2009

Lesbian subjective distress to violations of trust as a function of the butch/femme paradox: Evolutionary and social-cognitive hypotheses

Sarah Carver-Steil McNay

LESBIAN SUBJECTIVE DISTRESS TO VIOLATIONS OF TRUST AS A FUNCTION OF THE BUTCH/FEMME PARADOX: EVOLUTIONARY AND SOCIAL-COGNITIVE HYPOTHESES

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Psychology:

General-Experimental

---

by

Sarah McNay Carver-Steil

June 2009

LESBIAN SUBJECTIVE DISTRESS TO VIOLATIONS OF TRUST AS A FUNCTION OF THE BUTCH/FEMME PARADOX: EVOLUTIONARY AND SOCIAL-COGNITIVE HYPOTHESES

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Sarah McNay Carver-Steil

June 2009

Approved by:

[redacted]

Robert Cramer, Chair, Psychology — 6.1.09 Date

[redacted]

Charles Hoffman

[redacted]

Luis Rivera

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated both evolutionary and social-cognitive hypotheses regarding butch and femme lesbians' subjective distress to imagining a romantic partner's emotional and sexual infidelity. Participants' distress to other violations of trust, that could possibly threaten a relationship, was also investigated. To provide support for the assumptions underlying the predicted results, data regarding butch and femme lesbian mating psychology and practices including 1) participants' beliefs about the relationship between love and sex, 2) sources of relationship rewards, 3) sex partner preferences, and 4) lifestyles and values, were also collected. Using these data, a sample of butch lesbians who reported being attracted to femme lesbians and femme lesbians who reported being attracted to butch lesbians was identified. Based on an evolutionary psychology perspective, it was hypothesized that 1) more butch lesbians than femme lesbians would be distressed by imagining a romantic partner's sexual infidelity, and 2) more femme lesbians than butch lesbians would be distressed by imagining a romantic partner's emotional infidelity. According to a social-cognitive perspective (i.e., double-shot hypothesis) it was predicted

that butch and femme lesbians would agree that a partner's sexual infidelity would be more distressing than emotional infidelity. Contrary to evolutionary and social-cognitive perspectives, the lesbian sample was distressed more by emotional infidelity than by sexual infidelity. However, the infidelity distress findings were consistent with explanations based on the participants' reported beliefs about the conditional relationship between love and sex, and about the rewarding aspects, sexual or emotional, of a romantic relationship. The heuristic value of evolutionary and social-cognitive perspectives for future lesbian pair-bond research as well as avenues for future research on lesbian sexual-strategies and mating psychology was discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First off I want to thank my advisor Dr. Robert Cramer, who is not just a mentor but also an inspiration and a role model to me. His dedication to his field and his students is above reproach and, without his faith in me over the years, I may not have realized my potential in the field of experimental psychology. I also must thank John Meteer who instructed my Intro to Experimental Psychology Lab and encouraged me to get involved with SLERG. In those early years, I learned so much working with Dr. Cramer, John Meteer, Ryan Lipinski, and Jeremy Houska; I saw them struggle and triumph and they always welcomed me with patience and gave me the opportunity to learn the true essence of experimental research. I also want to thank Triin Anton who went with me to the Rocky Horror Picture Show during high school and ended up right along side me in SLERG years later; it's been fun -thanks.

Next I want to thank my committee members Dr. Charles Hoffman and Dr. Luis Rivera, two amazing psychologists who were willing to take on this monster thesis and help me steer through it. I also want to thank economist and LGBT researcher Dr. Nancy Rose who took time to help me adapt my measures for use with the lesbian community. I must also

express my gratitude to those responsible for awarding me the CSUSB LGBT scholarship for my efforts in the LGBT community; I hope they are proud of my work and their investment in me.

Next I want to thank Dr. Jacqueline Rhodes of the English department, for introducing me to LGBT studies and urging me to pursue the general experimental psychology program, and Dr. Aurora Wolfgang, coordinator of the LGS study group, for helping me earn my certificate in women's studies with an emphasis in LGBT studies so that I could keep current on LGBT issues while working on my psychology degree. Jacky and Aurora, and Nancy Rose for that matter, gave me the tools and encouragement I needed to be brave and persevere as an LGBT mentor, educator and researcher. And perhaps more so, they gave me something to look forward to. I know that if they can defy the odds and balance academia with activism and advocacy then I can to.

Now I have to give "props" to all the people who offered safe spaces for participants to complete and return questionnaires. I want to thank Angela Romagnoli the current CSUSB GLBT campus resource, who offered the California State University, Pride Center as a safe space for participants to complete and turn in questionnaires. I

also want to thank Sharon Sanders of the psychology department, Professor Angela Asbell of the English department, and Instructor Gina Hanson from the English department and the writing center, who also offered safe spaces for participants to return completed questionnaires. And, when I was recovering from my knee injury and struggled with walking, I am honored to thank Irma Beltran from Valley College, Crystal Carver-Steil my loving devoted wife, My new friends from Inland Empire Equality, and Paula Arnett of the CSUSB psychology department and the San Bernardino Rainbow Pride Youth Alliance, for bringing interested parties to me when I couldn't walk to them. Thanks ya'll; I couldn't have done it without you.

The next thanks goes to Ashley Hayes, an amazing fiction writer and my best friend in the whole wide world and maybe even the universe, who gave birth to two babies and still found time to tirelessly bring me lots of black coffee with cinnamon and sit by my side while I was making sense of all my research. Ashley, sweet Ashley, you never gave up on me, and you always made me feel like this thesis was worth the fight.

Last but not least I want to thank my family. My dad, step-mom and step-brother for their support and

encouragement; my mom for her endless hours of baby sitting and driving me everywhere when I couldn't walk; My wonderfully supportive landlord Bea Jo Dill; my grandma for being my rock and my hero; My honorary bro and sis, Daniel and Sarah, and their precious Kiera; and my wife for standing by my side and always believing in me. I also want to thank my brother, sister, cousins and my patient, intellectually intimidating daughter who was six months old when I started college and is now about to start middle school this September 2009. You all are smart, radiant kids and teens and your glistening smiles have lit my way through many challenges including this thesis. Though I am quite a bit older, you inspire and motivate me to excel because I know you are right behind me and I want to show you that it is possible to achieve your goals even if others don't seem to understand your passions. Thank you all: you rock!

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to everyone who has ever devoted their lives to legitimizing and defending the rights of the GLBTIQ community. Without all the courage, fervor, and sacrifice, none of us would be where we are today, and this thesis could not exist. Thank you from the bottom of my heart. Let's keep up the great work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Evolutionary psychology, which draws heavily from evolutionary biology, provides a theoretical framework for investigating social processes in human relationships such as attraction, short-term dating and long-term mating strategies, as well as infidelity and jealousy. Evolutionary biology argues that humans possess innate mechanisms, represented genotypically and phenotypically, that explain and predict fitness. These mechanisms explain why humans - or any species for that matter - are predisposed to maximize their fitness and why some individuals are more "fit" than others. According to evolutionary psychology, the sexually distinct, innate jealousy mechanisms in men and women have evolved to promote their reproductive fitness. In women, the mechanism is particularly sensitive to a partner's emotional infidelity, and in men, the mechanism is particularly sensitive to sexual infidelity (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Sex differences in subjective distress to a romantic partner's

emotional and sexual infidelity has frequently been reported across diverse cultures including Chile, China, Germany, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United States (Buss, Larsen, Westen & Semmelroth, 1992; Buss et al., 1999; Buunk, Angleitner, Oubaid & Buss, 1996; Geary, Rumsey, Bow-Thomas & Hoard, 1995; Fernandez, Sierra, Zubeidat, Vera-Villarroel, 2006; Wiederman & Kendall, 1999).

Gay men and lesbians, due to their unique same-sex pair-bonding environments, have been utilized to test an evolutionary psychology approach to infidelity. Results from such studies, however, are mixed. For example, Sheets and Wolfe (2001) found that gay men and lesbians were more distressed by a partner's emotional infidelity than by sexual infidelity. Dijkstra, Groothof, Poel, Laverman, Schrier, and Buunk (2001), however, found that gay men were distressed more by emotional infidelity, and lesbians were distressed more by sexual infidelity. One possible explanation for these inconsistencies may be related to gender expression within the gay and lesbian community. In both studies, the responses of gay men to imagining a partner being unfaithful were consistent. Emotional infidelity was particularly distressing. However, in one

study the lesbians' response to emotional infidelity was consistent with responses of gay men and previously reported responses of heterosexual women (Sheets & Wolfe, 2001) and in the other study, their responses to sexual infidelity were consistent with heterosexual male responses (Dijkstra et al. 2001). This thesis aims to clarify these inconsistencies by focusing specifically on butch and femme expression orientations within the lesbian community. By recognizing these distinctions, fresh insight into the empirical inconsistencies and the debate between evolutionary and social-cognitive perspectives of jealousy can be gained (Bassett, Pearcey and Dabbs, 2001; Singh, Vidaurri, Zambarano, & Dabbs, 1999).

Evolutionary Psychology of Attraction and Mating

Numerous factors contribute to the psychology of interpersonal attraction. For example propinquity, defined by closeness to a potential mate, is shown to positively influence mate-selection (Nahemow & Lawton, 1975; Segal, 1974). Furthermore, physical appearance plays a pertinent role in attraction (Green, Buchanan, & Heuer, 1984; Sprecher, 1989), and in both initiation of relationships as well as long-term relationship satisfaction (McNulty, Neff,

& Karney, 2008). Moreover, potential mates with similar genetic traits, identified by phenotypic configuration, are preferred to those that are less physically similar (Rushton & Nicholson, 1988). Attitudinal similarity also increases mate appeal (Byrne, 1971; Cramer, Weiss, Steileder, & Balling, 1985). Finally, Darwin's (1871) theory of sexual selection contributed a powerful theory of attraction and mate-selection, based on solving sexually divergent survival dilemmas confronted by males and females.

Sexual strategies theory (Buss, 2004; Buss & Schmitt, 1993) provides a framework for explaining and predicting numerous factors related to both short-term and long-term date preference and mating strategies for both men and women. According to Buss and Schmitt (1993), a short-term mating strategy concerns selection of a mate with no deliberate attempt to forge a long-term relationship. On the other hand, a long-term mating strategy concerns selection of a mate with intent to form a lasting pair bond that includes a sexual component as well as a relationship or emotional component. Theoretically, short-term mating strategies of men and women omit survival related mate characteristics as they do not concern acquiring mates that

will commit and invest in long-lasting relationships. Therefore, preferences are focused on increased sexual opportunities for men and increased access to favorable genes for women. Not surprisingly, Buss and Schmitt (1993) found that, when considering mates for the purpose of casual sex, men are most concerned with the opportunity for sex, while women are most concerned with a partner's health and physical attractiveness, signs of a good genotype.

