

Running head: IMPACT OF SEXUAL HISTORY

Impact of Sexual History on Perceptions of Men and Women

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation  
*with research distinction* in Psychology in the undergraduate colleges of The Ohio State University  
by

Trisha Kick

The Ohio State University Mansfield  
April 2013

Project Advisor: Dr. Terri Fisher, Department of Psychology

### Abstract

These two studies incorporated a different approach to researching the sexual double standard through the use of a video medium. The participants in the first study consisted of 98 General Psychology students ages 18-25; 52 men and 54 women. The second study had 190 General Psychology students ages 18-25; 80 men and 110 women. Participants watched one of four possible videos in which the interviewee revealed different levels of sexual activity. Afterwards they were given a sentence fragment completion task to test for priming effects from the videos and were asked to complete measures to evaluate the interviewee and views of individuals' personal characters. In the second study the participants were also asked to complete a list experiment task. The goal of both studies was to determine whether the traditional sexual double standard is prominent in today's young adults and if it affects how they view others. While these two studies were unable to find evidence in support of the double standard, researchers are still finding mixed results. It is hoped that these new methodologies can eventually aid in the study of the double standard.

### Impact of Sexual History on Perceptions of Men and Women

The sexual double standard, which is the idea of members of one gender being judged more severely than members of the other based on their sexual behavior, has been a topic of interest for researchers for at least the past forty years. The original sexual double standard rewarded men for their sexual experience and penalized women for the same behavior (Crawford & Popp, 2003). Women were seen negatively for participating in any sexual activity outside of marriage (Crawford & Popp, 2003). If women participated in premarital sex, they were seen as promiscuous and easy (Crawford & Popp, 2003). One of the early studies conducted by Reiss (1964) found that a significant number of college men considered premarital sex acceptable for males but not acceptable for females.

Several years after the Reiss study, a newer modification to the current sexual double standard arose, with women being permitted to engage in sexual activity if they are in a committed relationship (Sprecher, McKinney, & Orbuch, 1987). What length of time is considered a committed relationship? According to Sprecher and Hatfield (1996) the double standard was endorsed when men and women were dating less than a month. According to their study, the participants viewed this length of time as a casual relationship. The same study found that the double standard did not exist when men and women dated for approximately a year; the participants viewed this as serious relationship.

Cohen and Shotland (1996) conducted a study using 138 female and 104 male introductory psychology students with the objective of finding out when people believed the timing of first sexual experience should happen in a relationship. They found that men believed that coitus should happen by their third or fourth date, and those men see this to be socially appropriate. The average woman, in contrast, found first intercourse to be appropriate at the

twelfth to fourteenth date (Cohen & Shotland, 1996). Does the double standard influence women's perceptions of what is seen to be the appropriate time for first coitus? In the Sprecher and Hatfield (1996) research, women were seen not to be affected by the double standard when they were in the serious relationship stage. In comparing women's perceived timing of coitus to the results of Cohen and Shotland's (1996) research, it makes sense for women to believe the coitus should happen later since the double standard does not seem to affect women in serious relationships.

Nevertheless, even with the modification of the sexual double standard, Milhausen and Herold (2001) found 67 percent of women and 35 percent of men believed that men are awarded greater sexual freedom. In addition, Marks (2002) found in an Internet survey that 85 percent of respondents believed that women are afforded less sexual freedom than men. Furthermore, Milhausen and Herold (1999) found that 93 percent of women believed that they were judged more severely for their sexual activities. In a more recent study, Sakaluk and Milhausen (2012) found support for the existence of the double standard through the use of a questionnaire.

If Sakaluk and Milhausen (2012) were able to prove the existence of the double standard through the use of a questionnaire, why are other researchers having trouble establishing that a double standard exists? A study conducted by Fisher (2009) found that even an overheard conversation can have a profound effect on willingness to report certain behaviors. Society has long played a role in what is acceptable in the world of dating and sexual relationships. Take for example gender; according to Milnes (2010), women tend to draw upon cultural narratives in order to justify sexual behavior. When conforming to these cultural narratives (Milnes, 2010) women are placing themselves as passive respondents to male sexuality. When comparing Milnes' (2010) research to that of Alexander and Fisher's (2003) bogus pipeline research, it is understandable that women's responses would change when hooked up to a version of polygraph

that was believed to be functional. Alexander and Fisher (2003) found when women were in the bogus pipeline condition, they reported approximately the same number of sexual partners as men. Those women that were in the exposure threat condition (having been led to believe that the research assistant might see their responses) reported fewer sexual partners than men. When participants are reporting their behaviors about sexuality, it is important to take into consideration how gendered behavior is perceived in our society.

How does the sexual double standard influence the perception of young adults in American culture? In what way does the modern-day stereotype affect our sexual behavior? In the area of casual sex, Marks and Miller (1986) found women who participated in casual sex were perceived as being less agreeable and more sexual than their comparable male counterparts. Through the use of vignette characters, O'Sullivan (1995) established that participants rated both the male and female vignette characters with a higher number of sexual partners more negatively than those with a lower number of partners. The existing research suggests that social pressure for women to behave in a particular way affects their sexual behavior. This leads us to believe that the number of sexual partners plays a role in enhancing negative perceptions of women in American culture. According to Jonason and Fisher (2008), provided that men and women are heterosexual, theoretically they should have the same number of life time partners. Then why does it seem that women are affected more when reporting their sexual behaviors and histories? Jonason and Fisher (2008) believe that it is not the gender of the individual that effects reporting sexual partners; it is the amount of prestige that one gets from having numerous sexual partners. Clark and Hatfield (1989) found that women did not view sexual activity as very prestigious because men are so willing to participate, whereas men found it more prestigious due to the challenge of getting women to participate. Jonason (2007) found that the higher the sexual success, the greater status men receive among other men. This led Jonason and Fisher (2008) to

the conclusion that men and women have some degree of dishonesty in the reporting of their sexual behavior due to different beliefs in the prestige due to sexual success, resulting in illusory differences.

