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ABSTRACT

The double standard with reference to adolescent sexual behavior was examined utilizing a person-perception framework. One hundred and twenty female and sixty male high school students were randomly assigned to read one of six stimulus stories. The stories contained descriptions of the behavior of a fictitious sixteen year old high school student. The variations were number of sexual contacts—few, many, none and the names Barbara or David. Subjects then rated the fictitious student on likability and made attributions about perceived motives and causation for the sexual activity or non-activity. Traditionally of the subjects was also measured utilizing an Attitudes Toward Women Scale. Individual ANOVAs were computed on each of 30 variables separately for male and female subjects. The results yielded very little evidence of a double standard of sexual behavior among adolescents. The present study indicated that adolescents utilize the number of partners with which a person has had sexual intercourse rather than the sex of that person to make evaluative judgements and causal attributions. Implications of the study and future research were discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The idea of a double standard with reference to human sexual behavior and attitudes has existed in Western culture for a long time. The application of one set of standards or rules for the behavior and attitudes of one sex and another, often contrary, set for the other sex has made it possible to judge men and women quite differently when their behavior is virtually identical (Reiss, 1961). This double standard has been particularly apparent regarding adolescent premarital sexual behavior in which the traditional viewpoint has been that of basic male "activity" and female "passivity" (Seindenberg, 1974). While the male has been allowed to experience and actively participate in sexual encounters, the female has had to remain passive in the area of sexual experimentation and not have sexual desires (Masters & Johnson, 1974). Yet, many indicators suggest a lessening of the double standard (Sorensen, 1973).

With the emphasis on sexuality during the adolescent period of development, the paucity of research in the area of adolescent sexual behavior is astounding. Very few, if any, studies have dealt with the double standard and its effects upon the sexual attitudes of adolescents. Early studies such as Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948), Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard (1953) and Reiss (1966) and later studies in the
1970s such as Sorensen (1973) and Miller and Simon (1974) are the only comprehensive empirical research on adolescent sexual behavior to date. Yet these studies do not deal directly with the double standard of sexuality.

For male adolescents the double standard has involved elements of machismo which have pressured them to at least feign, if not actively seek, sexual conquest. Boys and young men have been taught to take advantage of any heterosexual opportunity that comes their way (Wattenberg, 1973). In the American family, as well as society as a whole, young men are pushed toward sexual experimentation in order to develop their manhood (Chesney-Lind, 1974). Sexual experience before marriage has traditionally been a way for the male to establish and prove his masculinity. According to Reiss (cited in Edwards, 1972), under the double standard, coitus has been viewed as a conquest for the male and has traditionally been a source of peer group prestige.

On the other hand, the double standard has implied that premarital sexual behavior (especially coitus) is "contranormative" or aberrant behavior for adolescent females (Miller & Simon, 1974). Young women have been taught that their self-respect and the respect of others is dependent upon their restraint from sexual experimentation. According to Masters and Johnson (1974), virginity at marriage has been traditionally expected of women, and adolescent females are often kept under control by their families in order to protect their virginity.
Although she must be sexually appealing, a "good girl" is never sexual (Chesney-Lind, 1974). Morrison and Borosage (1973) reported that while the term "bad boy" can be attributed to a male in a variety of situations, the term "bad girl" is almost exclusively attributed to the female who is sexually active.

The double standard of adolescent sexual behavior has been apparent in the labeling of sexuality as psychologically pathological. Although much of the work in this area is theoretical with very little data, it does lend insight to this double standard. Often while the adolescent female is labeled sexually delinquent (promiscuous) for engaging in repeated sexual encounters, the adolescent male is seen as striving toward manhood (sowing his oats) for the same behavior. Female adolescents engaging in repeated sexual liaisons are often seen as more emotionally disturbed in all of their relationships than male adolescents engaging in similar practice (Wattenberg, 1973). According to Mohr and Depres (1958), while adolescent male sexual behavior has been seen as motivated by physical need or biological urge, the motivations for the same behavior has been seen quite differently for females. The female has been viewed as being motivated by the need of acceptance and reassurance, neurotic character structure, or acting out an identification with or reaction to unconscious delinquency provoking attitudes in her parents (Mohr & Depres, 1958). Also, female adolescents
who engage in frequent coitus are seen as looking for love or affectional relationships not available at home (Gibbons, 1970). The adolescent female's sexual conduct has not been seen in the same terms as the adult female, but rather as a rebellion against parents or society as a whole (Gibbons & Griswold, 1957; Cavan, 1969), while, in contrast, adolescent male sexuality has been perceived as a step toward manhood and considered very normal.

The area of sexuality and its expression is confusing for many adolescents. There is a considerable gap between the time they are prepared—biologically, physiologically, and often psychologically—for the full expression of their sexual urges and the time their expressions are approved by society (Mohr & Depres, 1958). The double standard only adds to the obfuscation about sexual conduct.

Traditionally, sexual experimentation of any kind for adolescent females has only been thought of in the context of a stable and monogamous, emotional relationship such as "going steady" or being "promised." Usually this relationship is seen as culminating in marriage. Due to society's strict sanctions against indiscriminate sexual behavior for the adolescent female, she finds it necessary to demand this stable, committed relationship as a basis for participation in sexual behavior.

In an early article on adolescent sexuality, Reiss (cited in Edwards, 1972) suggested that most teenage males, at that
time, would only go as far as accepting heavy petting in a steady relationship and not think of their partner as a "bad girl." But, if she "allowed" him to proceed and coitus occurred, it would not be unusual to find the male had terminated the relationship because she would be considered a "bad girl." As the adolescent female becomes more secure in a relationship, she may feel that sexual experimentation and even coitus is permissible since they are "in love." But since she relented to sexual intercourse the boyfriend may perceive her as a less than suitable partner for a steady relationship and especially unsuitable for marriage.

In studies by Schofield (1965) and Simon, Berger, and Gagnon (1972) significantly more females (79%) than males (51%) agreed that sex with a casual partner would be wrong and only 44 percent of the males as compared to 75 percent of the females surveyed agreed that they would not engage in coitus if the person did not love them. In the study by Sorensen (1973), 33 percent of the adolescent males surveyed agreed that they would not want to marry a non-virgin.

Along with recent changes in societal acceptance of non-traditional sexual behavior, the adolescent viewpoint may also be changing. The direction of these changes seems to be in a greater acceptance of premarital coital behavior particularly when the female is in a continuing relationship. Even as early as 1966, Harris reported that the emphasis among young people was in the direction of meaningful personal
relationships and personal standards of morality were seen as more important than relying on the traditional moral codes such as the double standard.

Although modification of traditional attitudes do not signal the end of the double standard, it may mean there is a continued weakening of it (Hopkins, 1977). In Sorensen's (1973) research, 62 percent of all adolescents interviewed rejected the traditional double standard in regard to what is morally wrong for females.