For long-term mating, preferred traits represent qualities that contribute to long-term survival and reproductive success. To increase their reproductive success, men place more value on characteristics in a mate that signal health, vitality and fertility, such as youth and physical attractiveness, in order to increase the likelihood of successful childbearing and rearing, and to ensure that investments contribute to their own biological offspring (Buss, 1994; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss & Schmidt, 1993). Women, on the other hand, are more concerned with status related characteristics that signal good financial prospects, economic stability, and a willingness to invest resources when pursuing a long-term strategy. In theory, a woman's substantial investment in bearing and rearing offspring requires material resources and adequate

protection (Buss, 1994; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Buss & Schmitt, 1993). This asymmetry in mate preference traits based on relationship intent, short-term vs. long-term, provides support for the underlying mechanisms that men and women utilize during mate selection suggested by sexual strategies theory (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

Regardless of strategy utilized, short-term vs. long-term, men show higher desire for sex partner variety than do women (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt, 2003). In a cross cultural study conducted by Schmitt (2003), for example, men and women from fifty-two different countries, in ten major regions of the world, were surveyed. Regions included: North and South America; Africa and the Middle East; Eastern and South Eastern Asia; Eastern, Western and Southern Europe; as well as Oceania. In all countries surveyed, despite relationship status or sexual orientation, men compared to women, reported not only a greater desire for a variety of sexual partners within a one month period but also over a thirty year period (Schmitt, 2003). This finding provides further evidence in support of evolved sexually dimorphic partner mating mechanisms.

Natural selection most likely privileged men who preferred quantity, as apposed to quality of sex partners and women who required commitment and resources from their mates (Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993). From this perspective, conscious mate selection is unnecessary. Instead, men desiring and acquiring a variety of sex partners would have produced greater numbers of offspring than men who established strictly monogamous partner relationships.

In further support of adaptive male sexual propensity, studies show that men and women also differ in desire for sex. In a review of relevant research on gender differences in sexual motivation and drive, Baumeister, Catanese, and Vohs (2001), concluded that not only do men desire sex more often and with more partners than do women, they also think about sex, have sex, and masturbate more frequently than women. Moreover, men enjoy more varied sexual fantasies and practices than women, and initiate sexual encounters more often while refusing them less often than women. In addition, Baumeister et al. (2001) concluded that men "expend more resources and make more sacrifices for sex," than women (p.263). Men's willingness to invest resources and sacrifice for sexually receptive females compliments women's adaptive need for mates with resource potential.

Women who engaged in sexual activity with males who were reluctant to contribute resources would have had less offspring survive to reproductive age than women who secured a committed mate (Buss, 2004; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993).

Other research on women's sexual strategies, shows that some survival-based benefits can serve as potential benefits of short-term mating whether or not a long-term pair bond has already been established. Specifically, extra-pair encounters such as brief love affairs or sexual unfaithfulness, offer women immediate resource acquisition and opportunities for mate-switching to attain more desirable long-term mates. In a study conducted by Greiling and Buss (2000), women reported that extra-pair liaisons were highly beneficial and increased chances of resource support such as receiving material gifts, i.e. clothing and jewelry, as well as financial and provisional rewards along with career advancement opportunities. Furthermore, women reported that such affairs increased chances of finding partners willing to invest more time, emotional support and commitment than their current partners. Extra-pair mating, though seemingly short-term in nature, may serve as a method of acquiring better mates with long-term potential.

Evolutionary Psychology of Infidelity and Jealousy

Distinct reproductive strategies predict gender differences in response to current relationship factors such as sexual jealousy (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Though males and females benefit from concern regarding both their mate's sexual behavior and resource distribution, the innate jealousy mechanisms such as males' increased sexual jealousy and females' increased jealousy of resource commitment, reflect behavior and concerns most conducive of successful reproduction (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

According to an evolutionary perspective, these gender differences reflect reproductive challenges faced by men and women pursuing a mate. For example, men and women differ in fundamental aspects of parental investment (Trivers, 1972). Paternity certainty is a challenge, distinct to men, that assures resources are allocated to biological offspring. Hence, men, when selecting a mate, place a premium on youth and physical attractiveness, factors that signal chastity, fertility, and health (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). For women, parental investment involves allocating their bodies and time as resources for bearing and rearing offspring (Trivers, 1972). Maternal investment, depending on cultural differences, can take up to five

years, from conception to weaning, and includes physically demanding child-rearing obligations.

A romantic partner's infidelity threatens both paternity certainty and paternal investment. For men, pair bonding with a sexually promiscuous female increases the likelihood that investments are made to non-biological offspring, thereby threatening reproductive success. In contrast, women who pair bond with emotionally promiscuous men risk loosing material resources to other women with other offspring. Both sexual and emotional infidelities yield stable sex differences in reported distress (Buss et al., 1992). Buss et al. (1992) utilized a forced choice method to test the differences between men and women in distress relative to sexual and emotional infidelity. They found that imagining a partner being sexually unfaithful elicited more distress in men than in women. Furthermore, a partner's emotional unfaithfulness elicited more distress in women than in men (see also Abraham, Cramer, Fernandez & Mahler, 2001; Buss et al., 1999; Buunk et al., 1996; Cramer, Abraham, Johnson & Manning-Ryan, 2001; Cramer, Manning-Ryan, Johnson.& Barbo, 2000; Fenigstein & Peltz, 2002; Geary et al., 1995; Sagarin, Becker, Guadagno, Nicastle & Millevoi, 2003; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993).

Because a mate's sexual infidelity threatens paternity certainty, men who detect and respond to this threat are successful at producing and rearing biological offspring. Maternity certainty is never in question; therefore, sexual infidelity is less distressing to women than to men. In contrast, a mate's emotional infidelity threatens resource commitment and women who detect and respond to this threat are expected to be more successful in achieving their reproductive goals. Threats to partner's continued resource commitment are less threatening to men than to women.

Sexual and emotional infidelities are not the only relationship factors that produce gender differences. Cramer et al. (2000) investigated other relationship "violations of trust" that might occur and elicit gender differences in distress. The violations of trust studied consisted of male-linked and female-linked relationship threats and included, "threats to sexual accessibility," defined as a "partner no longer able to have sexual intercourse" (male-linked), "threats to a partner's physical attractiveness," defined as a partner intentionally or unintentionally being unattractive (male-linked), and "threats to economic security" defined as partner joblessness either intentional or unintentional

(female-linked). Consistent with evolutionary psychology, Cramer et al. (2000) found that men were more distressed than women regarding threats to sexual access and degradation of a partner's appearance, whereas women were more distressed than men regarding partner joblessness.

Social-Cognitive Critique of Evolutionary Psychology

The social cognitive perspective offers an alternative explanation for the observed gender differences in distress to a mate's unfaithfulness. According to Desteno and Salovey (1996), differences in infidelity distress, between men and women, are not biologically linked but are due to behavioral differences learned via socialization. The double-shot hypothesis presented by DeSteno and Salovey (1996) posits that the reported sex differences distress to emotional or sexual infidelity are linked to the co-occurrence of both infidelities. In other words, emotional and sexual infidelities are not likely to be independent. According to the double-shot hypothesis, women find imagining a partner's emotional infidelity distressing because women have learned that a man in love is also likely to be sexually involved. Men, in contrast, have not

learned to link love and sex in this way when women are concerned. Men find imagining a partner's sexually infidelity distressing because men have learned that a woman who is sexually involved is also likely to be in love. Women have not learned to link love and sex in this way when men are concerned. The double-shot hypothesis suggests that evolved mechanisms are not the antecedent to infidelity distress but that socialized beliefs about men and women predict distress in relationships. In testing this hypothesis, using two different samples of heterosexual women and men, DeSteno and Salovey (1996) found that women were more likely to believe that emotional infidelity predicted a partner's sexual infidelity and that men were more likely to believe that sexual infidelity predicted a partner's emotional infidelity. Harris and Christenfeld (1996) developed a similar line of logic to challenge the evolutionary interpretations of gender differences in subjective distress to infidelity.

DeSteno and Salovey (1996) and Harris and Christenfeld (1996) sought to replicate and reinterpret the findings of Buss et al. (1992) and in doing so, revealed that attitudes about male and female behavior, not merely innate mechanisms, are greatly influential in determining jealousy

responses to unfaithful partners. The former asserts that these attitudinal differences are learned and the latter suggests that distress is routed in logical deductions based on learned beliefs about male and female behavior, which may or may not be biologically linked. Both accounts offer a challenge to the theory that gender differences in subjective distress result exclusively from evolved mechanisms.

Resolving Evolutionary and Social-Cognitive Perspectives

Even if gender role socialization mediates differences between men and women in distress to infidelity, other research suggests that innate mechanisms play a fundamental role in the way men and women view a partner's sexual and emotional unfaithfulness. For example, findings explained by the double-shot hypothesis only show that men and women differ in their beliefs about partner infidelity signals, they do not address whether or not these beliefs are accurate or inaccurate predictors. In a study conducted by Greiling and Buss (2000), women were more likely to be sexually unfaithful if 1) their current partners' work history was unstable, 2) a competitor offered stronger

economic security, 3) a competitor was more attractive than their current partner, and 4) a competitor was more willing to commit than their current partner. Thus, for a man to infer that sexual infidelity is a legitimate threat and that it may also predict emotional infidelity, provides evidence that evolved sexual jealousy mechanisms accurately interpret the nature of women's extra-pair mating strategies. Similarly, if men were more willing to invest resources to acquire sexual opportunities (Baumeister et al., 2001), a signal of emotional involvement, this investment would threaten a woman's resource acquisition from her partner. Thus she would be more distressed by her mate investing emotionally with a competitor as this type of investment is most threatening to the relationship.

Early detection of relationship threat is key to sustaining long-term pair bonds. Therefore it would be imperative for men to be sensitive to sexual infidelity signals and for women to be sensitive to emotional infidelity signals. An alternative to the forced choice format used by Buss et al. (1992; 1999) is to evaluate gender differences in information processing sensitivity to cues that elicit jealousy. To delineate male and female jealousy thresholds and to determine if men and women

differ in cue processing efficiency based on type of infidelity being signaled, Schützwohl (2005) presented men and women with cues derived by Shackelford and Buss (1997) that were found to signal either sexual or emotional infidelity and ranked by their level of diagnostic value. Schützwohl (2005) asked participants to report which cue, presented in rank order from least to most diagnostic of a partner's infidelity, signaled the onset of jealousy and which cue signaled intolerable jealousy. Though no significant differences between men and women were observed at the first threshold, for the second threshold, men needed fewer sexual infidelity cues and women needed fewer emotional infidelity cues to reach intolerable jealousy. Furthermore, information processing of sexual infidelity cues was more efficient (i.e., faster response times) in men than in women, and processing of emotional infidelity cues was more efficient in women than in men. These sex differences in infidelity cue processing provide further support for an evolutionary perspective that innate, psychological mechanisms are responsible for gender differences in infidelity distress (Schützwohl, 2005).

Schützwohl and Koch (2004) provided additional support that men and women are inequitably sensitive to infidelity

signals that threaten their committed pair-bonds. Male and female participants were presented with story scenarios that were either contextually personal (i.e., referring directly to the participants and their partners) or contextually impersonal (i.e., referring to story characters not known to the participants). Each scenario type contained sexual and emotional infidelity cues as well as neutral information. When asked to recall story elements a week later, men recalled more sexual infidelity cues than did women and women recalled more emotional infidelity cues than did men. These sex differences in cue recall were, as expected by evolutionary psychology, significant for the personal context but not for the impersonal context. If beliefs about typical male and female behavior (i.e., double-shot hypothesis) mediate observed gender differences in jealousy research, then the impersonal context should have yielded the same recall effects as the personal context. This interaction between context and infidelity cue type, on recall, suggests that detection and sensitivity to infidelity cues exclusively relates to committed relationship threats, where investment is critical.