Past research in this area has been limited. However, there are several researchers who have studied the timing of sexual appropriateness and also the stigmas that come with sexual promiscuity. For example, Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) looked at the effects that the double bind theory played on gendered sexuality in young adults. What Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) called the double bind theory is the idea that hookups protect advantaged women (women who have powerful and successful jobs) from relationships; however the double standard gives men more control over the terms of the hookups. They found that hookups make sexual activity available without hurting women's careers, but the double standard gives the women a negative image for participating. Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) brought up the idea that pressure to internalize suitable gendered behavior and the effect of indulging in such behavior brings about a social stigma. For instance, while the double standard allows men to have greater power in the way of hooking up, women are left with feelings of dishonor for participating in sexual activity outside of a committed relationship (Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009).

The phenomenon of hooking up certainly leads to people having strong opinions about the participating individuals. Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) stated that with the help of media and the over-exploitation of hooking up on college campuses, hooking up has become institutionalized (Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009). Needless to say, gender plays a role in views of hooking up. Men were not as negatively affected by hookups as women were. Women who participate in casual hook ups are seen in a negative and degrading manner. Conley, Ziegler and Moors (2012) also found that women were stigmatized for participating in casual sex and that the idea of a possible backlash plays a role in their decision making process as to whether or not to

engage in casual sex. The media plays a significant role in the over-exploitation of the sexual double standard (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Conversely researchers Lyons, Giordano, Manning, and Longmore (2011) found that a young woman's group of friends can serve as a protective shield from the negative views and terms associated with sexual behavior.

It is certainly intriguing that researchers are having trouble proving a double standard exists when Americans believe there is a double standard in our culture (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Even though most people acknowledge a double standard exists, research has been unable to consistently find support for it. A study conducted by Bettor, Hendrick, and Hendrick (1995) found little evidence that men were afforded greater sexual freedom than women. When Sprecher (1989) compared 20 different target groups using a modification to the Reiss Scale, the study failed to demonstrate the sexual double standard existed as well. Marks and Fraley (2005) believe one reason the research is unable to prove its existence is the fact that questions are being asked regarding both genders in a back-to-back sequence. It would be better suited to conduct the surveys regarding each gender at two separate points in time. It is believed that participants may try to answer questions based on what the researcher or society believes to be proper gendered behavior. Past research also only focused on how the number of sexual partners related to the sexual double standard (Milhausen & Herold, 2001). Mihausen and Herold (2001) also looked at how if one uses a broader definition of sexual freedom, men are afforded more freedom than women. Past researchers such as Marks and Fraley (2005) stated that one potential problem can be that the participants are giving information that they feel is consistent with the social norm.

Another problem is that participants may want to answer in what is seen as the politically correct manner. Sakaluk and Milhausen (2012) made use of the Implicit Association Test (IAT) to try a new approach to proving that the sexual double standard exists. The use of the IAT prevents people from thinking about their answers because they have to react quickly (Sakaluk &

Milhausen, 2012). One fatal flaw in the Sakaluk and Milhausen (2012) study was it did not actually test for the double standard. Rather, the authors used seven sex positive and seven sex negative words, which does not confirm the existence of a sexual double standard. The use of the IAT is a wonderful addition to sex research, however we need to figure out a way to effectively use it to test for the sexual double standard. There are several possible circumstances that could have affected the information I collected from the participants, one being the participants are not answering the questions openly and honestly. Another area of concern is the order in which the material is presented to the participants. For example, Marks and Fraley (2005) found that if the participants are asked to rate the appropriateness of sexual activities of one gender immediately followed by the other gender, it will affect the study results. Marks and Fraley (2005) believe that another area that influences sexual double standard research is the fact that researchers are not differentiating participants' personal attitudes from the evaluations. They believe that attitudes relate to social norms, whereas evaluations are real life judgments of the individuals. In other words, while we may find things to be socially inappropriate for others, that does not mean we hold ourselves to those same standards. The studies reported here were designed to help to confirm the effect that social norms have on our perceptions.

In order to achieve my projected results, I needed to be extremely careful with the order in which I presented the video and survey information so that I did not affect the participants' views. This helped me to achieve an unbiased assessment from the participants. For the researcher, this helped insure the best results in finding evidence to support a sexual double standard in American culture. Researchers also have to be cautious of people presenting false information, thus making it important to eliminate as many confounds as possible (Marks & Fraley, 2005).