Also, in Sorensen's (1973) research, the distinction is made between serial monogamous and sexually adventurous adolescents. A serial monogamous adolescent is an unmarried non-virgin who has a close sexual relationship with his/her partner and s/he never has sex with another person while in this relationship. An adolescent sexual adventurer is a person who seeks many sexual partners and has no interest in a monogamous relationship with any of his/her partners. Of all non-virgin adolescents (male and female) surveyed by Sorensen in 1973, 40 percent qualified as monogamists and only 15 percent qualified as sexual adventurers. Thus while the modification of traditional attitudes among adolescents often includes participation in sexual intercourse, it also seems to include this participation within the confines of a monogamous relationship.

Other changes may also be occurring in the openness among adolescents about their sexual behavior. Traditionally, males
were allowed to openly discuss their sexual encounters with their peers and even their families. Conversely, adolescent females had to remain quiet about their sexual experiences even to their friends or take the chance of being labeled a "bad girl." As early as 1966 this seemed to be changing. According to a nationwide survey of 550 adolescents, ages 13 to 20, 75 percent of the sample believed that they were developing a new sexual morality and felt they could be more open about sex ("The Open Generation," 1966).

**Sexual Attributions**

Attribution theory provides a framework for viewing how individuals make inferences about others in terms of their sexual behavior. The attribution process is the means by which the individual attempts to explain his/her world. In this attempt to explain his/her environment, an individual makes causal inferences about the actions of others (Heider, 1958). In viewing a situation, the perceiver seeks to find sufficient reason as to why another person acted and why the act took on a particular form; thus, the perceiver attributes cause to the action and the individual (Jones & Davis, 1965). This process, according to Jones and Davis (1965), follows a pattern such that after an individual has observed another person's action, inferences about his/her personality traits, dispositions, and motives are made according to the perceived intentions.)
Causality attributed to the actions of others can take various forms. The cause may be attributed to the other person directly (internal), to the other person's environment (external), or to a combination of the two (Heider, 1958). It is the perceiver who seeks an explanation of another's behavior and judges the extent to which the individual's action is external or internal.

According to Jones and Davis (1965), expected or in role actions give very little information to the perceiver about the actor but expected or out of role behaviors lead to more internal attributions. Also, Jones and Davis (1965) view the extremity or social desirability of the behavior as an important determinant of the attributions of intent and dispositions. Action that deviates from accepted norms is more likely to be interpreted as internally motivated personal choice whereas a person's actions that conform with accepted norms is more likely to be attributed to external causes or circumstances rather than personal choice.

This person perception framework derived from attribution theory permits an analysis and evaluation of sex role behaviors as well as a determination of the perceived locus of causality of sex role associated behaviors which are involved in the inferences perceivers make (Cowan & Koziej, 1979). When an individual acts in a manner inconsistent with his/her given role, more extreme attributions are made with increasing confidence (Jones, Davis, & Gergen, 1961). As individuals
deviate from their stereotypic sex roles significantly more internal than external causes are attributed, especially for females (Cowan & Koziej, 1979).

In view of the double standard regarding premarital adolescent sexual behavior, a male would be acting out of role of choosing not to participate in sex while the female would be acting out of role by engaging in sex especially with different partners. Attribution theory suggests that the locus of causality for these behaviors would be seen as internal. The female adolescents' out of role behavior may also be viewed not only as reflecting more dispositional traits but also the perceived causes may be judged more pathological than male adolescents acting out of role or in role behaviors of both sexes. These judgements about her out of role behavior may be due to the extreme departure from the adolescent female role and the behavior's negative social desirability.

Several studies, utilizing the person perception framework, have dealt with sex role behaviors and the double standard. In one study dealing with the double standard of sexual behavior, Cowan, Warren, and Koenigshofer (1976) utilized videotaped actors expressing traditional (monogamous) attitudes or non-traditional (open) attitudes about marriage. It was hypothesized that if the double standard were present subjects would express greater disapproval of the female advocating open marriage than a male advocating open marriage.
Another issue addressed was the perceived motivations behind the sexual behavior of the females and males since the double standard may imply different motivations for each sex.

In the above study, 40 male and 40 female undergraduates were randomly assigned to one of the four videotaped segments: a male advocating traditional marriage, a female advocating traditional marriage, a male advocating open marriage, and a female advocating open marriage. After viewing the tape, the subjects responded to a questionnaire. The results did not lend any overall support for the existence of the double standard and revealed a devaluation of the male advocating open marriage in comparison to all other groups. Also, there was little evidence for perceived motivational differences between males and females in either condition. The authors concluded that the emphasis on sexual freedom for females may have led to a reaction against the outdated concepts of disproportional sexual freedom for the male.

In another attribution study dealing with the perception of sex inconsistent behavior, Cowan and Koziej (1979) hypothesized that out of role behavior would be rated more extreme than in role behavior on sex role stereotype scales and also the out of role behavior would be rated as more internally caused. One hundred and twenty female and male college students were randomly assigned to one of four conditions which involved listening to tapes of a male and female stimulus person (SP). The SPs in each condition showed variations
of in role and out of role behavior of dominance and submission. Subjects attributed traits to the SP via a questionnaire and also assessed the locus of causality for the rated traits. The results revealed that the dominant female, when compared to the dominant male, was attributed significantly more masculine and less feminine traits. Also, the dominant female's behavior, when compared to the dominant male, was viewed as stemming more from internal rather than situational causes. The authors conclude that out of role attributional analysis can aid in understanding the sex role stereotyping process and can help to clarify assumptions often held about the causes of female and male behavior.

Cowan and Weible (1977) used the person perception framework to study adolescents' attitudes about sexuality as well as to determine if a double standard existed in their attitudes. Four stimulus stories about fictitious male or female SPs of high school age with either a few or many sexual contacts were utilized. Subjects were 144 high school students who were randomly assigned one of the stories to read. The subjects then rated the SP on likeability and attributed traits and motives to the SP as well as whether they saw the SP's behavior as caused by internal or external forces. Subjects approved of the person with few partners regardless of sex more than the person with many partners but one cannot determine if the subjects were responding to the number of partners or the rate of sexual intercourse because the stories
unfortunately confounded the number of partners with the sexual activity level. The double standard, however, was indicated in that both sexes attributed stronger negative traits and motives to the female SP with many sexual contacts.

The present study represents an extension of the Cowan and Weible (1977) study and is also concerned with determining if a sexual double standard is reflected in high school students ratings of a fictitious high school student in terms of attributions of causality. In the present study, the fictitious student was described as either male or female and as engaging in moderate sexual activity with either a series of partners or with one steady partner. This study differs from the Cowan and Weible (1977) study in that the sexual activity was maintained at a moderate level while only the number of partners was varied. Also, an additional condition was utilized in which a male or female SP chose not to engage in sexual activity with one steady partner.