The research conducted by Schützwohl and his colleagues indicates that the frequently observed sex differences in infidelity distress are not limited to self-report methodologies. Other researchers have also extended the boundary conditions of an evolutionary perspective on jealousy. A study conducted by Pietrzak, Laird, Stevens, and Thompson (2002) tested not only self-reported distress but also physiological responses including heart rate, skin conductance, temperature and surface electromyographic activity, to jealousy evoking imagery. Once again, more men than women reported sexual infidelity as most distressing and more women than men reported emotional infidelity as most distressing. In addition, men experienced more intense physiological responses to imagining a romantic partner's sexually infidelity than emotional infidelity, and women experienced more intense physiological responses imagining a partner's emotional infidelity than sexual infidelity. These physiological results are consistent with results reported by Buss et al. (1992) but not consistent with results found by Harris (2000).

The violation of trust research conducted by Cramer et al. (2000) provides additional support for the argument that an evolutionary perspective has heuristic value in

understanding stressors in a romantic relationship. Using sex differences in mating interests and strategies as a "starting point," Cramer et al. (2000) showed that evolutionary psychology's explanatory and predictive power is not limited to distress produced by emotional and sexual infidelity. That is, men more so than women were distressed by male-linked violations of trust (i.e., a partner restricting sexual access) and women more so than men were distressed by female-linked violations (i.e., loss of economic security).

Attempting to provide evidence for a social-cognitive perspective, Ward and Voracek (2004) investigated both social-cognitive and evolutionary hypotheses sampling from different relationship types. Their research responded to the criticism that adaptionist studies on sexual jealousy lack recognition of participant personal relationship status. Ward and Voracek (2004) replicated the sex differences predicted by evolutionary psychology among married men and women in response to emotional and sexual infidelity. However, when infidelities were co-occurring, single men and women did not differ in distress to sexual and emotional infidelity. Based on these findings, Ward and Voracek (2004) stressed the importance of interpreting sex

differences in infidelity distress cautiously, and that future research should continue to examine people in various types of relationships before assuming that sex differences are universal.

Same-Sex Pair-Bonding and Jealousy

Gay men and lesbians have been compared to heterosexual men and women to test whether the previously reported gender differences in mating psychology generalize to same-sex mating situations. When comparing gay men, heterosexual men, lesbians, and heterosexual women, Bailey et al. (1994) found that, consistent with an evolutionary perspective, both gay men and heterosexual men were more interested in sex without commitment than were lesbians and heterosexual women. However, some differences were observed between lesbians and heterosexual women. Specifically, lesbians were significantly less concerned with partner status than were heterosexual women and, consistent with men, lesbians were more interested in visual sexual stimuli than were heterosexual women. Bailey et al. (1994) concluded that both socialization similarities and innate mechanisms could explain the findings. However since gay men, lesbians, heterosexual men and heterosexual women

differ in at least one main facet, same-sex versus other-sex attraction, and may also differ in innate characteristics, no one theory is sufficient.

If the threat to paternity certainty accounts for males' increased sensitivity to sexual infidelity cues (see Buss, 1994; 2003), then gay men, who are arguably unconcerned about paternity certainty, would not necessarily report greater distress to sexual as compared to emotional infidelity. It is possible, however, that gay men, who share beliefs about men regarding love and sex with women, may find emotional infidelity more distressing than sexual infidelity (see double-shot hypothesis). Lesbians would not differ from heterosexual women because maternity certainty is irrelevant to both populations. Predictably, studies have found that gay men do report more distress over emotional infidelity than do heterosexual men, and lesbians report consistent with heterosexual women, that emotional infidelity is more distressing than sexual (Bailey et al., 1994; Harris, 2002; Sagarin, et al. 2003; Sheets & Wolfe, 2001).

Interestingly, in a study conducted by Dijkstra et al. (2001), lesbians reported greater distress over sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity whereas their gay male

counterparts reported the opposite (for similar predictions see Camello, 2002; Fernandez, 2000). As noted above, both theories of jealousy, evolutionary (threats to sexual strategies) and social-cognitive (beliefs about sex and love) have yielded inconsistent findings for gay and lesbian populations. These conflicting results pose important yet answerable questions regarding the use of gay men and lesbians to support or refute sex differences in evolutionary and social-cognitive research.

Complications Measuring Sexual Orientation

A potential complication in utilizing gay men and lesbians for scientific research is gender-typed expression orientation. Within gay male populations, for example, a range of role expressions from hyper-effeminate to hyper-masculine (i.e., dandies and leather-daddies) challenge stereotypes regarding typical gay male characteristics. Unfortunately this distribution of role expression is not accounted for in studies that utilize gay male samples. In the lesbian community, a similar dichotomy of role expression is termed the butch-femme aesthetic (Case, 1993). Butch and femme classifications are comparable to

heterosexual masculine and feminine distinctions in gender expression.

Butch/Femme Expressions

Many of the relevant studies, conducted since the mid 20th century, classify all lesbians as one homogenous group (Singh et al., 1999). Following the assertion that all lesbians are androgynous, two classes of lesbians who are highly distinct from one another in mannerisms, style of dress, and overall disposition have been averaged together with more androgynous lesbians. Psychological theories of same-sex orientations have arguably failed to incorporate the butch/femme distinction. Buss (1994) reported that lesbian attraction and pair bonding choices support evolutionary psychology concepts of innate female characteristics, and justify heterosexual male and female sexual behavior. Additionally, based on the consistent findings between heterosexual, lesbian and gay samples, Bailey et al. (1994), characterized the two female populations, and the two male populations, as similar. Unfortunately, findings across studies have not been so consistent.

In The Evolution of Desire (1994), Buss asserts differences between heterosexual men and women by using the

different lifestyle dynamics of gay men and lesbians as a cross-sex mating strategy control. In his revised edition (2003), studies that explored the differences between butch and femme lesbians were addressed but only so far as to point out that individual differences within lesbian populations have been observed and that theories of homosexuality should "attend" to butch-femme distinctions (Buss, 2003, p.256). Interestingly, Buss (2003) neglected to attend to these distinctions and their possible implications in evolutionary theory of sex differences and the traditional use of lesbians as a control population for observing how women behave in a woman only dating environment.

When considering lesbians as a whole, the majority of lesbians rate themselves as more androgynous in behavior than any one extreme, feminine or masculine, and their gender expressions are more a mixture of various characteristics that cannot be linked specifically to either masculine or feminine classifications (Singh et al., 1999). This could in part be due to activism during the second wave of the feminist movement that promoted an androgynous lesbian identity to increase solidarity among lesbians and combat socially prescribed gender stereotypes

that perpetuate the suppression of women (Case, 1993). As a result, many lesbians began actively expressing gender in an androgynous way that is distinctive of modern lesbian stereotypes. Currently, lesbians who continue to express butch and femme roles are often scrutinized for perpetuating heteronormative sex role behavior (Case, 1993; Jagose, 1996). Still, the butch-femme aesthetic survives these social pressures and arguably remains a robust distinction within the lesbian community.

The most recent wave of the gay liberation movement, commonly associated with the 1969 Stonewall Rebellion in the United States, is currently operating at full force with the goal of acquiring equal rights for sexual minorities and validation of sexual minorities as a class of people who have endured persecution for their mere existence within civilized society (Carter, 2004). Butch and femme distinctions have been affected by the historical landscape but have withstood the tests of time and attempts to dissolve the categories by many feminist ideologists who still argue that the distinctions are left over from a time when lesbian survival was dependent upon passing as straight, man-woman couples, and that the continuation of such lesbian subgroups is a hindrance to the acclimation of

equality for all women (Case, 1993). In other words, butch and femme lesbians express themselves more traditionally masculine or feminine, thus they appear to mimic heteronormative sex roles. However, those who defend butch and femme expressions contend that such sub categories are natural within the range of lesbian identifications (Case, 1993).

Though labels promote negative stereotyping, butch and femme identities are observable across time, culture and empirical study. Singh et al. (1999) noted that the earliest documented observations concerning masculine-feminine lesbian role identification date back to the 1700s, and that classifications similar to butch and femme are found in various countries around the world. Not only are butch and femme distinctions prevalent in a variety of cultures, recent studies have reported statistical differences between lesbians categorized as butch and femme (Bassett et al., 2001; Singh et al., 1999).

Butch/Femme Distinctions

Differences between butch and femme lesbians adhere to differences between heterosexual men and women (Bassett et al., 2001; Singh et al., 1999). For example, on average butch lesbians have higher waste-to-hip ratios than femmes

(Singh et al., 1999) just as men, on average, have higher waste-to-hip ratios than women (Singh, 1993). In addition, butch lesbians have higher testosterone levels, on average, than femmes, and are more likely than femmes to report atypical gender behavior during childhood (Singh et al., 1999). Butch lesbians are also more likely than femmes to struggle with womanhood adjustment (Singh et al., 1999). Thus, butches express their prepubescent gender in more traditionally "boy appropriate" ways, than do femme lesbians who report gender development comparable to heterosexual females (Singh et al., 1999). Nevertheless, both butch and femme lesbians report significantly greater atypical childhood gender behavior than do heterosexual women however this similarity is most likely related to same-sex attraction more so than gender-typed expression (Singh et al., 1999).

Regarding attraction and mate selection, femmes, compared to butches, are more likely to consider a potential partner's financial resources -as do heterosexual women- as a high priority (Bassett et al., 2001). Complimentarily, butches report more jealousy of financially successful competitors than do femmes, and femmes report more jealousy of physically attractive

competitors than do butches. These distinctions equate to differences frequently found between heterosexual men and women. As far as jealousy elicited by emotional versus sexual infidelity, no significant differences between butch and femme lesbians have been observed (Bassett et al., 2001).

Though partner qualities were measured, Bassett et al. (2001) did not report if the type of lesbian partner, each participant imagined being unfaithful (butch, femme, or androgynous), was controlled. They did mention that Pearcey, Docherty and Dabbs (1996) found that butch and femme lesbians were likely to pair-bond with their respective role-identified counterparts, however Basset et al. (2001) did not appear to directly control for the possibility that some butches may have imagined butch or androgynous lesbians and some femmes may have imagined femme or androgynous lesbians being unfaithful. It is possible that the identity expression orientation of lesbian partner imagined, plays a predictive role in infidelity distress, and thus may account for failure to observe expected differences.

Research Goals

The choice of a lesbian sample to investigate mechanisms that activate jealousy in romantic relationships is informed by evolutionary psychology and social-cognitive factors. Symons (1979), for example, explained that "the fact that . . . lesbians behave like heterosexual women, only more so, indicates that some aspects of human sexuality are not so plastic" (p. 304-305). Lesbian mating psychology, however, is not as consistent as Symons implies. Like heterosexual women, lesbians show a preference for older partners but lesbians tend to prefer younger mates as they age (Kenrick, Keefe, Bryan, Barr, & Brown, 1995). And unlike heterosexual women, lesbians are less interested in a potential partner's social status (Bailey et al., 1994). It is important to recognize that these findings do not draw distinctions between lesbians identified in terms of butch and femme.

Pearcey, Docherty and Dabbs (1996) found that lesbian couples generally consist of one predominately butch partner and one predominantly femme partner. Consistent with this finding, Bassett et al. (2001) reported that butch and femme lesbians preferred a more femme partner and a more butch partner, respectively. Bassett et al (2001)

also utilized the butch/femme distinction in their investigation of subjective distress to imagining a romantic partner's emotional and sexual infidelity. They hypothesized that butch lesbians would be more distressed than femmes by a partner's sexual infidelity, and that femme lesbians would be more distressed than butches by a partner's emotional infidelity. Their expected differences were analogous to differences frequently found among heterosexual men and women when they were asked to imagine a romantic partner being emotionally and sexually unfaithful (e.g., Buss et al. 1992; Buss et. 1999). Bassett et al. (2001) failed to confirm their hypotheses.