The purpose of the present studies was to correct some of the methodological shortcomings of previous studies in order to document that in 2012, there is still a sexual double standard that influences the perception of individuals as a function of their gender and their sexual behavior. In order to try and prevent people from presenting false information, I used four separate scenarios for the videos. The idea is that, through the use of media, participants' minds will become engaged in what they are viewing and will not have time to think of the politically correct answer, thus giving the researcher a more open and honest opinion. The use of visual media was intended to demonstrate that we all endorse some degree of the double standard even though we might not mean to. The video medium added the feel of our everyday lives and helped relate the information to the participants by keeping them engaged in the scenario they watched. Each video had the same basic components, with the only difference being the level of sexual experience of the depicted individuals. The participants only saw one of the four videos in order to avoid an order effect. As I manipulated the variables of the hypothetical person, it was believed that in the promiscuous condition, the positive perception of the female target would decrease, while there would be no such effect on her male counterpart. I used a variety of measures to evaluate the differences in the views of acceptable activity for both genders in order to find statistical support for the idea that the sexual double standard continues to exist in American culture. I also made use of the word fragment completion task (Roediger & Blaxton, 1987) in order to test for priming effects from the videos.

I initially planned to do one study in order to test my hypotheses on the sexual double standard. After the completion of Study 1, I found that the levels of sexual experience were not drastic enough in order to try and prove my hypothesis. This led to the creation of my second study to expand on aspects of the first study which needed enhanced in order to seek better results.

## Study 1

I hypothesized that the woman in the promiscuous video would be rated more negatively than the promiscuous male target, as designated by a significant interaction between sex of target and condition. It is possible that the man in the non-promiscuous video would be viewed more harshly due to the belief that men should be more sexually experienced. In comparison, the non-promiscuous female target should be rated more positively, having conformed to society's sexual ideals for women.

### Method

#### *Participants*

Participants in this study were found using convenience sampling, which included 52 male and 54 female General Psychology students, who are enrolled at The Ohio State University Mansfield. These individuals received credit for participating in the study. Each group showing of the video was randomly assigned to one of the four video conditions. Only data from students between the ages of 18-25 were analyzed, in order to reduce heterogeneity for the statistical analysis.

#### *Instruments and Materials*

A video depicting a college student being interviewed about life after high school was used. The target characters were asked questions about how their lives have changed now that they are in college. The interview also touched on their sexual behaviors. All four of the videos were basically the same. In two of the videos there was a young woman being interviewed. The only difference between videos one and two was the answers to the sexual behavior questions. In the non-promiscuous condition, the target character indicated that she had only one sexual partner in high school and two serious boyfriends whereas in the promiscuous condition, she indicated that she had 10 sexual partners in high school and numerous boyfriends. During the

interviews the interviewees were also asked if he/she had ever had a one night stand. In the non-promiscuous condition he/she indicated they had experienced this one time. In the promiscuous condition he/she indicated “too many times to count.” All other areas of questioning remained the same. The other two videos had a young male interviewee, again with the only difference being his answers to the sexual behavior questions. Both the promiscuous man and woman had the same answers for sexual behavior questions. For all videos, the interviewees’ clothing and hair styles remained the same. This helped to keep all things constant and to prevent any bias. The goal of the videos was to serve as a prime and subconsciously draw out participants’ true beliefs about people who are highly promiscuous. Participants completed the Glick and Fiske (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Cronbach’s alpha for Hostile sexism was .86 and Cronbach’s alpha for Benevolent sexism was .83), which consisted of 22 items (11 items were related to the benevolent sexism scale and 11 items for the hostile sexism subscale in which respondents rated their degree of agreement on a scale of 0-5 (0= *disagree strongly*; 5= *agree strongly*). The benevolent sexism scale evaluates how the participants feel about women who conform to traditional gender roles. If a person scores high in benevolent sexism, they would agree with statements such as “Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for women in their lives.” On the other hand, the hostile sexism scale evaluates if the participant has a negative attitude towards women. An example from the hostile sexism subscale would be “Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for equality.” If a participant were to score high in hostile sexism, he/she would rate this statement as “strongly agree.” This scale was used to evaluate participants’ views on men’s and women’s roles in relationships within our society. A Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) with a Cronbach’s alpha of .76 was used to assess the sexual behavior and attitudes of the participants (these 9

questions were on a scale). A sample question from the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory is “I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.” Also a Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hogben, McGowan, & Dawson, 1998), was used which yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .83. This scale consisted of 19 questions with a scale ranging from 1 to 6 (1= *strongly disagree*; 6 = *strongly agree*) which looked at the relationships between men and women. Sample questions from the Hypergender Ideology Scale are “A true man knows how to command others” and “Women don’t mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.” They also rated their perceptions of the target individuals by means of a semantic differential evaluation (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958) which yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .75. The semantic differential was important to the study by serving as a means to evaluate the participant’s perceptions of the target individuals. This scale made use of 42 word terms which resulted in 21 pairs. The words were paired up and the participants had to rate which word that they felt the individual in the videos that they had watched best represented. For example the participants would see the terms “Bad” on one side of the page and “Good” on the other with a scale in between (-2 = *very*, -1 = *somewhat*, 0 = *neither/nor*, and on the other side 1= *somewhat*, 2 = *very*) I also made use of a modified version of Tulving, Schacter, and Stark’s (1982) word fragment completion task to test for priming effects from the videos. The word fragment task consisted of a list of twenty-two partially filled-in words that could be completed to make a sex-negative word or an arbitrary word. Once the task was complete, I evaluated how many sex-negative words the participants came up with having followed watching the videos. For example \_ I M B O could be either BIMBO or LIMBO and T R A \_ \_ could be TRAMP or TRACK. This was used to test if the video primed the participants to think negatively when filling out the other parts of the questionnaire.