In the present study, subjects were given a series of questions on which they rated the fictitious student on likability and made attributions about perceived motives and causation for the sexual activity or non-activity. Traditionality of the subjects concerning sex roles was measured by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreich, 1978). This scale was used to determine if non-traditional and traditional thinking high school students hold different beliefs about the sexual double standard. If changes
are occurring, the changes should be reflected in the answers of those students who are more non-traditional in their attitudes toward standard sex roles. The hypotheses for the study were as follows:

1. The female behaving in role (not engaging in sexual relations or engaging in sexual activity with one steady partner) will be liked more than the female behaving out of role (engaging in sexual activity with a series of partners).

2. The male behaving in role (engaging in sexual activity with one or many partners) will be liked more than the male behaving out of role (choosing to abstain from sexual activity).

3. The male engaging in sexual activity with a number of partners will be liked more than the female engaging in sexual activity with a number of partners.

4. The female behaving out of role will be seen as more pathological than the male behaving out of role as well as the male and female behaving in role.

5. Locus of causality will be rated significantly more internal for the female and male who behave out of role than the female and male who behave in role.

6. The female behaving in role will be seen as more open about her behavior than the female behaving out of role.

7. The male behaving in role will be seen as more open about his behavior than the male behaving out of role.
METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 120 female and 60 male high school student volunteers from Pacific High School and Cajon High School in San Bernardino, California. The subjects were administered the questionnaire in groups of approximately 30 in classrooms at their respective high schools.

Experimental Manipulations and Measures

The experimental manipulation consisted of one of six possible stimulus stories. The stimulus stories contained six descriptions of the behavior of a fictitious sixteen year old high school student. In three of the descriptions the wording was the same except for changes to accommodate the sex of the individual, e.g. name "Barbara" for "David". The other variation was the number of sexual contacts—few, many, and none. The sexual activity of the SP was held constant at a moderate level in the few and many conditions.

A measure of traditionality of each subject concerning sex roles in general was used to assign subjects to either a traditional or non-traditional attitude condition. The short, fifteen item version of the Attitude Toward Women Scale, developed by Spence and Helmreich (1978), was used for this purpose. The scale contains statements regarding the roles, rights, and privileges that women should have to be permitted
and allows subjects to indicate their agreement with each statement on a four-point scale ranging from "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly." The items are scored from 0 to 3 with the higher scores indicating a non-traditional, egalitarian attitude. The possible scores range from 0 to 45 points. (See Appendix B for a copy of this scale.) The fifteen item version has been found to have a correlation of .91 with the original 55 item AWS in a sample of college students (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Dependent measures. The questionnaire utilized in this study was developed to measure subjects' liking for, perceived openness of the stimulus person and to obtain attributions made by the subjects as to the pathology and causation for the sexual behavior of the SPs. The following question numbers correspond to the questionnaire presented in Appendix A. The section of the questionnaire measuring likability of the SP consisted of questions which were grouped together to give an overall likability score: (1) like, (3) like to know, (4) approve, (5) want to be like. A second set of items was used which measured perceived adjustment of the SP: (2) behavior compared to others, (6) happiness in general, (9) school performance, (10) popularity, (15) relationship with opposite sex, (16) insecurity, (17) likelihood of early marriage, (23) mentally disturbed, (27) adjustment. Another group of questions was concerned with attributions about causes for the behavior of the SP: (7) influence of dates, (12) find or obtain love, (13) obtain friends, (14) concern with others
opinions, (18) "show-off", (21) spite parents, (22) consequences of act, (24) boredom, (25) sexual need, (26) sexual enjoyment, (28) religion, and also openness of the SP about the behavior: (19) tells parents, (20) tells friends. At the end of the questionnaire three questions were used to reflect the perceived direction of causality: situational (external, item 30), personal choice (internal, item 29), and personality needs (internal but unintentional, item 31).

Design and Procedure

The design was a 2 X 2 X 3 factorial for male subjects and female subjects separately, varying sex of the stimulus person (SP), sex role attitude (traditional or non-traditional), and sexual behavior of the SP (monogamous, multiple partners, or no sex). All variables were between subjects.

The subjects were randomly assigned to one of six experimental groups defined by conditions of male or female SP and sexual behavior of the SP. Each subject was given a packet of materials (instructions, story, questionnaire, and the AWS). The initial instructions were read aloud to each group by the same female experimenter as the subjects read them silently. The subjects were told that the present experiment was a study about the process of decision making. They were asked to give their individual opinions about the high school student based upon what they read in the story. Instructions on how to mark the scales were given and subjects were told not to give their names on the questionnaire. Other written
instructions, actually reminders, on how to complete the rating scales were placed before the actual questions and again before the AWS. After the subjects read the descriptions, they completed the questionnaire, by marking the rating scales, which measured their liking of the SP, their attributions of traits and motives to the SP, and whether they saw the SP's behavior as caused by personality or situational forces. After the completion of the questionnaire, each subject was given the AWS in order to obtain a measure of his/her traditional or non-traditionality of attitudes about sex roles. A median split was used to assign subjects to traditional or non-traditional conditions.

Results

Individual ANOVAs were computed on each of 30 variables (questions and/or sets of questions) separately for male and female subjects. Separate ANOVA's were done for male and female subjects because the use of sex of subject as a fourth independent variable would allow the possibility of four-way interactions which are very difficult to interpret. Necessary comparisons between the results of the male and female subjects are possible by using the separate sets of ANOVA data; thus, the design did not need to be enlarged.

The results section is divided into three categories. All categories are divided into results for female and results for male subjects in the interest of clarity. First, the results dealing with the double standard are presented in which
significant Activity X Sex of SP interactions are reported as evidence for the double standard. In the second category, the sexual attitudes of the subjects are reported. Significant main effects of activity level are utilized as support for the hypotheses. The traditionality variable is presented in the third category and all significant main effects and interactions dealing specifically with this variable are reported.

Evidence for Double Standard

Eight significant (four for female and four for male subjects) Activity X Sex of SP interactions were obtained. Simple main effects tests and Tukey's test for differences between means were performed on the data according to Kirk (1968). All comparisons stated are significant at the p < .05 level unless otherwise indicated. The cell means for the significant interactions are presented in Table 1 for female subjects and Table 2 for male subjects.

Female Subjects: There was a significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP on the items measuring overall likability (like, like to know, approve, and want to be like), F (2,108) = 7.57, p < .01. Simple main effects tests indicated a significant main effect of Sex of SP for the no sex condition, F (2,108) = 18.03, such that the male SP was overall liked more than the female SP in this condition. There was no significant simple main effect of Sex of SP for the monogamous condition and no simple main effect for the multiple partners
condition. Therefore, the third hypothesis, that the male SP engaging in sexual activity with a number of partners will be liked more than the female SP engaging in the same behavior, was not supported.

Comparisons were conducted on the likability items within Sex of SP. Simple main effects tests indicated a significant main effect of Activity for the female SP, $F(2,108) = 33.78$ and for the male SP, $F(2,108) = 96.62$. Both the female SP and the male SP in the no sex condition were rated as significantly more likable than the female and male SP in the monogamous condition, who were rated as significantly more likable than the female and male SP in the multiple partners condition. Thus, for the female subjects, the first hypothesis, that the female SP behaving in role will be liked more than the female SP behaving out of role was supported but no support was found for the second hypothesis that the male SP behaving in role will be liked more than the male SP behaving out of role.