The purpose of the present research was to reexamine the Bassett et al. (2001) hypotheses and procedures. First, both evolutionary and social-cognitive hypotheses were investigated using a variety of emotional and sexual infidelity formats first described by Buss et al. (1999). Second, violations of trust in a romantic relationship, other than emotional and sexual infidelity, were examined (Cramer et al. 2000). Third, the infidelity distress hypotheses using butch lesbians who report a preference for a femme romantic partner and femme lesbians who report a preference for a butch romantic partner were tested. While

the Bassett et al. (2001) study did differentiate butch and femme participants, they may have failed to successfully carry the distinction through to the participant's partner's role expression. Finally, additional information pertaining to lesbian mating psychology was gathered to 1) provide explanatory context for the hypothesized results and 2) to further illuminate the butch/femme paradox.

Hypotheses

Evolutionary Psychology Hypotheses

Early jealousy research from our laboratory did not attend to the butch/femme distinction, and found that lesbians, like heterosexual women, reported being particularly distressed by imagining a romantic partner's emotional infidelity (Camello, 2002; Fernandez, 2000). These results were consistent with the evolutionary psychology expectation that the participants' biological sex would trump their sexual orientation in determining the source of relationship distress. Bassett et al. (2001), however, argued that because butch lesbians evidenced more masculinity in their physiognomy, physiology and sexual behavior than did femmes (see also Singh et al. 1999) they should also evidence a more masculine psychology when it

comes to jealousy. Femmes, in contrast, would then evidence a more feminine psychology when it comes to jealousy.

Consistent with the Bassett et al. (1999), extrapolations from evolutionary psychology - while also recognizing distinctions among the participant's partner's role expression - the present study tested the following hypotheses, 1) more butch lesbians than femme lesbians will be distressed by imagining a romantic partner's sexual infidelity, and 2) more femme lesbians than butch lesbians will be distressed by imagining a romantic partner's emotional infidelity. By extension, a similar pattern of differences was hypothesized for the male-linked (i.e., partner no longer trying to look attractive) and female-linked (i.e., partner no longer wanting to work) violations of trust.

Social-Cognitive Hypotheses

The social-cognitive account (i.e., double-shot hypothesis, DeSteno & Salovey, 1996) of the reported sex differences in distress to a partner's infidelity assumes that men and women have learned different information about how men and women, respectively, associate love and sex. Men presumably have learned that a woman who is having sex is very likely to also be in love. Women have not learned

to draw such an inference when thinking about a man who is having sex. Furthermore, women presumably have learned that a man who is in love is also very likely to be having sex. Men have not learned to draw such an inference when thinking about a woman who is in love. For men, according to DeSteno and Salovey (1996), sexual infidelity signals a double-shot of infidelity because a partner is also likely to be in love. For women, in contrast, emotional infidelity signals a double-shot of infidelity because a partner is also likely to be having sex. Not surprisingly a social-cognitive account, like evolutionary psychology, predicts the frequently reported sex differences in subjective distress to a partner's unfaithfulness. Interestingly, the "unique" knowledge men and women allegedly have about one another is actually common knowledge. Moreover, Buss et al. (1999) found that the sex of the target determines beliefs about the target, not the sex of the believer. Hence, men and women share common beliefs about men and women (see also Cramer, Lipinski, Bowman, & Carollo, 2009).

According to the arguments above, it was hypothesized that butch and femme lesbians, who share comparable gender role socialization pressures, will respond similarly to imagining a female partner's emotional and sexual

infidelity. That is, the participants will report that sexual infidelity is more distressing than emotional infidelity because women know that, for women, sexual infidelity implies the co-occurrence of love, while emotional infidelity does not imply the co-concurrence of sex. Because the social-cognitive perspective was develop only to explain and predict participants' response to emotional and sexual infidelity, other violations of trust hypotheses were not tested in this format.

Butch/Femme Mating Psychology: Supplemental Analyses

Additional explanatory support for the hypothesized differences could be found in measures of 1) participants' beliefs about the relationship between love and sex, 2) sources of relationship rewards, and 3) sex partner preferences. Additional information was collected on lesbian lifestyles and values. For example, the social-cognitive hypotheses (i.e., double-shot) would find additional support if both butch and femme lesbians reported that they believe that a partner's sexual infidelity, implies the co-occurrence of love more so than emotional infidelity implies the co-occurrence of sex. Additionally, the present research tested an alternative

explanation of the differences hypothesized by evolutionary psychology. For example, it is possible that butch lesbians are more distressed by sexual infidelity than are femmes because they, more so than femmes, receive their relationship rewards from sexual activity. In contrast, it is possible that femme lesbians are more distressed by emotional infidelity than are butch lesbians because they, more so than butch lesbians, receive their relationship rewards from emotional involvement and commitment. The remaining measures allowed for comparisons between butch and femme lesbians in their partner preferences, and in their lifestyles and values. Observing reliable differences between butch and femme lesbians, would support evolutionary hypotheses regarding distress to emotional and sexual infidelity, as well as other violations of trust, based on distinctions in expression orientation among butch and femme lesbians argued by Bassett at al. (2001) and the present author.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants and Recruitment

A total of 165 participants were sampled. All participants were biological females over 18 years of age, who reported an attraction orientation towards other females. Participants were recruited using three methods in an attempt to secure an externally valid sample of the lesbian community. They were recruited using the "snow ball" method in which lesbian individuals, unaware of the nature of the study but known to the researcher(s), were asked to not only participate themselves, but to refer friends and acquaintances to participate as well (Lee & Renzetti, 1990; Singh et al., 1999). The second method of recruitment was to utilize the California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) campus Pride Center listserv to notify all affiliated individuals about the study and request their participation. This listserv included, but was not limited to, students, faculty, members of the community, and other similar institutions throughout California. For this "email snowball," adapted from a similar mass emailing technique used by Cohen and

Tannenbaum (2001), participants were notified that paper and pencil questionnaires, which included privacy envelopes, were available at the CSUSB Pride Center. Fliers were also posted on bulletin boards in each building at the CSUSB main campus directing interested party's to contact either the Pride Center or, if there were any specific questions related to recruitment, to email a special account set up for information correspondence only. To protect participant anonymity this email account was deleted once the recruitment portion of the study had terminated and the incentive dispersed. The third method of recruitment, similar to that used by Bassett et al. (2001) and Dijkstra et al. (2001), was the coffee shop-bar hop method in which participants were recruited from lesbian "hot spots," including coffee shops, gay bars, lesbian social gatherings, and pride festivals, located in Southern California.

Incentives for participation were as follows: for CSUSB psychology students, extra-credit was awarded upon completion of the questionnaire; for all methods of recruitment, a raffle was set up for a $60 gift card. The raffle prizewinner was randomly selected, notified via email, and the prize was mailed. Incentive disbursement

marked the termination of recruitment. In no instance were participants' identities linked to individual questionnaires. All participants were treated in accordance with the "Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct," (American Psychological Association, 2002).

From the total sample of participants, Butch and Femme test groups were determined based on participant responses to three items, 1) reported degree of sexual orientation, 2) reported degree of butchness, and 3) degree of femmeness. Only participants who reported a high degree of same-sex attraction were utilized. For degree of butchness, in accordance with Singh et al. (1999), degree of butchness was subtracted from degree of femmeness revealing the total butch/femme expression identification score. These scores were classified by the following guidelines, 1) a score of zero indicated androgynous orientation, 2) a positive score indicated butch orientation, and 3) a negative score indicated femme orientation. Participants with an androgynous orientation were not considered for this study. It is important to note that computed butch and femme expression identifications did not differ from forced choice participant self-report.

A total of 116 butch (N = 55) and femme (N = 61) participants with an average age of 36.10 (SD = 11.972) were utilized (Butch *M* =37.62, SD = 12.026; Femme *M* = 34.75, SD = 2.399). 93.1% of participants were from California, 1.7% from Arizona, 0.9% from Minnesota, 0.9% from Nevada, 1.7% from Utah, and 0.9% from Canada. As for ethnicity, 1.7% were African American, 18.1% Latin American, 1.7% Asian American, 61.2% European American, 4.3% Native American, 0.9% Canadian, 4.3% mixed race, and 4.3% did not specify. For education level, 0.9% had less than high school education, 7.8% were high school graduates, 0.9% had high school equivalency, 35.3% completed some college, 32.8% were college graduates, 19% had graduate degrees, and 2.6% had specialized vocational training. Regarding relationship status, 22.4% were single, 26.7% were single but in a relationship, 6% were registered domestic partners (RDP) only, 19.8% were legally married (note: married participants included those who were both RDP and married and those who were just married), 22.4% were in cohabitation relationships but not RDP, and 1.7% did not specify relationship status. For all butch and femme participants, 88.8% expected monogamy in a relationship, 9.5% did not, and 1.7% did not specify. As

for sobriety, 13% reported they were under the influence of a mind-altering substance (i.e. alcohol) and 87% reported they were not. It is important to note that during the recruitment period a California election repealed the right for same-sex couples to legally marry; 79.3% of participants were recruited prior to the election and 20.7% were recruited after.

For analyses that required knowledge of participant partner expression identification (PEI), participants were asked to report the degree of butchness (1 = exclusively femme, 9 = exclusively butch) of their ideal partners. PEI categories were determined by considering participants' butch/femme expression identification and reported ideal partner expression identification. Only butch participants who reported a preference for femme partners (PEI < 4) and femme participants who reported a preference for butch partners (PEI > 4) were utilized (N = 64) for the primary analyses. The average age of butch participants attracted to femme partners (N = 34), was 38.42 (SD = 13.198), and the average age of femme participants attracted to femme partners (N = 30), was 37.66 (SD = 13.592).

Materials

The materials used to collect participant information and test hypotheses included a Demographic Scale, Violations of Trust Questionnaire adapted from Buss et al. (1992, 1999) and from previous research conducted in our lab, Love and Sex Beliefs Scale adapted from Desteno and Salovey (1996), Relationship Rewards Scale adapted from Wiederman and Allgeier (1993), Sex Partner Preference Scale adapted from McGuirl and Wiederman (2000), and a Lesbian Lifestyle Questionnaire which included items adapted from Dijkstra et al., 2001 and Singh et al. (1999), and written by the author.

Demographics Survey

The 10-item Demographic Survey collected information about the participants such as age, biological sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, education level, occupation, as well as residency and relationship status. Due to the nature of distinction between butchness and femmeness, and its close link to gender expression (Carr, 2005), participants were asked to report biological sex only. Finally, as an added precaution, participants were asked to indicate if they were under the influence of alcohol or other mind altering substances as this was found

to affect lesbian responses to infidelity scenarios, specifically, lesbians were found to report greater distress to sexual infidelity while intoxicated (Dijkstra et al., 2001). See Appendix B for the complete Demographic Scale.

Violations of Trust Questionnaire

The seven-item Violation of Trust Questionnaire (VTQ) measured the participant's subjective distress to paired violations of trust. Each item paired a female-linked (femme-linked) and male-linked (butch-linked) violation and asked participants to indicate which violation was most upsetting or distressing. For example, participants were asked to "Please think of a serious committed romantic relationship that you had in the past, currently have, or would like to have. Imagine you discover that the woman, with whom you are seriously involved, became interested in someone else. What would upset or distress you more?" Participants responded by selecting either "Imagining your partner trying different sexual positions with another woman" or "Imagining your partner falling in love with another woman." Different items presented the emotional and sexual infidelity in a mutually exclusive and combined format, and asked participants to respond to other

violations of trust including a threat to economic security and physical attractiveness. See Appendix C for the complete VTQ.