### *Procedure*

Participants were tested in classrooms in group sizes ranging from 10 to 20. Each group watched one of four possible videos. The participants only saw one of four videos to prevent any bias in the results provided by the participants. Following the video, each participant was provided with a questionnaire packet containing the aforementioned scales and measures.

I informed the students that they would be answering questions about their impressions of a person based on the particular interview. The participants were informed that to protect their privacy, no one other than the researcher would see these results. The participants were advised that when they finished with each individual survey, they should put their papers in the locked box sitting at the front of the room. They were assured the only person with a key was the researcher conducting the studies. I informed the students that, if at any point in the video or survey they were uncomfortable answering any of the questions, they could either skip the question or quit and still receive full participation credit. Afterwards there was a debriefing to inform the participants of the true purpose of the study.

### Results

Results of a 2x2x2 ANOVA, with the three variables of sex of subject, sex of target, and condition type (non-promiscuous or promiscuous) revealed no significant main effects of sex of target or interactions for either negative words on the semantic differential evaluation or negative sexual terms on the word fragment task. The analysis for the semantic differential did reveal marginal significance for a main effect of sex of subject,  $F(1, 104) = 3.65, p < .001, \eta^2 = .034$ , with the female participants reporting more negative terms,  $M = 3.81$  ( $SD = 4.0$ ) than the male participants,  $M = 2.27$  ( $SD = 4.03$ ). The Sociosexual Orientation Inventory also revealed a main effect of sex of subject,  $F(1, 106) = 23.93, p < .001, \eta^2 = .18$ , with the male participants scoring higher on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory,  $M = 33.17$  ( $SD = 12.70$ ) than the women,  $M = 22.47$  ( $SD = 21.39$ ).

## Discussion

Unfortunately, Study 1 did not yield any significant findings to demonstrate the existence of the sexual double standard. While I did not find evidence to support my hypothesis, I did find some marginal statistical significance. The study did find that men made much higher scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory, indicating more positive attitudes toward casual sex. The evaluation of the semantic differential revealed that the women regardless of which condition they watched, were reporting more negative terms towards both the male and female interviewees. One possible reason for the women in the study having evaluated the interviewees more negatively is the fact that in all conditions the interviewees admitted to some form of sexual behavior outside of marriage. It could also be that women are more critical of people and the behaviors that the interviewees admitted to. This leads into the idea of the traditional stereotype that women are seen as more moral and would judge people harsher for immoral behavior.

The lack of significant interactions suggests that perhaps the manipulation was not extreme enough. That is, perhaps there was not enough difference in the levels of sexual experience reported by target characters in the two conditions. By changing the manipulation this should result in a clearer distinction between the conditions as it pertains to the sexual behavior of the target characters. In my study, I also never came out and asked the participants if they endorsed the double standard. Only indirect measures were used, which can be seen as a strength of the study. In order to make the study even stronger a list experiment was added to the second study. This led to the need to expand on the first study by developing a second study to further research and formulate a clearer explanation for these findings.

## Study 2

The goal of Study 2 was to determine if the sexual double standard influences perceptions of men and women differently as a function of their level of sexual activity and to correct some

of the methodological shortcomings of the previous study. One area that I improved upon was a clearer distinction between the promiscuous condition and the non-promiscuous condition. This was necessary in order to make a solid distinction between the sexual behavior between the promiscuous and non-promiscuous condition. This would prevent those who might believe that even having one casual sexual experience is promiscuous. For this study, in the non-promiscuous condition (now called “inexperienced”) both the male and female interviewees revealed they had no sexual experience compared to the promiscuous condition they revealed 10 partners and numerous one night stands.

I hypothesized for Study 2, the woman in the promiscuous video would be rated more negatively than the promiscuous male target, as designated by a significant interaction between sex of target and condition. It is possible that the man in the inexperienced video may be viewed more harshly due to the belief that men should be more sexually experienced. In comparison, the inexperienced woman should be rated more positively having conformed to society’s sexual ideals for women.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants in this study were found using convenience sampling, which included 190 students from The Ohio State University Mansfield of which 80 were males and 110 were females. These individuals were General Psychology students who received credit for participating in the study. The groups were randomly assigned as to which one of the four video conditions they were in. Only data from students between the ages of 18-25 were analyzed, in order to reduce heterogeneity for the statistical analysis.

### *Instruments and Materials*

In this study, the e condition was modified in the video depicting a college student being interviewed about life after high school. The interview in this study had more contrast in the target's sexual behaviors. All four of the videos were basically the same as the previous study, with the exception of the non-promiscuous (inexperienced) condition. In those two videos the male and female targets revealed that they were virgins in the interview. The promiscuous condition remained the same with the target character indicating that he/she had 10 sexual partners in high school and numerous boyfriends. During the interviews the interviewees were also asked if he/she had ever had a one night stand. In the inexperienced condition he/she indicated they had not. In the promiscuous condition he/she indicated "too many times to count." All other areas of questioning remained the same in both studies. In this study I did not use the same individuals as targets as were used in the first study. However, all other things were kept constant as with the first study. Again with this study the videos were used to serve as a priming device in order to subconsciously draw out participants' true beliefs about people's sexual behavior. The second study also included the addition of a list experiment.

The list experiment (Blair & Imai, 2012) that the participants completed was one of two versions. In the first version, the participants were to indicate out of a list of three statements, how many of the behaviors upset them. In the second version, participants were asked out of four statements how many of the behaviors upset them. The fourth question that was added to the list experiment was one of a sexual double-standard nature. The fourth questions were added to various positions among the statements, in order to prevent the sexual behavior questions always being the forth statement. An example of the ambiguous statement that might upset someone is "People who don't have any money but have smartphones" and a double-standard statement for example is "Women who brag about the number of men they have had sex with."