Another significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, $F(2,108) = 5.34$, was obtained on the item measuring the degree to which the SP's behavior was seen as an attempt to find or keep love. Simple main effects tests yielded a significant effect of Sex of SP in the no sex condition, $F(2,108) = 3.93$. In this condition, the male SP was viewed as attempting to find or keep love by his actions more than the female SP. There was also a significant simple main effect of Sex of SP
Table 1
Activity X Sex of SP Interactions
For Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Sex</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likeability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2,108) = 7.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attempt for Love</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2,108) = 5.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boredom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2,108) = 3.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness with Friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2,108) = 4.72*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
### Table 2

Activity X Sex of SP Interactions

For Male Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Sex</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usualness of Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 48) = 4.49*</td>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 48) = 5.42**</td>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness with Parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 48) = 3.71*</td>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence By Dates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 48) = 3.40*</td>
<td>Female SP</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male SP</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
within the multiple partners condition, $F(2,108) = 5.43$, such that the female SP was seen as attempting to find or keep love by her actions more than the male SP. There was no significant effect of Sex of SP within the monogamous condition.

The item measuring the degree of boredom as a causal factor for the behavior of the SP yielded a third significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, $F(2,108) = 3.19$, $p < .05$. Simple main effects test showed a significant effect of Sex of SP for the no sex condition, $F(2,108) = 3.10$. The female SP was seen as not engaging in sex because of boredom more than the male SP. There was another significant simple main effect of Sex of SP for the multiple partners condition, $F(2,108) = 3.10$, such that the male SP was viewed as engaging in sex with many partners more out of boredom than the female SP. There was no main effect of Sex of SP for the monogamous condition.

On the item measuring openness with friends about the specified behavior there was a significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, $F(2,108) = 4.72$, $p < .05$. Simple main effects tests yielded a significant effect of Sex of SP for the no sex condition, $F(2,108) = 4.18$. The female SP was seen as telling her friends more about her non-sexual behavior than the male SP. There was also a significant Sex of SP main effect within the multiple partners condition, $F(2,108) = 4.18$, with the male SP rated as more likely to tell his friends
about his multiple partner behavior than the female SP. There was no main effect of Sex of SP within the monogamous condition.

Simple main effects tests were also performed within Sex of SP on the item measuring openness with friends to test the sixth hypothesis that the female SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about her behavior than the female SP behaving out of role and the seventh hypothesis that the male SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about his behavior than the male SP behaving out of role. Simple main effects tests yielded no significant effect of Activity for the female SP thereby providing no support for the sixth hypothesis that the female SP behaving in role will be more open about her behavior than the female SP behaving out of role. However, there was a significant main effect of Activity for the male SP, F (2,108) = 21.37. Comparisons for the significant effects revealed the male SP in the multiple partners condition was rated as more likely to tell his friends about his behavior than the male SP in either the monogamous or no sex condition. The male SP in the monogamous condition was seen as more likely to be open with friends about his behavior than the male SP in the no sex condition supporting the seventh hypothesis that the male SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about his behavior than the male behaving out of role.

In summary, the female subjects viewed the female SP in the no sex condition as attempting to find or keep love less
than her male counterpart as well as more open, about her actions with friends. Contrary to prediction, the female SP was also liked less and rated as more bored than the male SP for the no sex condition. Yet, in the multiple partners condition the female SP was seen as attempting to find or keep love more, as well as less open with friends and engaging in the behavior less out of boredom than the male SP. Also, there were no differences in ratings for the male and female SP in the monogamous condition on the items reported above.

Male Subjects: For male subjects, there was a significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, $F(2,38) = 4.49$, $p < .05$, on the item dealing with the usualness of the behavior compared to other people known to the subject. There was a significant simple main effect of Sex of SP within the no sex condition $F(2,48) = 4.86$, such that the female SP's behavior was rated as more usual than the male SP's behavior. There were no simple main effects of Sex of SP within the monogamous and multiple partners conditions.

The item measuring perceived adjustment of the SP yielded a second significant Activity X Sex of SP interaction, $F(2,48) = 5.42$, $p < .01$. Simple main effects tests indicated a significant effect of Sex of SP within the multiple partners condition, $F(2,48) = 7.05$. The male SP was seen as more well adjusted than the female SP. There was no significant main effects of Sex of SP for the monogamous and no sex conditions.

On the item measuring openness with parents about the
particular sexual behavior, there was a significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, F (2,48) = 3.71, p < .05. A significant simple main effect of Sex of SP was found, F (2,48) = 5.34, for the no sex condition such that the female SP was seen as more likely to tell her parents about her behavior than the male SP. There were no significant Sex of SP main effects for the monogamous and multiple partners conditions on this item.

Main effects tests and comparisons were performed on the openness with parents item across the Activity variable to test some of the experimental hypotheses. A significant main effect of Activity for the female SP was found, F (2,48) = 10.90, but no main effect of Activity for the male SP. Comparisons on the significant effect indicated that the female SP in the no sex condition was seen as more likely to tell her parents about her behavior than the female SP in the monogamous or multiple partners condition. There was no difference in rating of openness with parents between the monogamous and multiple partners conditions. These comparisons lend direct support to the sixth hypothesis that the female SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about her behavior than the female SP behaving out of role. Since no main effect of Activity for the male SP was found, the seventh hypothesis that the male SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about his behavior than the male SP behaving out of role was not supported.
The fourth significant interaction of Activity X Sex of SP, $F (2,48) = 3.40$, $p < .05$, was on the item measuring influence by dates as a causal factor for the specified behavior. Simple main effects tests yielded a significant effect of Sex of SP for the no sex condition, $F (2,48) = 8.39$. The female SP was seen as more influenced by dates than the male SP in this condition. There were no significant main effects of Sex of SP for the monogamous and multiple partner conditions.

There was also a significant three-way interaction of Activity X Sex of SP X Traditionality on the item measuring the degree of sexual enjoyment. This factor is discussed in the section dealing with Traditionality.

In summary, for male subjects, the female SP in the no sex condition was seen as more usual, more likely to tell her parents about her behavior, and more influenced by dates than her male counterpart. In the multiple partners condition, the male SP was rated as more well adjusted than the female SP in the same condition. Also, there were no differences in ratings for the male and female SP in the monogamous condition on the items reported above.

**Sexual Attitudes**

In the following section, the results are presented dealing with the attitudes of the subjects about the sexual behavior of the SPs, regardless of the SPs' sex. A large number of significant main effects of activity level resulted. These effects indicate that judgements about the SPs were
based on their specified behavior or activity level regardless of the sex of the SP so that no double standard was operating. The cell means for the effects are presented in Table 3 for female subjects and Table 4 for male subjects. Comparisons were made utilizing Tukey's test for differences between means according to Kirk (1968). All comparisons stated are significant at the $p < .05$ level unless otherwise indicated. The following sections detail the main effects and their respective directions. All ANOVAs were analyzed separately for male and female subjects.