Love and Sex Beliefs Scale

The four-item Love and Sex Beliefs Scale (LSBS) measured participant's beliefs about the relationship between love and sex. Participants were asked to rate the likelihood of several scenarios involving a romantic partner's behavior. For example, participants were asked to read "Imagine that you discover that *YOUR PARTNER* has sexual contact with another woman. How likely do you think it is that *SHE* is also in love with this woman?" [Italics and caps included on LSBS.] Participants responded using a 7-point scale anchored with 1 = Unlikely and 7 = Very Likely. Participants also responded to an item that asked them to imagine a partner falling in love with another woman and to indicate the likelihood that she is also having sex with this woman. In two additional items the participant's beliefs about her own likely behavior regarding falling in love and sexual contact was measured. See Appendix D for the complete LSBS.

Relationship Rewards Scale

The six-item Relationship Rewards Scale (RRS) measured the reward value participants place on emotional and sexual activity in a romantic relationship. For example, participants were asked to respond to "Being involved in an emotionally close dating relationship is important to me," and "Sex is the best part of intimate dating relationships." Participants responded using a 9-point Likert-type scale anchored with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 9 = Strongly Agree. See Appendix E for the complete RRS.

Sex Partner Preference Scale

The 10-item Sex Partner Preference Scale (SPPS) measured the sexual characteristics participants prefer in a long-term romantic partner. Participants were asked to respond to each item with her level of agreement. For example, participants were asked to respond to items such as "Be physically attractive" and "Like erotic videos, books, and magazines" using a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. See Appendix F for the complete SPPS.

Lesbian Lifestyle Questionnaire

The 42-item Lesbian Lifestyle Questionnaire (LLQ) measured degree of sexual orientation, butch-femme

expression identification, butch-femme attraction orientation, maternal experience and desire, lesbian exclusivity, and sexual receptivity and performance.

To measure sexual orientation (SO) participants were asked to directly indicate their sexual orientation. Participants who reported a heterosexual orientation were excluded. Second, consistent with Dijkstra et al. (2001), participants responded using a 7-point Likert scale anchored with 1 = *completely same-sex oriented*, 7 = *completely other-sex oriented*. Scores equal to four or higher were discarded. This scale was chosen because it allows for some level of sexual variety, thus it is more ecologically valid than a forced choice measure, and is less dependent upon rigid constructs of sexuality (Dijkstra et al., 2001).

Due to the controversial nature of roles within the lesbian community, to measure butch-femme expression identification (BFEI), participants were first provided an explanation of butch/femme terms, (see also Singh et al., 1999). See Appendix G for complete explanation. Next, The butch-femme rating consisted of asking participants to indicate with which dimension they most identify, butch or femme. The forced choice item read, "If you had to choose

either butch or femme to identify yourself, which would you choose?" (See Bassett et al (2001). The two "strength-of-conviction" items were measured on a 9-point rating scale anchored with 1 = *definitely not true*, and 9 = *definitely true*, and read as follows: "I think of myself primarily as butch" and "I think of myself primarily as femme." Participants, who rated themselves higher on the butch scale than on the femme scale, were assigned to the butch group, whereas participants, who rated themselves higher on the femme scale than on the butch scale, were assigned to the femme group. The forced-choice items served as a manipulation check to further ensure the reliability of the continuous measure, the primary indicator of butchness or femmeness in the present study. Participants who refused to indicate butch or femme identification were excluded from the study. Past research shows that very few participants make such a refusal (e.g., Bassett et al., 2001; Singh et al. 1999). Consequently, no major butch-femme classification problems were anticipated.

A second, exploratory, "real-world" forced choice item was included. For this item, participants were instructed to, "Imagine you and your partner are participating in a

wedding registry." Participants were asked, "When asked to indicate your status, which of the following would you select?" Participants indicated either bride or groom by checking the corresponding box. Within the American culture, this item represents a "real-world," forced choice dilemma, for which the behavioral expression of masculine versus feminine gender typing is foreclosed. This item was included to measure participant self-identification and instrumental self-expression. If this measure has adequately predicted butch/femme role identification, it may have been effective as a measure of lesbian gender role identification without directly using butch and femme labels. Participants who indicated "bride" were considered to have expressed a more traditional feminine role, i.e. femme, than a more traditional masculine role, i.e. butch. Participants who indicated "groom," on the other hand, were assumed to have expressed a more traditional masculine role as apposed to a more feminine role. This item has not been previously tested and was not used in this research as a manipulation check. Unfortunately, because a very large percentage of participants indicted a preference for the title of "bride," this particular measure was not as helpful as anticipated and is not reported in the results.

To measure butch-femme attraction orientation (BFAO), participants were asked to "Please indicate your typical attraction preferences," regarding the following two items 1) "To which type of lesbian do you most often develop dating relationships with" and 2) "To which type of lesbian do you most often develop strictly plutonic relationships with?" For each item participants responded using a 9-point rating scale anchored with 1 = exclusively femme lesbians, and 9 = exclusively butch lesbians. Responses to the BFAO were used to control for butch participants imagining a femme partner being unfaithful, and femme participants imagining a butch partner being unfaithful.

To assess maternal experience and desire participants were asked to report their experiences and beliefs about acquiring and rearing children. For example, participants were asked to indicate whether or not they have or desire to have children, and if so, what means of fertilization they prefer. For a complete list of items, see Appendix G.

To test same-sex partner exclusivity (SSPE), i.e. the likelihood of butch and femme lesbians to consider deviating from exclusively lesbian romantic relationships dependent upon sexual strategy (short-term vs. long-term), participants were asked to, "Please rate to what degree you

would consider dating the following." Participants responded to eight items using a five-point Likert-type scale anchored with 1 = never consider, and 5 = always consider. See Appendix G for the complete LE.

The sexual action preferences of butch and femme lesbians were assessed using a sexual receptivity and performance (SRP) scale. Informed by the popular book written by Felice Newman (2004), the author developed the SRP to measure the likelihood that butch and femme lesbians would prefer sexual reception, performance, or simultaneous reciprocity. Participants were asked to, "Please rate to what degree you would prefer participating in the following activities." In addition to this "self" orientation, participants also responded to items oriented toward an ideal partner's preferences. Participants responded to nine items using a five-point Likert-type scale anchored with 1 = *never prefer*, and 5 = *always prefer*. See Appendix G for the SRP.

Procedure

All measures were administered via a paper-and-pencil questionnaire battery. Participants were informed of the general nature of the study and basic instructions by way

of a written Informed Consent (Appendix A). Demographic items preceded all of the remaining measures. The order of presentation of the measure to the participants followed the order found in the Appendix. It is important to recognize that the butch/femme expression orientation measures were presented last, because the nature of its items may inadvertently divulge the purpose of the study, and potentially prime butch or femme typed responses on other measures. Completing the battery took approximately 30 minutes. Upon completion of the battery participants were provided with a written Debriefing Statement (Appendix H).

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Evolutionary Psychology Hypotheses

A missing value analysis was conducted using participants who met the butch-femme criterion, and revealed that no measure had a percentage of missing data greater than five percent. Differences in subjective distress to emotional and sexual infidelity and to the other sex-linked violations of trust between butch participants, interested in femme partners, and femme participants, interested in butch partners were tested. The percentage of participants who reported emotional and sexual infidelity distress are reported in Table 1. The percentages for the male-linked and female-linked violations are reported in Table 2. Chi Square (χ^2) analyses were conducted to test the evolutionary and social-cognitive hypotheses. It was predicted that, according to an evolutionary perspective, butch participants would be more distressed than femme participants by a partner's sexual infidelity and femme participants would be more distressed than butch participants by a partner's emotional infidelity. Furthermore, it was predicted that butch

participants would report greater distress than femme participants to male-linked violations of trust, and femme participants would report greater distress than butch participants to female-linked violations of trust.

In regards to emotional versus sexual infidelity, both butch and femme participants reported more distress when asked to imagine a partner falling in love with another woman as opposed a partner trying different sexual positions with another woman (See Table 1). Hence, the initial infidelity hypothesis was not supported, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.77$, $p > .05$. Similar results were found for the mutually exclusive and combined infidelity scenarios, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.10$ $p > .05$ and $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.49$, $p > .05$ respectively. For the forced choice item both butch and femme participants were more distressed by imagining a partner's emotional infidelity (86%) than sexual infidelity (14%), $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 33.06$, $p < .05$. For the mutually exclusive item, both butch and femme participants were more distressed by imagining a partner forming a deep emotional attachment (but not a sexual relationship) with another woman (72%) than by a partner enjoying passionate sex (but not becoming emotionally attached) with another woman (28%), $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 12.25$, $p < .05$. And when the

participants were asked to imagine a partner both fall in love with and try different sexual positions with another woman, both butch and femme participants were more distressed by the emotional aspect (91%) than the sexual aspect (9%) of the combined infidelity, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 42.25, p < .05$.

Table 1. Percentage of Butch (Attracted to Femme) and Femme (Attracted to Butch) Lesbians Reporting Distress to Emotional Versus Sexual Infidelity Violations

	Participants	
Infidelity Violation of Trust	Butch	Femme
Forced Choice Format		
Different Sexual Positions	18	10
Falling in Love	82	90
Mutually Exclusive Format		
Enjoying Sex (No Emotion)	26	30
Emotionally Attached (No Sex)	74	70
Combined Format		
Sexual Aspect	12	7
Emotional Aspect	88	93

Note. Male-linked violations are listed first

For the remaining four violations of trust, participants indicated which of two hypothetical male-linked and female-linked scenarios was the most distressing when presented in a forced choice format (See Table 2). A larger percentage of butch participants than femme participants reported being distressed by imagining a partner no longer making an effort to look physically attractive, and more femmes than butches were distressed by imagining a partner who no longer desired to work and gave up on her career, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 5.59$, $p < .05$, $\phi = 0.30$. Butch and femme participants, however, did not respond differently when asked to indicate whether imagining a partner accumulating substantial credit card debt or losing interest and no longer wanting to have sex was most distressing, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.01$, $p > .05$. Although both groups were more distressed by the loss of sexual interest, a male-linked relationship threat, than by the accumulation of debt, a female-linked threat, the difference was not reliable ($p > .05$). No significant differences were observed when participants chose between their partner no longer making an effort to look physically attractive (male-linked), and their partner accumulating substantial credit debt (female-linked), $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.01$, $p > .05$.