All of the measures from Study 1 were used, including the Glick and Fiske (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Benevolent sexism had a Cronbach's alpha of .80 and Hostile sexism had a Cronbach's alpha of .82.) , the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .85, the Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hogben, McGowan, & Dawson, 1998) with a Cronbach's alpha of .82, the word fragment completion task (Tulving, Schacter, & Stark, 1982), and the semantic differential evaluation (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958) which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .80.

### *Procedure*

Participants were tested in classrooms in group sizes ranging from 10 to 20. Each group watched one of four possible videos. The participants only saw one of the videos to prevent any bias in the results provided by the participants. Following the video, each participant was provided with a questionnaire packet containing the aforementioned scales and measures.

I informed the students that they would be answering questions about their impressions of a person based on the particular interview. The participants were informed that to protect their privacy, no one other than the researcher would see these results. The participants were advised that when they finished with each individual survey, they should put their papers in the locked box sitting at the front of the room. They were assured the only person with a key was the researcher conducting the studies. I informed the students that, if at any point in the video or survey they were uncomfortable answering any of the questions, they could either skip the question or quit and still receive full participation credit. Afterwards there was a debriefing to inform the participants of the true purpose of the study.

### *Results*

Results of a 2x2x2 ANOVA, with the three variables of sex of subject, sex of target, and condition type (inexperienced or promiscuous) revealed no significant interactions for negative

words on the semantic differential evaluation, negative sexual terms on the word fragment task, Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, or the list experiment, thus once again failing to support the hypotheses. For the semantic differential, a main effect of condition was revealed,  $F(1, 175) = 19.84, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$ , with those in promiscuous condition rating the target significantly more negatively regardless of gender. For the promiscuous condition,  $M = 1.37 (SD = 3.88)$  and for non-promiscuous,  $M = 4.17 (SD = 4.38)$ . The Sociosexual Orientation Inventory also revealed a main effect of sex of subject,  $F(1, 181) = 32.60, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$ , with the male participants scoring higher on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory,  $M = 29.26 (SD = 14.25)$ , than the women,  $M = 18.68 (SD = 10.68)$ . The list experiment also revealed an interesting finding with the gender of the participant playing a role,  $F(1, 179) = 11.37, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$ , with the female participants revealing they were slightly upset with women who do not follow appropriate female sexual behavior (for women  $M = 7.04 (SD = 1.95)$ ; for men,  $M = 6.08 (SD = 1.80)$ ).

### Discussion

Even after increasing the difference in sexual experience between the targets in the promiscuous and non-promiscuous conditions, this study did not yield any significant findings to support the existence of the double standard. The study did however reveal that the video did have an effect on the response of the participants, even though it was not what I was looking for. The promiscuous interviewee was viewed more negatively, which helped to show that the manipulation had an effect. The reason I did find an effect with the promiscuous condition is because I did not ask the participants to rate the behavior of the interviewee, but to make characteristic judgments, such as good versus bad. That way the participants were not consciously judging just the interviewees' sexual behavior. The study also found that men had much higher scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory, indicating more positive attitudes toward casual sex as compared to women.

It is possible that with a little more fine tuning of the questions asked in the list experiment, that measure may have yielded significant results. When reevaluating the questions asked in the list experiment, more significant questions could have been used to relate more to the participants' age group. For example, some of the questions that were asked to evaluate the double standard were geared more towards an older age group. The questions should have been based more on things that bother college students in order to get a more accurate picture. With the surveys that had the sexual behavior questions, those questions needed to be more focused and only apply to women's behavior.

### General Discussion

While neither study yielded results in support of the hypotheses, these two studies implemented the use of a different medium to help study the double standard. It is possible that with a little more time to more deeply develop the video used and the use of a more realistic scenario, there might have been a larger priming effect on the participants. Should a third study be conducted, a short video of students talking to one another about their alleged sexual behavior may be more successful than the interview tactic used in the two previous studies.

The foremost important goal of these two studies was to clearly document that the double standard still exists and that it affects the perception of women relative to men. Unfortunately, even Study 2 did not yield any significant results in favor of supporting the sexual double standard. Both studies did reveal that the female participants tended to rate the interviewees more negatively with the use of the semantic differential evaluation. In Study 1, the female participants rated both the promiscuous and the non-promiscuous conditions more negatively. Whereas in Study 2 it was the promiscuous condition that all participants rated significantly more negatively, likely because in the inexperienced condition, the interviewee revealed no sexual experience as compared to the promiscuous condition that revealed sexual behavior. I also found similar

findings with the list experiment where the female participants rated women who were more sexual or bragged about their sexuality more negatively by expressing that it upset them. It seems as though women will rate other women more negatively for being sexually active when looking at the results of the list experiment and the semantic differential results from Study 1. This is an interesting area for further study.

Another possible issue between the two studies which may have had an effect on the results of the studies was the fact we used different people in the interviews. What this means is that I used a different male and female target in Study 1 than I used in Study 2. This could be seen as a possible confound between the two studies. It may be that the participants judged the female target in Study 1 more harshly than the female target in Study 2. Although the information that the interview targets presented in both studies was the same, the physical appearance was obviously different and could have had an effect when I compare the two studies to one another.