**Female Subjects:** On the items measuring overall likability, overall mental health, happiness, school performance, adjustment, consideration of consequences, mental disturbance, and degree to which the specified behavior was an attempt to "show-off", the SP in the no sex condition was seen as more likable, more mentally healthy, as doing better in school, more well adjusted, as giving more consideration to the consequences of the behavior, less mentally disturbed and attempting to "show-off" less than the SP in the monogamous or multiple partners conditions. The same directions of the items above were also attributed to the SP in the monogamous condition significantly more than to the SP in the multiple partners condition.

On the item dealing with religion, the SP in the no sex condition was seen as significantly more religious than either the SP in the monogamous or multiple partners conditions, with no difference in rating between these two conditions.
Table 3

Cell Means and F Statistics for Main Effects of Activity Level for Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Sex</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall likability</td>
<td>13.025</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>57.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mental health</td>
<td>25.325</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>23.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>12.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School performance</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>10.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness of Relationships</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>18.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity (reversed-higher score/more secure)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>8.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental disturbment (reversed-higher score/less</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>15.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustemt</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>13.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall strength cf attribution items</td>
<td>12.625</td>
<td>14.525</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>6.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationship with parents</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to find or keep love</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to gain likability</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>6.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;showing-off&quot;</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>15.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;spite&quot; parents</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness with friends</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>6.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of friends</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>4.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of marriage before 20</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predetermination of consequences</td>
<td>3.675</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>36.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3.275</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>21.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
df = (2,108)
Table 4

Cell Means and F Statistics for Main Effects of Activity Level for Male Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Sex</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>popularity</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor relationship with parents</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.38 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;showing-off&quot;</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.55 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openness with friends</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.23 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence of dates</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5.38 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likelihood of marriage before 20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.78 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-consideration of consequences</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6.22 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.56 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = (2,48)

* p < .05
The SPs in the no sex and monogamous conditions, although not rated significantly different from each other, were rated significantly higher on the items measuring meaningfulness of relationships and attempting to find or keep love than the SP in the multiple partners condition. For the items on which openness with friends about the specified behavior, insecurity, and degree to which the behavior was an attempt to get others to like the SP were measured, the SP in the multiple partners condition was seen as significantly more open, more insecure, and as utilizing the behavior more to gain likability than the SP in either the monogamous or no sex conditions. No significant difference in ratings resulted on these items between the SPs in the monogamous and no sex conditions.

On the items measuring poor relationships with parents, influence by friends, influence by dates, using behavior to "spite" parents, and an overall strength of attribution score, the SP in the monogamous and multiple partners condition was seen as significantly more influenced by friends as well as by dates, more spiteful toward parents, as having poorer relationships with parents, and were given stronger attributions (overall combined score on all attribution items were higher) than the SP in the no sex condition. There were no differences in ratings on these items for the monogamous and multiple partners conditions.

On the item measuring the likelihood of marriage before age 20, the SP in the monogamous condition was rated as signi-
ficantly more likely to marry before age 20 than the SP in the no sex condition. There were no significant differences on this item between the SP in the monogamous and multiple partners conditions and no difference between the multiple partners and no sex conditions.

Male Subjects: On the items measuring popularity, poor relationship with parents, and degree to which the behavior was an attempt to "show-off", the SP in the multiple partners condition was rated as significantly more popular, as having a poorer relationship with parents and as using the particular behavior to "show-off" significantly more than the SP in either the monogamous or no sex condition. There was no difference between the ratings of the SP in the monogamous and no sex condition on these items.

The SP in the no sex condition was rated on the items measuring the degree of religious belief and degree to which s/he thought of the consequences before acting as significantly more religious and as considering the consequences significantly more than the SP in the monogamous and multiple partners conditions. There were no significant differences on these items for the monogamous and multiple partners conditions.

On the item measuring influence by dates as a causal factor for the behavior, the SP in the multiple partners and monogamous conditions were rated as equally influenced by dates but significantly more influenced than the SP in the no sex condition. For the item dealing with openness with friends
about the particular behavior, the SP in the multiple partners condition was seen as significantly more open than the SP in the no sex condition but equally as open as the SP in the monogamous condition. The SP in the monogamous condition and no sex condition were also seen as equally open with friends about the behavior.

On the item measuring likelihood of marriage before age 20, the SP in the monogamous condition was rated as significantly more likely to marry than the SP in the no sex condition. There were no significant differences between the multiple partners condition and the monogamous condition and none between the multiple partners and no sex conditions on this item.

In summary, the female subjects made twenty distinctions in personality traits or perceived causality on the basis of sexual activity while male subjects made only eight. While the directions of these distinctions were the same for both male and female subjects, the female subjects made more discriminations between the three different levels of sexual activity. On eight of the twenty items for which there was a significant main effect of activity, the female subjects rated all three levels as significantly different from each other. On the eight significant main effects of activity for the male subjects there were no items on which all three levels were rated significantly different from each other.

There were also several significant main effects of Sex
of SP in the total set of items. These effects are presented in Table 5 for female and male subjects. The directions of the significant main effects are presented in the following sections.

**Female Subjects:** On the items dealing with overall likability, mental health, adjustment, and enjoyment of sex, the male SP was rated as significantly more likable, more mentally healthy, more well adjusted and as gaining more enjoyment from sex than the female SP.

**Male Subjects:** On the item measuring the meaningfulness of relationships with the opposite sex, the female SP was seen as having significantly more meaningful relationships than the male SP. For the item dealing with openness with friends about the particular behavior, the male SP was rated as significantly more likely to tell his friends about the behavior than the female SP.

**Traditionality Variable**

Degree of traditionality was defined by a subject's score on the short form version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). (See Methods Section). A median split was employed to ascertain subject groupings of "traditional" and "non-traditional". The median split for male subjects was: a score of 25 or above was classified as "non-traditional", below 25 was classified as "traditional". The median split for female subjects was: a score of 28 or above was classified as "non-traditional", below 28 was classified as "traditional".
### Table 5

Cell Means and F Statistics for Main Effects of Sex of SP for Male and Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female SP</th>
<th>Male SP</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningfulness of relationships</strong></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openness with friends</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female SP</th>
<th>Male SP</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female S (df = 2,108)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall likability</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall mental health</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>6.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>9.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment of sex</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.77*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
Simple main effects tests and Tukey's test for differences between means were performed according to Kirk (1968). Cell means for main effects of traditionality for female subjects are presented in Table 6. Significant Activity X Traditionality interactions for male and female subjects are presented in Table 7.

Female Subjects: Main effects of the Traditionality variable (score on the AWS) indicated that traditional subjects rated the SPs' behavior across all conditions as an attempt to get others to like him/her significantly more than did non-traditional subjects. Also, the traditional subjects saw the SP as significantly more religious and more concerned with what other people thought about the behavior than the non-traditional subjects.