The percentage of participants reporting distress did not differ as a function of the violation of trust, partner attractiveness vs. accumulated debt ($p > .05$). And finally, when participants where asked to choose between their partner losing interest in sex and losing interest in desire to work as most distressing, no significant differences were observed, $\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 0.28$, $p > .05$. The percentage of participants reporting distress did not differ as a function of the violation of trust, partner losing interest in sex vs. losing interest in work ($p > .05$)

Table 2. Percentage of Butch (Attracted to Femme) and Femme (Attracted to Butch) Lesbians Reporting Distress to Sex-Linked Violations of Trust

	Participants	
Sex-linked Violations of Trust	Butch	Femme
Item 1		
No Longer Desires to Work	56	17
No longer looks attractive	44	83
Item 2		
Accumulates Credit Card Debt	41	40
No longer Wants Sex	59	60
Item 3		
Accumulates Credit Card Debt	59	60
No Longer Looks Attractive	41	40
Item 4		
No Longer Desires to Work	50	57
No Longer Wants Sex	50	43

Note. Female-linked violations are listed first

Social-Cognitive Hypotheses

Because all participants were biological females from a common culture, and assumed to have been exposed to the

same gender role socialization, sexual infidelity was expected to be more distressing than emotional infidelity, to both groups. It was predicted that no significant differences between butch participants, attracted to femme partners, and femme participants, attracted to butch partners, would be observed. Instead, responses would reflect a larger percentage of responses in favor of sexual infidelity scenarios as most distressing. Specifically, sexual infidelity would represent a double-shot of infidelity in that females would have learned that, regarding women, if sexual infidelity occurs, emotional infidelity would also occur. Thus, sexual infidelity scenarios would be interpreted as a double-shot of infidelity, whereas emotional infidelity would not necessarily represent the co-occurrence of a sexual relationship and, therefore would not represent a double-shot of infidelity. In the case of infidelity, no significant difference between groups was observed. More participants reported that emotional infidelity scenarios were more distressing than sexual infidelity scenarios (See Table 1). For male-linked and female-linked violations, no predictions were made based on the social-cognitive perspective.

Butch/Femme Mating Psychology: Supplemental Analyses

An analysis of potential outliers revealed only a small number of extreme scores for the various measures in the exploratory analyses. These extreme scores yielded a z-score > 3.3 and were replaced with the next raw score in the sample with a z-score < 3.3. A second analysis was then conducted with no additional outliers detected.

Love and Sex Beliefs

To determine the participants' beliefs about the relationship between love and sex a measure termed the differential infidelity implication (DII, DeSteno & Salovey, 1996) score was calculated. The DII was calculated by subtracting participant's beliefs about sexual intimacy (sex) leading to emotional attachment (love) from their beliefs about emotional attachment leading to sexual intimacy. A positive score indicates that emotional closeness is more likely to lead to sexual closeness than sexual closeness is likely to lead to emotional closeness. A negative score indicates that sexual closeness predicts emotional closeness more so than emotional closeness predicts sexual closeness. No significant mean differences were observed between butch and femme participants in their

beliefs about partners and beliefs held about the self. Both groups reported that emotional closeness predicts sexual closeness more so than the reverse, for beliefs about partner, combined DII M = 1.56, SD = 2.84, for beliefs about self, combined DII M = 1.61, SD = 3.03. The same pattern was observed for butch participants attracted to femme partners, beliefs about partners, DII M = 1.29, SD = 2.80; beliefs about self, DII M = 1.38, SD = 3.60. Femme participants attracted to butch partners responded similarly, beliefs about partners, DII M = 1.87, SD = 2.90, for beliefs about self, DII M = 1.87, SD = 2.26. These beliefs about the relationship between love and sex for a romantic partner and the self, did not differ between butch and femme participants, t's (62) < 1, p's > .05.

Relationship Rewards

On the six-item Relationships Rewards Questionnaire (RRQ) asked participants to rate the importance of various sexual and emotional aspects of relationships. The RRQ was used to compute male-linked and female-linked relationship reward items. To do this, a mean was computed using the three male-linked items and a mean was computed for the three female-linked items. Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficients were 0.61 for the three male-linked items and

0.85 for the three female-linked items. The means for butch (M = 6.53, SD = 1.68) and femme (M = 6.37, SD = 1.72) on male-linked (sexual reward) and for butch (M = 7.25, SD = 1.76) and femme (M = 8.06, SD = 1.07) female-linked (emotional reward) items were calculated. The two groups did not differ, independent t's (62) < 1, p's > .05.

Within group comparisons were also performed and revealed that butch participants indicated emotional rewards (M = 7.25, SD = 1.75) were more important in a relationship than sexual rewards (M = 6.54, SD = 1.69), independent $t(33) = -3.26$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.24$. Femmes showed a similar difference between importance of emotional (M = 8.06, SD = 1.07) and sexual (M = 6.37, SD = 1.72) rewards, independent $t(29) = 4.95$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.46$.

Because results from additional exploratory items do not directly pertain to the jealousy hypotheses tested in this thesis, the full butch (N = 55) and femme (N = 61) sample, without regard to partner butch/femme expression, was used for the analyses presented below. Therefore, the sample sizes are increased from those reported for above analyses. An inspection of demographic data revealed no apparent difference, on any item, between the full sample and the sample used to test the jealousy hypotheses.

Sex Partner Preference

To assess preferred male-linked (Cronbach's α = .68) and female-linked traits (Cronbach's α = .45) of a sex partner, butch and femme participants were compared on each of 10 Sex Partner Preference Scale (SPPS) items. Independent *t*-tests revealed only one significant difference on the "take the dominant role during sex" (female-linked) item. Femme participants (M = 5.066, SD = 1.69) indicated a stronger preference, in this sex partner role, than did butch participants (M = 3.73, SD = 1.77), independent $t(114) = -4.16$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.13$. Another item approached a moderate level of statistical significance (α = 0.10). That is, butch participants (M = 5.65, SD = 0.99) indicated a stronger preference for a physically attractive partner (male-linked), than did femme participants (M = 5.30, SD = 1.22), independent $t(114) = 1.74$, $p < .10$.

To explore this item further, it was evaluated using the butch-femme sample that considered partner expression identification. The direction of the difference was the same and significant by conventional standards. Butch participants attracted to femme partners (M = 5.79, SD = 0.95) preferred a partner that was physically attractive more than femme participants attracted to butch partners

(M = 5.00, SD = 1.20), independent $t(62) = 2.95$, $p < .05$, r^2 = 0.12. Mean differences on the "take the dominant role during sex" item, were also significant. Femme participants attracted to butch partners (M = 5.43, SD = 1.50) indicated a stronger preference than butch participants attracted to femme partners (M = 3.47, SD = 1.97), independent $t(62)$ = -4.43, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.24$.

Maternal Experience and Desire

To assess maternal experience (ME), participants were asked how many children they had, whether or not they were a biological parent, whether or not their partner was a biological parent, and whether or not they were a step-parent (i.e. children came from partner's previous relationship). Thirty-two participants reported having children. The 15 butch and 17 femme participants had an average of 2.13 and 2.59 children, respectively. Their mean number of children did not differ, $t(30) = -.85$, $p > .05$. For butch parents (N = 14), 7.3% adopted, 7.3% personally gave birth, 18.2% had a partner who gave birth, and 16.4% reported that they were stepparents. For femme parents (N = 17), 3.3% adopted, 23% personally gave birth, 6.6% had a partner who gave birth, and 6.6% reported they were stepparents.

To assess maternal desire (MD), the full sample was asked whether or not they would like to have (have more) children. Participants who indicated a desire to have children in the future were also asked about preferred child-baring and fertilization methods. For the full sample, butch and femme participants with or without children who responded to MD items (N = 112), 43.6% of butch (N = 51) and 57.4% of femme (N = 61) participants, reported a desire to have children in the future.

For butch participants with maternal desire (N = 24), 12.7% preferred to personally give birth, 20% preferred a partner to give birth, 7.3% preferred to adopt only, and 5.5% preferred other child baring methods. When asked about preferred method of fertilization, 21.8% preferred alternative insemination (AI) with a known donor, 10.9% preferred AI with an unknown donor, 1.8% preferred to conceive naturally (engage in sexual intercourse with a male), and 3.6% preferred other fertilization methods.

For femme participants with maternal desire (N = 35), 34.4% preferred to personally give birth, 8.2% preferred a partner to give birth, 9.8% preferred to adopt only, and 4.9% preferred other child baring methods. When asked about preferred method of fertilization, 32.8% preferred AI with

a known donor, 13.1% preferred AI with an unknown donor, 3.3% preferred to conceive naturally, and 3.3% preferred other fertilization methods.

Same-Sex Partner Exclusivity

The Same-Sex Partner Exclusivity Scale was used to further knowledge regarding both long-term and short-term same-sex pair bonding relationships (Cronbach's α = .57) Seeing as how all participants reported a strong degree of same-sex attraction orientation, it is assumed that no differences between butch and femme participants would be found regarding short-term (consideration of a partner for casual sex) and long-term (consideration of a partner for an intimate, committed relationship) pair bonds with other lesbians. However, likelihood of participants' willingness to form short-term and long-term relationships with heterosexual women, gay men, and heterosexual men was also explored.

For short-term relationships, butch (M = 3.62, SD = 1.39) and femme (M = 3.49, SD = 1.26) participants did not differ in likelihood of considering a lesbian partner for the purpose of casual sex, independent $t(114) < 1$, $p > .05$. However, butch participants (M = 2.74, SD = 1.49), as compared to femme participants (M = 2.18, SD = 0.99),

indicated a stronger likelihood to consider a heterosexual woman for the purpose of casual sex, $t(114) = 2.42$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.41$. A similar pattern was found regarding gay men, butch participants ($M = 1.34$, SD = 0.72), as compared to femme participants ($M = 1.10$, SD = 0.35), indicated a stronger likelihood to consider a gay man for the purpose of casual sex $t(114) = 2.21$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.04$. Regarding heterosexual men, femme participants ($M = 1.85$, SD = 0.96), as compared to butch participants ($M = 1.36$, SD = 0.68), indicated a stronger likelihood to consider a heterosexual man for the purpose of casual sex $t(114) = -3.13$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.08$.

For long-term relationships, butch ($M = 4.64$, SD = 0.68) and femme ($M = 4.75$, SD = 0.57) participants did not differ in likelihood of considering a lesbian partner for the purpose of an intimate, committed relationship, independent $t(114) < 1$, $p > .05$. In addition, butch ($M = 2.15$, SD = 1.33) and femme ($M = 1.89$, SD = 1.03) participants did not differ in likelihood of considering a heterosexual woman for the purpose of a long-term relationships, independent $t(114) < 1$, $p > .05$. A similar pattern was found regarding gay men, butch ($M = 1.46$, SD = 0.94) and femme ($M = 1.30$, SD = 0.69) participants did not

differ in likelihood of considering a gay man for the purpose of a long-term relationships, independent $t(114) = 1.05$, $p > .05$. It is important to note that both groups reported a greater likelihood to pair bond with lesbians ($M = 4.66$) as compared to heterosexual females ($M = 2.02$) and gay men ($M = 1.38$). Regarding heterosexual men, femme participants ($M = 1.72$, SD = 1.00), as compared to butch participants ($M = 1.27$, SD = 0.73), indicated a stronger likelihood to consider a heterosexual man for the purpose of a long-term relationship, independent $t(114) = -2.73$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = 0.06$.

Sexual Receptivity and Performance

To evaluate performance and receptivity preferences regarding a variety of sexual actions, scores on select items from the PRS-Self, measuring participants' personal preferences, were combined. Scores on similar select items from the PRS-Partner, measuring their ideal partner's preferences, were combined as well. That is, each preference measure, performance (P), receptivity (R) and simultaneous (S), were each defined as the mean of three items measuring clitoral manipulation, oral genital stimulation, and vaginal penetration. The Cronbach alphas for the performance measures from the PRS-S and PRS-P were

0.49 and 0.62, respectively. For the receptivity measure the alphas were 0.64 from the PRS-S and 0.72 from the PRS-P. And for the simultaneous measure the alphas were 0.58 from the PRS-S and 0.80 from the PRS-P.