Another possible reason I did not find our projected results was the fact that college students might not be the right age group to use for participants. It would be interesting to study adults between the ages of 25-35 years old. The reasoning behind an older age group is the fact that as people mature, they are more likely to have solid views how they feel about sensitive issues. When people are eighteen and just entering college, their views are likely to change before they graduate (Marcia, 1966).

Even though these two studies did not find evidence of the sexual double standard, it is important to recognize when it comes to sexuality, the double standard is affecting young American women, whether it is due to their gender or religious background. It is hoped that by incorporating a different methodology into future research, evidence will be found that the sexual double standard continues to exist and affects perceptions of men and women as a function of

their degree of sexual activity. While this study was unable to find supporting evidence for the double standard, researchers are still finding mixed results. It is hoped that these methodologies applied in this new way can eventually aid in the study of the double standard.

## References

- Alexander, M. G., & Fisher, T. D. (2003). Truth and consequences: Using the bogus pipeline to examine sex differences in self-reported sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 27-35.
- Bettor, L., Hendrick, S. S. & Hendrick, C. (1995). Gender and sexual standards in dating relationships. *Personal Relationships, 2*, 359-369.
- Blair, G. & Imai, K. (2012). Statistical analysis of list experiments. *Political Analysis, 20*, 47-77.
- Clark III, R.D., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2*, 39-55.
- Cohen, L. L., & Shotland, R. L. (1996). Timing of first sexual intercourse in a relationship: expectations, experiences, and perceptions of others. *The Journal of Sex Research, 33*, 291-299.
- Conley, T. D., Ziegler, A., & Moors, A. (2012). Backlash from the bedroom: stigma mediates gender differences in acceptance of casual sex offers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1*-16.
- Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 13-26.
- Fisher, T. D. (2009). The impact of socially conveyed norms on the reporting of sexual behavior and attitudes by men and women. *The Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 45*, 567-572.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.
- Hamberger, M. E., Hogben, M., McGowan, S., & Dawson, L. J. (1998). Hypergender

- ideology scale. In C. M. Davis, W. L. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 287-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society*, 23, 589-616.
- Jonason, P.K. (2007). A mediation hypothesis to account for the gender difference in reported number of sexual partners: An intrasexual competition approach. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 19, 41-49.
- Jonason, P. K., & Fisher, T. D. (2008). The power of prestige: why young men report having more sex partners than young women. *Sex Roles*, 60, 151-159.
- Lyons, H., Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2011). Identity, peer relationships, and adolescent girl's sexual behavior: an exploration of the contemporary double standard. *Journal of Sex Research*, 48, 437-449.
- Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B., (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 95, 1113-1135.
- Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 551-558.
- Marks, M. J. (2002). [Internet survey of attitudes of sexual freedom.] Unpublished raw data.
- 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). Conformation bias and the sexual double standard. *Sex Roles*, 54, 19-26.

- Marks, M. M., & Miller, M. L. (1986). The effects of sexual permissiveness, target gender, subject gender, and attitude toward women on social perception: In search of the double standard. *Sex Roles, 15*, 311-322
- Milhausen, R.R., & Herold, E. S. (1999). Does the sexual double standard still exist? Perceptions of university women. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 361-368.
- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (2001). Reconceptualizing the sexual double standard. *The Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 13*, 63-83.
- Milnes, K. (2010). Challenging the sexual double standard: Constructing sexual equality narratives as a strategy of resistance. *Feminism & Psychology, 20*, 255-259.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957) *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press
- O'Sullivan, L. F. (1995). The effects of sexual experience on judgments of men's and women's personality characteristics and relationship desirability. *Sex Roles, 33*, 159-181.
- Reiss, I. L. (1964). The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 26*, 188-198.
- Roediger III, H. L., & Blaxton, T. A. (1987). Effects of varying modality, surface features, and retention interval on priming in word-fragment completion. *Memory & Cognition, 15*, 379-388.
- Sakaluk, J. K., & Milhausen, R. R. (2012). Factors influencing university students' explicit and implicit sexual double standards. *Journal of Sex Research, 49*, 464-476.
- Sprecher, S. (1989). Premarital sexual standards for different categories of individuals. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 232-248.

Sprecher, S., & Hatfield, E. (1996). Premarital sexual standards among U.S. college students:

Comparison with Russian and Japanese students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 25, 261-288.

Sprecher, S., McKinney, K., & Orbach, T. L. (1987). Has the double standard disappeared? An

experimental test. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 24-31.

Tulving, E., Schacter, D. L., & Stark, H. A. (1982). Priming effects in word-fragment completion

are independent of recognition memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Memory, Learning, and Cognition*, 8, 336-342.