There was a significant Activity X Traditionality interaction on the item pertaining to degree of religious belief, $F(2,108) = 4.51$. A simple main effects test done across the no sex condition yielded a significant main effect of traditionality, $F(2,108) = 14.58$. Traditional subjects viewed the SP in the no sex condition as more religious than did the non-traditional subjects. There were no significant main effects of traditionality across the monogamous or multiple partners conditions.

Male Subjects: There were no significant main effects of Traditionality for the male subjects but several significant Activity X Traditionality interactions were found. On the
Table 6

Cell Means + F Statistics for Main Effects of Traditionality for Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Traditional Subjects</th>
<th>Non-traditional Subjects</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to gain likability</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>*8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with what others think</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>*7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>*5.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 1,108
Table 7
Cell Means + F Statistics for Activity X Traditionality Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Non-Sex</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df = 2,48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trad</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-trad</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trad</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction of causation as internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-trad</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female SP</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-way enjoyment of six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male SP</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female SP</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-trad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male SP</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df = 2,108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trad</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-trad</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
item measuring adjustment there was a significant interaction of Activity X Traditionality, $F(2,48) = 6.08$. Simple main effects tests were performed on this item across the activity levels. A significant main effect across the no sex condition indicated that non-traditional subjects viewed the SP in the no sex condition as more well adjusted than did the traditional subjects, $F(2,48) = 3.72$. Another significant main effect resulted across the multiple partners condition such that the traditional subjects viewed the SP in the multiple partners condition as more well adjusted than the non-traditional subjects, $F(2,48) = 7.05$. There was no significant main effect across the monogamous condition.

On the item dealing with the direction of causality as internal, there was a second significant interaction of Activity X Traditionality, $F(2,48) = 7.13$. Simple main effects tests across the activity levels yielded a significant effect within the no sex condition such that the non-traditional subjects attributed more internal causation to the SP in the no sex condition than the traditional subjects, $F(2,48) = 9.05$. Another significant effect across the multiple partners condition was that the traditional subjects attributed more internal causation to the SP in the multiple partners condition than did the non-traditional subjects, $F(2,48) = 5.35$. There was no main effect across the monogamous condition.

On the item dealing with sexual enjoyment there was a significant three-way interaction of Activity X Sex of SP X
Traditionality, F (2,48) = 4.44. Simple main effects tests were performed across the Traditionality variable. A significant effect resulted in the no sex, male SP condition, F (2,48) = 6.19, such that non-traditional male subjects viewed the male SP as enjoying sex more if he tried it than did traditional male subjects. There was no main effect of traditionality for the no sex, female SP condition.

Another significant main effect of traditionality was found in the monogamous, male SP condition, F (2,48) = 4.55. The traditional male subjects viewed than male SP in this condition as enjoying sex significantly more than did the non-traditional male subjects. There was no effect of traditionality within this condition for the female SP. Also, there were no significant effects of traditionality for the male and female SP in the multiple partners condition.

In summary, the traditionality of the subjects was only a factor on a very select group of six items. Attributions of causality, pathology and overall likability of the various SPs were not greatly affected by the traditionality or non-traditionality of the subjects.

Discussion

The results show very little evidence of a double standard of sexuality among the adolescents in this study. The evidence for a double standard was only reflected on a few select items for both male and female subjects.

The items which showed a double standard differed for
male and female subjects. For female subjects, the items included overall likability, boredom and openness with friends and attempting to find or keep love. On the other hand, for the male subjects, the items were unusualness of behavior, perceived adjustment, openness with parents and influence by dates. No meaningful pattern is clear in distinguishing between the items reflecting the double standard for male and female subjects. Both female and male subjects showed the double standard on separated but selected items reflecting evaluation (such as: likability, adjustment, etc.) and also on the degree of openness (with parents and friends) and in perceived causality (finding love, influence of dates, etc.).

For the female subjects, on all the items, excluding overall likability, a reversal of the ratings for the male and female SP was noted. The female SP in the no sex condition was rated the same (bored, open with friends, and not attempting to find or keep love) as the male SP in the multiple partners condition. Also, the male SP in the no sex condition was rated the same (less bored, less open with friends, and attempting to find or keep love) as the female SP in the multiple partners condition. Thus, the female SP was attributed the same causes and traits for not engaging in sex as the male SP who engaged in sex with multiple partners and the male SP in the no sex condition was attributed the same causes for not engaging in sex as the female SP that engaged in sex with a number of partners by the female subjects.
The most obvious double standard in these findings is the belief held by the female subjects that females (female SP) who engage in sex with a number of partners are searching for love more than males (male SP). The common theme of a female's "promiscuity" being due to the interpretation of her looking for love was noted. Another result on this item was that the male SP in the no sex condition was rated as looking for love more than the female in this condition. Thus another common theme arises here in that males in the no sex condition are seen as looking for love--they don't have sex with "good girls" or the girls they love rather they have sex with females considered "bad girls", the girls that they would not or do not love. It is also interesting that the male in the multiple partners condition is seen as more bored than his female counterpart, perhaps because his sexual behavior is not in the context of looking for love.

On the likability items, the female subjects liked the male SP in the no sex condition more than the female in the same condition. This result may be due to the male SP in the no sex condition taking the responsibility for saying "no" to the sexual encounter. Thus the female partner was perceived as not being pressured into sex, and the responsibility of her having to say "no" to keep her good girl status was alleviated. The female subjects may have seen the behavior of the male SP in the no sex condition as an individual and a positive change from the stereotypic male behavior in sexual
encounters. A result similar to this was found in Cowan, Warren and Koenigshofer (1976) discussed earlier. In the Cowan et.al. (1976) study there was a reaction to a male advocating sexual freedom such that he was devalued in comparison to all other groups of SPs. The authors concluded that subjects may have reacted against the outdated concepts of disproportional sexual freedom for the male. This may have been what also occurred in the present study on the likability items for the female subjects.

Seven hypotheses regarding the double standard were tested in the present study. The first hypothesis was: the female SP behaving in role will be liked more than the female SP behaving out of role. This hypothesis received some support from the data on the likability items by the female subjects. The second hypothesis that the male SP behaving in role will be liked more than the male SP behaving out of role was not supported and the reverse was found. Also, the third experimental hypothesis that the male SP in the multiple partners condition would be liked more than the female SP in the same condition was not supported by the data from either male or female subjects. In fact, they were equally disliked by the female subjects.

For the female subjects, on the likability items, no double standard was implied. Although the female SP in the no sex condition was liked more than the female SP in the multiple partners condition, the same findings apply to the
male SP, in fact, the male SP in the no sex condition (out of role) was liked more than the female SP in the no sex condition (in role). These subjects seem to have based their perceived likability for both the female and male SP on the SPs' sexual activity and not on the SP's sex or sex role which would imply a double standard. The SP in the no sex condition was overall liked significantly more than the SP in the multiple partners condition, regardless of the sex of the SP.