Two 2 X 3 mixed analysis of variance with two levels of expression identification (1 = Butch; 2 = Femme) and three levels of preference (1 = performance; 2 = receptivity; 3 = simultaneous) were conducted. In terms of the participant's self actions, there was a significant main effect for preference, $F(2,222) = 17.19$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.13$, and an interaction, $F(2,222) = 6.16$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$ (See Table 3). Pairwise mean comparisons using the *LSD* method indicated that the three preference means differed significantly from each other: performance vs. receptivity, $LSD = .19$, $p < .05$; performance vs. simultaneous, $LSD = .42$, $p < .05$; receptivity vs. simultaneous, $LSD = .23$, $p < .05$.

The interaction was interpreted by conducting a series of paired comparisons examining butch and femme means for each preference measure (See Table 3). The comparisons indicated that butches compared to femmes preferred to perform, $M = 4.46$ ($SD = .60$) vs. $M = 4.30$ ($SD = .67$), $t(111) = 1.86$, $p < .10$, and that femmes compared to butches

preferred simultaneous, $M = 4.07$ ($SD = .76$) vs. $M = 3.85$ ($SD = .93$), $t(111)$ -1.92, $p < .10$, and to receive, $M = 4.35$ ($SD = .74$) vs. $M = 4.03$ ($SD = .94$) $t(111) = -2,84$, $p < .05$.

Table 3. Means and (Standard Deviations) of Self Preference for Performance, Receptivity, and Simultaneous Sexual Action

	Participants		
Sex Action - Self	Butch	Femme	Total
Performance	4.47 (0.60)	4.30 (0.67)	4.37 (0.64)
Receptivity	4.03 (0.94)	4.35 (0.74)	4.20 (0.86)
Simultaneous	3.85 (0.93)	4.07 (0.76)	3.96 (0.85)

In terms of the participant's partner's actions, there was a significant main effect for preference, $F(2,222) = 7.91$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.07$ (See Table 4). Pairwise mean comparisons using the *LSD* method indicated that the both performance and receptivity significantly differed from simultaneous but not from one another: performance vs. simultaneous, $LSD = 0.25$, $p < .05$; receptivity vs. simultaneous, $LSD = 0.26$, $p < .05$.

Table 4. Means and (Standard Deviations) of Ideal Partner's Preference for Performance, Receptivity, and Simultaneous Sexual Action

Sex Action - Partner	Participants		
	Butch	Femme	Total
Performance	4.28 (0.81)	4.24 (0.86)	4.26 (0.83)
Receptivity	4.38 (0.81)	4.16 (0.86)	4.27 (0.84)
Simultaneous	3.10 (1.07)	4.03 (0.90)	4.01 (0.98)

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

This discussion will first review and then examine the findings of the present study. The examination will focus on lesbian mating psychology from both evolutionary and social-cognitive perspectives, and then will address implications and suggestions for future research.

Review of Results

Primary Findings

Evolutionary Psychology Hypotheses. Subjective distress to sex-linked violations of trust among butch lesbians attracted to femme partners and femme lesbians attracted to butch partners was evaluated. To evaluate emotional and sexual infidelity violations, specifically, three different formats were utilized: 1) forced choice (one violation or the other), 2) mutually exclusive (one violation but not the other), and 3) combined (both violations at the same time). Based on an evolutionary perspective of subjective distress to emotional and sexual infidelity, it was predicted that, compared to femme participants, butch participants attracted to femme

partners would report more distress to sexual infidelity. In contrast, when compared to butch participants, femme participants attracted to butch partners would report greater distress to emotional infidelity. However, both butch and femme participants reported greater subjective distress to emotional aspects of infidelity in the three infidelity formats.

In regards to the other sex-linked violations of trust, it was predicted that butch participants would report more distress to male-linked violations than would femme participants. In contrast, femme participants were expected to report more distress to female-linked violations than would butch participants. Partial support for these hypotheses was observed. It was found that butch participants reported more distress than femme participants when imagining a partner no longer making an effort to look physically attractive (male-linked), and femme participants reported more distress than butch participants when imagining a partner no longer desiring to work (female-linked). For the remaining violation of trust pairs no significant differences in distress were observed between the participants or the violations.

Social-Cognitive Hypotheses. Based on a social-cognitive perspective it was predicted that butch and femme participants would show no differences. Specifically, for both groups, sexual infidelity was expected to be more distressing than emotional infidelity. This expectation stems from the female participants sharing similar gender role socialization, and the shared social knowledge that women who are having sex are also likely to be in love, in contrast to women who are in love are not necessarily having sex. No significant differences between the groups were observed, however. Contrary to the hypothesis, both groups were more distressed by emotional infidelity than sexual infidelity.

Butch/Femme Mating Psychology Findings

Love and Sex Beliefs. To measure participants' beliefs about the relationship between Love and sex, participants were asked to estimate the likelihood of sex leading to love and the likelihood of love leading to sex. The estimates were made for both the participants themselves and their partners. On both self and partner dimensions, both groups agreed that emotional involvement was a better predictor of sexual involvement than the reverse.

Relationship Rewards. Reward values of emotional and sexual aspects of romantic relationships were also measured to provide further information for responses to previous analyses. Between groups, no differences were observed and within groups, Butch and femme participants agreed that emotional aspects of relationships are more rewarding than sexual.

Sex Partner Preference. Preferred sex-linked sex partner traits were assessed, with two items yielding significant differences. Femme participants indicated a stronger preference than butch participants for a partner to take a dominant role during sex (female-linked), and butch participants indicated a moderate sized preference than did femme participants, for a physically attractive sex partner (male-linked). When these items were evaluated using the butch-femme sample that took into consideration partner expression, butch and femme participants significantly differed on both preferences. That is, a partner who took a dominant role during sex was preferred by femme participants attracted to butch partners more so than by butch participants attracted to femme partners. In addition, butch participants attracted to femme partners

showed a greater preference for an attractive partner, than did femme participants attracted to butch partners.

Maternal Experience and Desire. Motherhood roles of butch and femme lesbian parents and prospective parents were investigated. The number of butch parents was equal to the number of femme parents, with the mean number of children being equal as well. However, more butch lesbians reported that they were not the biological parents of their children and more femme lesbians reported that they were. A similar pattern was observed for butch and femme lesbians who desired to have children in the future. That is, more butch participants reported that they desired to be parents but not biological parents of future potential children, and more femme lesbians reported that they desired to be biological parents to future potential children.

Same-Sex Partner Exclusivity. All participants in the present study expressed a strong degree of same-sex orientation, however same-sex partner exclusivity for both short-term and long-term pair bond relationships was investigated. It was expected that no differences would be observed for short-term and long-term pair-bonds with other lesbians, however the willingness to pair-bond with heterosexual women, gay men, and heterosexual men was

explored. For short-term relationships, butch and femme participants did not differ in their consideration of a lesbian partner for the purpose of casual sex. However, butch participants were more likely than femme participants to consider a heterosexual woman for the purpose of casual sex. Butch participants were also more likely than femme participants to consider a gay man for the purpose of casual sex. Femme participants, in contrast, were more likely than butch participants to consider a heterosexual man for the purpose of casual sex. For long-term relationships, as expected, both groups were equally as likely to consider a lesbian for the purpose of a long-term relationship. Both groups were also equally as likely to consider a heterosexual woman, or a gay man for the purpose of a long-term relationship. However the consideration of a member of each of these groups for a long-term relationship was much lower than for a lesbian. Finally, more femme than butch participants were willing to consider a heterosexual man for the purpose of a long-term relationship. Again, femme participants were less likely to consider a heterosexual man than a lesbian.

Sexual Receptivity and Performance. Performance and receptivity preferences regarding a variety of sexual

actions for both self and partner were examined. For self, a main effect of preference revealed that both groups preferred performing over receiving and receiving over simultaneous performance and reception. An interaction revealed that butch participants compared to femme participants, preferred to perform and that femme participants compared to butch participants, preferred simultaneous performance and reception and to receive. And finally for partner, a main effect of preferences revealed that both groups preferred a partner who preferred performing or receiving significantly more so than a partner who preferred simultaneously performing and receiving.

Examination of Findings

Examination of Emotional Versus Sexual Violations of Trust

The purpose of the present research was to provide new insight into the long-standing debate between evolutionary and social-cognitive perspectives of infidelity by incorporating butch and femme lesbian identity expression orientations. Though not all lesbians fall into one of the aforementioned distinctions, those that do, offer a unique

opportunity for studying differences in subjective distress to a romantic partner's violations of trust that have been previously thought of as sex-based, as opposed to socialized, gender expression based.

In theory, sex-linked jealousy mechanisms evolved to promote reproductive success. In females, compared to males, the mechanism appears highly sensitive to emotional infidelity acts committed by a romantic partner. In contrast, the male mechanism appears highly sensitive to sexual infidelity acts committed by a romantic partner (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Previous research suggested that the *physiological* differences between butch and femme lesbians are similar to differences observed between heterosexual men and women (Singh et al., 1999), and therefore, based on one evolutionary perspective, could predict and explain differences in infidelity distress similar to those observed in heterosexual male and female comparative samples (Basset et al., 2001). Basset et al. (2001) found that butch and femme lesbians did not, in fact, differ in subjective distress to sexual versus emotional infidelity; specifically both groups were more distressed by emotional infidelity scenarios. Though Basset et al. (2001) considered butch/femme distinctions in participants,

they neglected to directly assess if the butch/femme expression orientation of the target romantic partner played a role in participant's responses as it does with heterosexual men and women. The present study found that, even when controlling for both participant butch/femme expression orientation and ideal partner expression orientation, butch and femme lesbians reported greater distress to emotional infidelity scenarios than to sexual infidelity scenarios. Thus, the present study joins other research from our laboratory (Camello, 2002; Fernandez, 2000) that arguably provides support for a narrower evolutionary perspective. According to this perspective, females have evolved sensitivity to emotional infidelity regardless of a romantic partner's biological sex or butch/femme expression orientation.

Other researchers have argued that the sex differences in subjective distress to infidelity, predicted by evolutionary theorists, are in fact artifacts stemming from what women "know" about men and what men "know" about women (DeSteno & Salovey, 1996; Harris & Christenfeld, 1996). Recall, that the double-shot hypothesis predicts that heterosexual men will be more distressed by a partner's sexual infidelity because it implies that emotional

infidelity is co-occurring. In theory, a female partner's emotional infidelity does not imply the co-occurrence of sexual infidelity. Previous research indicated that these specific beliefs are held by both men and women (Buss et al., 1999; Cramer et al., 2009), and therefore, are not unique to men and to women. The results of the present study indicated that butch and femme lesbians agreed that, for their female partners, emotion leads to sex more so than sex leads to emotion. These beliefs, albeit not originally anticipated by the double-shot hypothesis, are not consistent with the hypothesis. Interestingly, their shared beliefs about their partners corresponded to what heterosexual women believe about their male partners, not to what women have been found to believe about a "typical" woman (Buss et al., 1999; Cramer et al., 2009).