Table 1

Study 1 Means and Standard Deviations for Major Variables Grouped by Gender, Target, and Condition

Variables	Non-promiscuous Female						Promiscuous Female						Non-promiscuous Male						Promiscuous Male					
	Male			Female			Male			Female			Male			Female			Male			Female		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Fragment Words	3.15	3.8	13	5.00	2.92	17	2.44	4.97	16	4.36	3.01	11	2.82	3.16	11	2.22	4.60	9	1.00	3.16	15	3.05	4.74	20
SOI-R	25.50	10.85	14	20.18	6.21	17	20.38	4.86	16	23.83	10.53	12	31.36	11.57	11	32.33	9.26	9	36.93	16.54	15	32.05	14.63	20
Semantic Differential	3.15	3.85	13	5.00	2.92	17	2.44	4.97	16	4.36	3.01	11	2.81	3.16	11	2.22	4.60	9	1.00	3.16	15	3.05	4.74	20
HSS	2.46	1.07	14	2.43	.93	16	2.64	.76	16	2.92	.81	12	2.55	.93	11	2.91	.81	8	2.47	1.18	16	2.89	.72	19
BSS	2.56	1.12	14	2.85	1.05	16	2.66	.99	16	2.48	.67	12	2.38	.99	10	3.14	.84	9	2.48	1.10	16	2.98	.76	19
HI Scale	42.62	14.90	13	46.20	9.02	15	44.00	6.62	14	37.22	8.06	9	53.87	12.23	8	58.38	13.57	8	50.13	13.14	15	57.83	10.17	18

Table 2  
*Study 2 Means and Standard Deviations for Major Variables Grouped by Gender, Target, and Condition*

Variables	Non-promiscuous Female						Promiscuous Female						Non-promiscuous Male						Promiscuous Male					
	Male			Female			Male			Female			Male			Female			Male			Female		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Fragment Words	5.50	2.04	20	5.93	2.25	29	6.24	2.26	21	6.21	3.39	28	6.13	2.74	24	6.75	2.43	28	5.47	2.23	15	7.08	2.68	25
SOI-R	31.95	14.94	20	20.36	13.03	28	26.86	13.31	21	18.36	10.45	28	29.71	15.88	24	15.54	7.28	28	28.33	12.48	15	20.68	10.99	25
Semantic Differential	3.73	4.08	19	5.83	4.45	29	1.45	4.17	20	1.78	4.16	27	3.45	4.11	22	3.67	4.54	27	1.79	4.59	14	.48	2.89	25
HSS	2.93	.97	20	2.65	.70	26	2.77	.96	21	2.68	.91	28	2.54	1.03	24	2.73	1.04	28	2.78	1.03	15	2.63	.85	24
BSS	2.93	.99	20	2.61	.75	20	2.85	.87	21	2.76	.78	28	2.78	.78	24	2.87	1.04	28	2.78	.76	15	2.68	.87	25
HI Scale	53.30	12.85	20	44.20	10.21	25	13.22	49.75	20	44.39	11.96	28	50.61	12.93	23	43.74	13.12	27	51.33	14.25	15	45.52	8.85	25
List Experiment	2.15	.55	20	2.43	.78	28	.60	2.57	21	2.67	.65	28	2.22	5.6	23	2.80	.50	27	2.12	.63	15	2.51	.66	25

## Appendix

## Fragment Words

Please fill in the blank with the letter(s) which form the first word that comes to mind for each word fragment.

S \_ A N K

W \_ N D \_ W

\_ A Y

S L \_ T

E A S \_

P \_ A Y \_ R

\_ H I C K E N

\_ I M B O

W H O \_ E

T R A \_ \_

G U \_ S S

S \_ U D

B \_ T C H

\_ U S S \_

R E \_ D

T R A \_ \_

\_ O L D

C \_ L L \_ G E

\_ U S S Y

\_ I C K

\_ E A S E

P R \_ \_ E

\_ \_ R \_ N

\_ E A S E

## Semantic Differential Evaluation

The following section of the questionnaire aims at finding out about your ideas and impressions about the person who was interviewed in the video. In answering the questions we would like to ask you to rate this person on a number of scales. All the scales have pairs of opposites at each end, and between these there are 5 numbers. You are to circle the number which best indicates how you feel about the person.

Please respond rapidly and don't stop to think about each scale. We are interested in your immediate impression. Remember, this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. The "right" answer is the one that is true for you. Be sure to circle only one number on each scale.

	Very	Somewhat	Neither/Nor	Somewhat	Very	
Bad	-2	-1	0	1	2	Good
Cruel	-2	-1	0	1	2	Kind
Ugly	-2	-1	0	1	2	Beautiful
Sad	-2	-1	0	1	2	Happy
Negative	-2	-1	0	1	2	Positive
Unpleasant	-2	-1	0	1	2	Pleasant
Worthless	-2	-1	0	1	2	Valuable
Weak	-2	-1	0	1	2	Strong
Small	-2	-1	0	1	2	Large
Soft	-2	-1	0	1	2	Hard
Light	-2	-1	0	1	2	Heavy
Shallow	-2	-1	0	1	2	Deep
Submissive	-2	-1	0	1	2	Assertive
Simple	-2	-1	0	1	2	Complex
Passive	-2	-1	0	1	2	Active
Relaxed	-2	-1	0	1	2	Tense
Slow	-2	-1	0	1	2	Fast
Cold	-2	-1	0	1	2	Hot
Quiet	-2	-1	0	1	2	Noisy
Dim	-2	-1	0	1	2	Bright
Rounded	-2	-1	0	1	2	Angular

### Demographic Questions

Sex:        \_\_\_\_\_ Male        \_\_\_\_\_ Female        \_\_\_\_\_ It's complicated

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship status:

\_\_\_\_\_ single

\_\_\_\_\_ living together

\_\_\_\_\_ married

\_\_\_\_\_ divorced

\_\_\_\_\_ widowed

Racial/ ethnic background

\_\_\_\_\_ Asian

\_\_\_\_\_ Black/ African- American

\_\_\_\_\_ White/ Caucasian

\_\_\_\_\_ Multiracial

\_\_\_\_\_ Other

Sexual Orientation

\_\_\_\_\_ Heterosexual (attracted to other sex)