The male subjects did not show an overall reversal of ratings across conditions. Their ratings of the SPs revealed the double standard such that the female SP in the no sex condition was seen as more usual, more open with parents, and more influenced by dates than the male SP in the same condition. In the multiple partners condition the male SP was perceived as more well adjusted and more usual than the female SP in the same condition which clearly reveals the double standard.

On the question dealing with the influence by dates it should be noted that the question may have been interpreted by the male subjects to mean liking or non-liking of the date or involvement with the date, etc. rather than only the sexual or seductive influence by the date. This is indicated by the ratings of the female SP regardless of her sexual activity as being quite influenced by dates (all three female SPs were rated high \( M = 3.8 \) on the rating scale). This result also may be due to the fact that females are generally seen as influenced or non-autonomous. But, if it were only taken
to mean seductive influence, the female SP in the multiple partners condition probably would have been seen as more influenced by dates than the SPs in the other conditions as the traditional view is that the sexual woman is acted upon or seduced.

Also, on this item from an inspection of the means, male subjects see the influence of dates on the male SP as a function of the amount of sexual activity (number of partners), with the more sexually active SPs being seen as more influenced by dates. Perhaps the influence by dates may have been interpreted to be the female date allowing sexual intercourse in the multiple partners and monogamous conditions, thus determining the male SP's behavior as the female in a sexual relationship has traditionally been seen as the "gatekeeper". Thus, the no sex condition male was perhaps viewed as the least influenced because it was his decision not to engage in sex.

On the two items dealing with openness with friends and with parents, partial support was gained for two of the experimental hypotheses. The sixth hypothesis that the female SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about her behavior than the female SP behaving out of role was supported only by the data from the male subjects on the item dealing with openness with parents but not with friends. On the openness with parents item all the conditions for the male and female SPs were rated very low on the rating scales except the
female SP in the no sex condition by the male subjects, i.e. for the most part adolescents are not seen as open about their sexuality with their parents. The female SP not having sexual relations was the only one viewed as being quite open or telling her parents about her behavior.

The seventh hypothesis was that the male SP behaving in role will be seen as more open about his behavior than the male SP behaving out of role. This hypothesis was supported by the data from the female subjects on the openness with friends item but not on the openness with parents item. An interesting result on the openness with friends item was that the male SP in the multiple partners conditions was rated as more likely to tell his friends about his behavior than the female SP in the same condition only by the female subjects. This result implies that the behavior is less sanctioned for the females who engage in sex with multiple partners by the female subjects. Females think that females who engage in this behavior still disclose less about their activity than males to friends but male subjects did not make this distinction. Inspection of the means (as presented in Table 1) on this item reveals an interesting result. The female SP, regardless of condition, is viewed as only slightly open with friends yet as the male SP increases his number of sexual partners his openness with friends also sharply increases as seen by the female subjects.

In both cases, the sixth and seventh hypotheses about
openness (described above) were supported by data from the opposite sex. Males and females may hold certain cross-sex stereotypes (such as the daughter reassuring the parents of her virginity and the male telling his friends of his sexual encounters) but within their own sex group, the members realize the stereotypes are less realistic.

**General Attitudes About Sexual Activity**

The large number of main effects across the Activity variable indicate more evidence for discrimination based on the sexual activity of the SP regardless of the sex of the SP. These main effects reveal a conservative direction in attitudes toward sexual activity for both male and female subjects. Both groups of subjects rated the SP in the no sex condition toward the more favorable pole on mental health, happiness, school performance, etc. With the exception of the male subjects having rated the SP in the multiple partners condition as more popular, the SP in the no sex condition was favored over the SP in the monogamous and multiple partners condition. Also, when a finer discrimination was noted, the monogamous SP was favored over the SP in the multiple partners condition.

On all the items (except attempting to find or keep love and degree of religious belief), for both male and female subjects, the SP in the multiple partners condition was attributed a greater amount of internal causality for his/her behavior than the SP in the no sex condition. Thus, although females are more interpretive of sexual behavior, it is speci-
fically multiple partners behavior that seems to lead to causal inferences that are internal. Rather than explaining why adolescents do not have sex, as it might be in a less restrictive society, the multiple partners SP elicits motivational and personality interpretations. On the basis of attribution theory (Jones & Davis, 1965) these data suggest that for the most part, it is still the adolescent who engages in sex with different partners who is out of role and whose behavior is not seen as desirable.

The data seem to point to attributions being based on sexual behavior not on the sex of the SP. There was only one significant Activity X Sex of SP interaction that reflected internal causation for each subject group (for female subjects—the item dealing with attempting to find or keep love and for male subjects—perceived adjustment item). Our fourth experimental hypothesis that the female SP behaving out of role will be seen as more pathological than the male and female SPs behaving in role was only minimally supported by the data. Also, the fifth experimental hypothesis that the locus of causality will be rated significantly more internal for the female and male who behave out of role than the female and male who behave in role was not supported as the internal attributions were based on the SPs' sexual activity condition alone. The results also indicate very few attributions, one way or the other, being made regarding the female and male SP in either the no sex or monogamous conditions.
The results indicate that out of the possible 31 items, the female subjects made more distinctions based on the sexual activity of the SP (main effects of Activity on 20 items) than did the male subjects (main effects of Activity on 8 items) suggesting the females still hold stronger attitudes toward individuals on the basis of their sexual activity. All main effects for the Activity variable are in the same direction for both male and female subjects. Also, the female subjects made finer discriminations between the activity levels, in that all three levels were significantly different from each other, than did the male subjects.

The female subjects, as well as making finer discriminations, were more evaluative in their ratings of the SPs than the male subjects. The female subjects made evaluative judgements on items measuring happiness, insecurity, school performance, meaningfulness of relationships and consideration of the consequences, while the male subjects made only two evaluative judgements on the items dealing with popularity and consideration of the consequences.

In their attributions of causality for the specified behavior, the female subjects yielded a larger number of effects on the items that reflected internal causality. These items included the relationship with parents, finding or keeping love, getting others to like him/her, attempting to "show-off" and attempting to "spite" parents. The data from the male subjects only yielded significant effects on two items
that dealt with internal causation (relationship with parents and attempting to "show-off"). These results point out that the female subjects are more interpretive of and seek more reasons for the described sexual behavior than the male subjects, as well as holding a more traditional view of sexuality in which the individual is judged solely on the basis of his or her sexual behavior.

According to the results, the degree of traditionality (as defined by the scores on the AWS) of the subjects has little influence on their attributions for the SP in the stimulus stories. Main effects and interactions for the traditionality variable only occurred on a select number of items. Most of the significant effects were in the predicted direction such that the non-traditional subjects were less discriminating on the basis of sexual activity in their attributions toward the SP than the traditional subjects.

