popularity | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly 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 Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly 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 |

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly 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 Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly 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 |

*Note:* Participants did not see these statements broken down into subscales. They were listed as one questionnaire, with no dividers between the subscales. The order of the subscales was counterbalanced.