\_\_\_\_\_ Bisexual (attracted to both sexes)

\_\_\_\_\_ Homosexual (attracted to same sex)

\_\_\_\_\_ Asexual (experience no sexual attraction)

## Hypergender Ideology Scale

The following survey contains various statements about attitudes concerning the relationships between men and women. Please read each statement carefully and indicate, in the space to the left of the item, the extent you agree with the statement. Please note, however, that some of the statements may not completely apply to you. In such cases, please try to imagine what your response would be if it DID apply to you, and answer accordingly. Please use the following scale to make your responses.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly	Disagree	Slightly	Slightly	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree		Agree

- \_\_\_ 1) A true man knows how to command others.
- \_\_\_ 2) The only thing a lesbian needs is good sex with a man.
- \_\_\_ 3) Men should be ready to take any risk, if the payoff is large enough.
- \_\_\_ 4) No wife is obliged to provide sex for anybody, even her husband.
- \_\_\_ 5) Women should break dates with female friends when guys ask them out.
- \_\_\_ 6) Men have to expect that most women will be something of a tease.
- \_\_\_ 7) A real man can get any woman to have sex with him.
- \_\_\_ 8) Women instinctively try to manipulate men.
- \_\_\_ 9) Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she'll let you do whatever you want.
- \_\_\_ 10) Men should be in charge during sex.
- \_\_\_ 11) It's okay for a man to be a little forceful to get sex.
- \_\_\_ 12) Women don't mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.
- \_\_\_ 13) Homosexuals can be just as good at parenting as heterosexuals.
- \_\_\_ 14) Gays and lesbians are generally just like everybody else.
- \_\_\_ 15) Pick-ups should expect to put out.
- \_\_\_ 16) If men pay for a date, they deserve something in return.
- \_\_\_ 17) Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
- \_\_\_ 18) Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
- \_\_\_ 19) I believe some women lead happy lives without having male partners.

## Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below:

0	1	2	3	4	5
disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Women are too easily offended.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. People are not truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Men are incomplete without women.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a more superior moral sensibility.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. Women, compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

## The Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R)

Please respond honestly to the following questions:

1. With how many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?

0	1	2	3	4	5-6	7-9	10-19	20 or more
---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	-------	------------

2. With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse on *one and only one* occasion?

0	1	2	3	4	5-6	7-9	10-19	20 or more
---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	-------	------------

3. With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse without having an interest in a long-term committed relationship with this person?

0	1	2	3	4	5-6	7-9	10-19	20 or more
0	1	2	3	4	5-6	7-9	10-19	20 or more

4. Sex without love is OK.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

5. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.

[illegible]

6. I do *not* want to have sex with a person until I am sure that we will have a long-term, serious relationship.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>										<b>Strongly Agree</b>

7. How often do you have fantasies about having sex with someone with whom you do *not* have a committed romantic relationship?

- ☐ 1 – never
- ☐ 2 – very seldom
- ☐ 3 – about once every two or three months
- ☐ 4 – about once a month
- ☐ 5 – about once every two weeks
- ☐ 6 – about once a week
- ☐ 7 – several times per week
- ☐ 8 – nearly every day
- ☐ 9 – at least once a day

8. How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone with whom you do *not* have a committed romantic relationship?

- ☐ 1 – never
- ☐ 2 – very seldom
- ☐ 3 – about once every two or three months
- ☐ 4 – about once a month
- ☐ 5 – about once every two weeks
- ☐ 6 – about once a week
- ☐ 7 – several times per week
- ☐ 8 – nearly every day
- ☐ 9 – at least once a day

9. In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?

- ☐ 1 – never
- ☐ 2 – very seldom
- ☐ 3 – about once every two or three months
- ☐ 4 – about once a month
- ☐ 5 – about once every two weeks
- ☐ 6 – about once a week
- ☐ 7 – several times per week
- ☐ 8 – nearly every day
- ☐ 9 – at least once a day

## List Experiment #1

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline
- (2) Professional athletes getting million-dollar-plus salaries
- (3) Large corporations polluting the environment

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People talking during a movie
- (2) Screaming fan at a game yelling in your ear
- (3) Person tail-gateing you for a long distance

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People who laugh at their own jokes
- (2) People who chew with their mouth open
- (3) People who text and drive

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People in the grocery line that use an excessive number of coupons
- (2) People who wear their clothes entirely too tight
- (3) People who don't have any money but have smartphones

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

## List Experiment #2

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline
- (2) Professional athletes getting million-dollar-plus salaries
- (3) Large corporations polluting the environment
- (4) Women who brag about the number of men they have had sex with.

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People talking during a movie
- (2) Women who initiate sexual advances
- (3) Screaming fan at a game yelling in your ear
- (4) Person tail-gateing you for a long distance

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People who laugh at their own jokes
- (2) People who chew with their mouth open
- (3) People who text and drive
- (4) Women who will sleep with anyone.

How many, if any of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_

Please read the list of three things that sometimes make people upset or angry. After you read the following set of statements and write how many of the following statements make you angry or upset you. (I don't want to know which ones, just how many.)

- (1) People in the grocery line that use an excessive number of coupons
- (2) People who wear their clothes entirely too tight
- (3) Men who brag about their sexual behaviors
- (4) People who don't have any money but have smartphones

How many, if any, of these things upset you? \_\_\_\_\_