The non-traditional male subjects viewed the person choosing not to have sex as doing so for internal reasons (i.e. choice) not because of personality needs or external circumstances and as very well adjusted. Yet the traditional male subjects perceived more internal causation for the multiple partners behavior as well as perceiving the SP in this condition as very well adjusted. This result may be due to the non-traditional and traditional male subjects utilizing different criteria for adjustment. Also, on the item dealing with sexual enjoyment, the non-traditional males viewed the male SP
in the no sex condition as enjoying sex more if he experienced it than did traditional males and the traditional males viewed the male SP in the multiple partners condition as enjoying sex more than did the non-traditional males. The non-traditional males see the male SP in the no sex condition as having more internal control, better adjusted and as liking sex more if he experienced it. This result implies that the non-traditional males are more willing to allow the male SP freedom from the stereotyped male role of "stud" as exemplified by the male SP in the multiple partners condition. Yet the traditional males continue to view the male SP in the stereotypic role as having more internal control, better adjusted and as receiving the most enjoyment from sex.

While the traditionality variable adds only limited but useful insight into the attitudes of adolescents about sexuality, in this instance perhaps a finer discrimination such as dividing the subjects into three groups along the AWS would be of more value in future research. On the other hand, it may be that the adolescent does not yet have an integrated world view about women's roles and sexuality as the adult may have.

In summary, very little evidence of a double standard of sexual behavior among adolescents was found. The present study indicates that adolescents utilize the number of partners with which a person has had sexual intercourse rather than the sex of that person to make evaluative judgements and causal attri-
butions. Because the frequency of intercourse with the specified number of partners was held constant (at a moderate level) in this study, it can be ruled out as a factor in this data. Cowan and Weible (1977) reported that when the sexual activity level was varied along with the number of partners, a double standard in attitudes of the adolescents was noted. Perhaps in future research the incidence of sexual intercourse should be varied at different levels of numbers of partners in a factorial design to determine how this may enter into the double standard.

A conservative attitude among the adolescents studied was noted such that there was significantly more approval for the sexually inactive SP, especially by the female subjects. It is not known from this study whether the frequency per se of sexual behavior may better reflect a double standard. Also, this conservative attitude among this sample of adolescents is discrepant with previous studies (Sorenson, 1973; Miller & Simon, 1974) in which an increase in the rate of sexual activity and intercourse among adolescents has been indicated. Perhaps this study hits at a more personal level than previous research, thus, the more conservative attitudes because the present study did not ask general attitude questions about sexuality or the social desirability of sexual activity. Perhaps in this instance, behaviors change faster than cultural norms. The more global, general attitudes studied previously may be more liberal but at the deeper, personal
level the attitudes are still more conservative as well as decisions about a person based on his/her behavior. Although information regarding knowledge of sex and the sexual activity of the subjects was not collected in this sample, one might infer that the paradox of increasing adolescent sexual behavior and attitudinal conservatism may explain the frequently noted concern about adolescents' contraceptive neglect (Abramson & Bryne, 1979). Thus through the use of the attributional technique researchers may be able to ascertain more personal as well as more accurate attitudes about adolescent sexuality.
Appendix A

Please circle the number of the answer which is most true of your feelings. This is not a test and there are noright or wrong answers. Please do not leave any questions blank.

What is your sex? Female Male (Circle one)

1. How much did you like Barbara?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly dislike</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>slightly neutral</td>
<td>slightly like</td>
<td>slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like quite a bit</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How unusual is Barbara's behavior compared to people you know?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unusual</td>
<td>quite unusual</td>
<td>slightly unusual</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly usual</td>
<td>usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unusual</td>
<td>unusual</td>
<td>unusual</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly usual</td>
<td>usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite unusual</td>
<td>very unusual</td>
<td>usual</td>
<td>usual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much would you like to know someone like Barbara?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly would not</td>
<td>would not</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>would slightly</td>
<td>slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>would slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How much do you approve of Barbara's behavior?

1 2 3 4
strongly disapprove disapprove neutral
disapprove quite a bit slightly
5 6 7
approve approve strongly
slightly quite a bit

5. How much would you want to be like Barbara?

1 2 3 4
strongly would not would not neutral
would not quite a bit slightly
5 6 7
would would strongly
slightly quite would
a bit

6. How happy do you think Barbara is in general?

1 2 3 4 5
very quite slightly neutral slightly
unhappy unhappy unhappy happy
6 7
quite very
happy happy

7. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is influenced by her friends?

1 2 3 4 5
not at slightly somewhat quite a bit very much all

8. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is due to a poor relationship with her parents?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all slightly somewhat quite a bit very much

9. How well do you think Barbara does in school?

1 2 3 4 5
poorly below average average above average excellent
10. How popular do you think Barbara is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>popular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is influenced by her dates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is an attempt to find or keep love?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is an attempt to get others to like her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much do you think Barbara is concerned with what other people think about her behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How meaningful do you think Barbara's relationships are with boys?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How insecure do you think Barbara is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>insecure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How likely is it that Barbara will be married before she is 20 years old?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is an attempt to "show off"?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

19. How likely do you think it is that Barbara tells either of her parents about her behavior?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

20. How likely do you think it is that Barbara tells her friends about her behavior?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

21. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is an attempt to "spite" her parents?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

22. How much do you think Barbara thinks of the consequences of her behavior before she acts?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

23. How mentally disturbed do you think Barbara is?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

24. How much do you think Barbara's behavior is due to boredom?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

25. How much do you think Barbara's decision to engage in this behavior is due to her own sexual needs?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much

26. How much do you think Barbara enjoys sex?

   1   2   3   4   5
  not at all  slightly  somewhat  quite a bit  very much
27. How well adjusted do you think Barbara is?

1. not at all 2. slightly 3. somewhat 4. quite a bit 5. very well
adjusted

28. How important do you think religion is to a person like Barbara?

1. not at all 2. slightly 3. somewhat 4. quite 5. very
important

29. How much do you think Barbara's decision to engage in this behavior is the result of her own choices and free of outside pressure?

1. not at all 2. slightly 3. somewhat 4. quite a bit 5. very much

30. How much do you think Barbara's decision to engage in this behavior was the result of situations she finds herself in and not her own choices?

1. not at all 2. slightly 3. somewhat 4. quite a bit 5. very much

31. How much do you think Barbara's decision to engage in this behavior was due to her personality or inner needs (not her own choices and not the situations she finds herself in)?

1. not at all 2. slightly 3. somewhat 4. quite a bit 5. very much
Appendix B

The statements listed below state situations men and women often find themselves in. Please read each statement carefully. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree mildly, (3) disagree mildly, or (4) disagree strongly. Please circle the number of your answer.

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.

   1........2........3........4
   agree agree disagree disagree
   strongly mildly mildly strongly

2. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

   1........2........3........4
   agree agree disagree disagree
   strongly mildly mildly strongly

3. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

   1........2........3........4
   agree agree disagree disagree
   strongly mildly mildly strongly

4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.

   1........2........3........4
   agree agree disagree disagree
   strongly mildly mildly strongly
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5. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

6. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

7. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

8. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

9. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

10. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in various trades.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly

11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

agree agree disagree disagree
strongly mildly mildly strongly
12. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. There are many jobs which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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