Based on the double-shot hypothesis it was predicted that lesbians would respond to imagining a romantic partner's unfaithfulness like heterosexual men who, in theory, believe that for women, sex leads to emotional attachment. Recall, that women share men's beliefs about women and the relationship between sex and love (Buss et al., 1999; Cramer et al., 2009). Instead, the butch and femme lesbians were, like heterosexual women measured in

previous research, more distressed by emotional infidelity. And similar to past research on women's beliefs, the lesbians in the present study reported that, in regard to their partners, emotional attachment leads to sex more so than does the reverse. Therefore, women who are emotionally and sexually attracted to women believe that for other women who are emotionally and sexually attracted to women, emotional attachment leads to sex. Furthermore, because both heterosexual women and lesbians are women, they are, independent of their partners' biological sex, particularly sensitive to threats to relationship commitment.

In the present study, the value that butch and femme lesbians placed on the emotional as compared the sexual rewards of romantic relationships provides further evidence for lesbian's sensitivity to emotional infidelity. Butch and femme lesbians agreed that the emotional components of a romantic relationship are more rewarding than the sexual components. Further support for a female-specific, evolved emotional sensitivity mechanism could involve future research designed to investigate differences in infidelity distress and beliefs about love and sex between transgendered biological males and females - males who

identify and live as women and females who identify and live as men, respectively.

Reconciling Primary Findings Using Butch/Femme Mating Psychology

Butch and femme lesbians did not differ in (1) the direction of responses to imagining a romantic partner committing acts of infidelity, (2) their beliefs about the relationship between sex and love, and (3) the reward value they place on the emotional versus sexual aspects of romantic relationships. Differences, however, were observed in the other sex-linked violations of trust, and in the lifestyle and values measures. The butch/femme differences observed in the present study join distinctions found in other research, and provide support for adaption-based theories of butch/femme differences, as well as avenues for future research.

Childbearing Potential and Resource Investment. An evolutionary perspective posits that men place more value than do women on a potential mate's physical attributes because for men such characteristics communicate a mate's capacity for successful childbearing and rearing (e.g. Buss & Schmitt, 1993). In the present study butch lesbians compared to femme lesbians (1) preferred ideal partners

that were physically attractive, and (2) were more distressed when imagining a partner no longer making an effort to look physically attractive (when the alternative violation of trust was a partner no longer wanting to work). The initial difference was intensified when partner expression was controlled. That is, this partner attractiveness effect was stronger in butch lesbians specifically indentified as preferring femme lesbian partners. Consistent with these interesting findings, Basset et al. (2001) found that femme lesbians were more jealous of mate competitors that were more physically attractive than themselves. Arguably, femme lesbians recognize that butch lesbians are sensitive to a potential partner's physical attractiveness when seeking a mate. These distinctions indicate that both butch and femme lesbians are concerned with physical attractiveness in romantic relationships, but for different reasons.

For butch lesbians physical attractiveness concerns are focused on potential partners, and if physical characteristics signal information about child bearing and rearing potential, then butch lesbians, like heterosexual men, may be sensitive to a potential romantic partner's reproductive fitness signals. Interestingly, Singh et al.

(1999) found butch lesbians, on average, have high waste-to-hip ratios (WTHR) and femme lesbians, on average, have low WTHR. High WTHR, in contrast with low WHTR, are linked with fertility problems and low birth weight of first-borns (Pawlowski & Dunbar, 2005). Therefore, it may be adaptive for butch lesbians to pair-bond with femme lesbians who have less likelihood of experiencing problems with fertility. In a sense, a butch lesbians' attraction to the femme body-type might be adaptive to ensuring maternity certainty, by increasing the certainty that successful child rearing is possible. Moreover, butch lesbian's decreased desire to bare children, found in the present study and Singh et al. (1999), may be adaptive in that avoiding the role of childbearer can afford them more opportunity to be resource providers and family protectors. Future research may benefit from a more in-depth look at the relationship between the desire to bare offspring and the ability to successfully carry and give birth to healthy offspring in butch lesbians.

A potential mate's financial prospects which, for heterosexual women, signals an ability to invest resources, and dominance which signals an ability to protect, also may be a concern for lesbians. In the present study, femme

lesbians, compared to butch lesbians, reported greater distress when imagining a partner no longer desiring to work compared to imagining a partner no longer making an effort to look attractive. Interestingly, Basset et al. (2001) found that femme lesbians were more likely to be attracted to a potential partner with a high WTHR, if that potential partner also had good financial prospects. Clearly, for femme lesbians a potential partner's financial stability is an important mating factor. They prefer financial stability in a potential partner and are distressed by imagining its loss. Basset et al. also found that butch lesbians, compared to femme lesbians, became more jealous if a mate competitor had better financial prospects than themselves. Butch lesbians recognize that femme lesbians are sensitive to a potential partner's financial prospects when seeking a mate. Both femme and butch lesbians are concerned with financial stability in romantic relationships, but again for different reasons.

In the present study it was also found that femme lesbians, compared to butch lesbians, were more likely to prefer to receive sexual stimulation and to prefer a sex partner that assumes the dominant role during sex. Conversely, butch lesbians, compared to femme lesbians,

were more likely to prefer performing sexual stimulation on their partners. Butch and femme lesbians preferred divergent, yet compatible, roles in terms of sexual actions that were dominant (performance oriented) and vulnerable (reception oriented). Clearly, additional research is required before we can infer strong similarities between femme lesbians and heterosexual women in terms of their preferences for dominant partners. In the present study dominance is defined primarily in sexual terms whereas in the heterosexual mating literature dominance is defined in economic and social terms (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

Butch sensitivity to signals that communicate childbearing potential and femme sensitivity to signals that communicate resource investment ability appear to align with male and female sensitivities that, according to an evolutionary perspective, increase reproductive success (See Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Though two females cannot produce shared, biological offspring, in the present study, lesbians with biological offspring were surveyed to investigate possible distinctions in parental investment. It was observed that a large percent of femme lesbians with children, compared to a small percent of butch lesbians with children, reported that they were the biological

parent of their children. In addition, femme lesbians were more likely than butch lesbians to report a desire to bear biological offspring in the future (See also Singh et al., 1999). Conversely, a large percent of butch lesbians, compared to a small percent of femme lesbians, reported that they were parents to non-biological offspring, including adopted children, step-children, and children conceived in committed relationships via planned alternatives. Additionally, butch lesbians were more likely than femme lesbians to report a desire for a partner to bear offspring in the future. Recall, that butch lesbians, in particular, prefer mates with low WTHR, a ratio which has been linked to reproductive fitness. These distinct differences in butch and femme parental investment, which can be illuminated further by future research, may produce unique circumstances wherein both groups are female but sexual strategies differ.

Lesbian Exclusivity and Short-Term Pair-Bonds. Heterosexual women utilize opportunities for casual sex, a short-term mating strategy, to gain superior genes for potential offspring (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993). In terms of short-term mating, the lesbians surveyed in the present study presumably relaxed their standards and were more

likely to consider casual sex with non-lesbians including heterosexual women but also gay men, and even heterosexual men. When participants were asked to rate the likelihood of considering gay and heterosexual men for the purpose of casual sex, butch lesbians were more likely than femme lesbians to consider gay men and femme lesbians were more likely than butch lesbians to consider heterosexual men. Why did the lesbians in the present study indicate even the remote possibility of engaging a man in short-term casual sex? In theory, it makes sense that lesbians who engage in temporary sexual affairs with men can ensure that their reproductive success will not be jeopardized by their lesbian orientations. From an evolutionary perspective, lesbians should be inclined to consider sexual encounters with biological males to enhance their fitness by passing their genetic material to future offspring. Hence, if lesbians capitalize on a short-term mating strategy that is less restrictive than their same-sex oriented long-term mating strategies there would, in theory, be an increase in lesbian reproductive success. Therefore, more research into lesbian short-term mating strategies that may support evolutionary based theories of same-sex oriented individuals should be conducted.

Violations of Trust in Same-Sex Pair-Bonds. It may be possible that butch and femme lesbians are not "more distressed" by emotional infidelity but rather they are "less distressed" by sexual infidelity. The difference then is a matter of emphasis. For butch and femme lesbians, sexual infidelity, though not desired nor encouraged, may pose a logical, natural means of reproduction, giving a whole new definition to the term "maternity certainty." Therefore, it may not be the case that, for lesbians, emotional infidelity poses the greater threat to a relationship because resource investment is a universal concern. In the case of extra-pair mating, same-sex oriented females maybe less distressed by sexual infidelity because of increased reproductive success for both partners. Future research should consider this possibility and investigate willingness to maintain romantic relationships with sexually unfaithful partners in lesbian relationships.

In the present study, both butch and femme lesbians reported moderately more distress (59% vs. 41%) over imagining a partner losing interest in having sex (a male-linked threat) than a partner accumulating substantial credit card debt (a female-linked threat). In past research, more heterosexual men than women reported being distressed

by imagining a partner losing interest in having sex (e.g., Cramer et al., 2009). Cramer et al. (2009) argued that a partner's loss of sexual interest is particularly distressing to males due to its inferred relationship to loss of sexual access. Unlike heterosexual men and women, lesbians cannot naturally combine genetic material to produce shared biological offspring. Therefore, a lesbian's concern about a partner's loss of interest in having sex may result from circumstances unique to same-sex pair-bonds. In such a pair-bond, sex acts between partners may be more a matter of maintaining relationship bonds and reinforcing strength of physical attraction. In a sense, if a partner accumulates massive debt, this may be less communicative of loss of interest in maintaining a romantic partnership bond than if they no-longer desire to have sex.

Conclusion

Future research could benefit from continued investigation of mating strategies for same-sex oriented individuals with predictions based on either evolutionary or social-cognitive psychology. Nevertheless, there may be more to human romantic pair-bonds than resource investment, reproductive fitness, and learned beliefs about men and

women, and sex and love. The present study provides evidence that even in a female exclusive pair-bond environment, distinctions between individuals, in this case butch and femme lesbians, appear to align with distinctions previously thought to be male and female sex-linked, whether innate or learned. Overall, the findings from the present study that conform to findings from other research indicate a need to conduct more research and to continue to develop existing theories of sex-based behavior in lesbian romantic pair-bonds.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Sarah Carver McNay Steil under the supervision of Professor Robert Cramer. The study investigates investigate individual differences within the lesbian community specifically focusing on aspects related to relationships. Individuals 18 years of age or older can volunteer.

Specifically, you will be asked to complete questionnaires examining 1) your emotional and sexual interests, 2) your lifestyle preferences, and 3) your family relationships. Completing the questionnaires should take about 20-30 minutes.

Any information that you provide will be anonymous. At no time will your name, or any other identifiable information; be reported along with your responses. All data will be reported only in self-report format. At the study's conclusion you may receive a report of the results. Results will be available after December 2008.

Focusing on one's intimate, personal and sexual preferences as well as relationships and lifestyle choices (past present and/or future) may be temporarily uncomfortable for some people. Please consider this possibility before agreeing to participate in this study.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You are free to withdraw without penalty or remove any data you have provided at any time during this study. You may also omit any items you feel uncomfortable answering.

Participation in this study qualifies you to enter a $60 gift card raffle. Your participation in the raffle is voluntary and is in no way related to your participation in the study. Only one winner will be chosen. Upon completion of this survey you will be asked to provide recruiters with your email address, which will be put in a random drawing. The grand prizewinner will be notified via email once the participant recruitment period is terminated. All email addresses will be discarded once the prize has been awarded and at no time will any email addresses be linked to participants or their surveys. To ensure your anonymity,

please do not provide any additional information to recruiters upon entering.

This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of California State University, San Bernardino; a copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear somewhere on this form. If you have any questions regarding this study or if you would like a report of the results please contact Professor Robert Cramer at (909) 537-5576.

By placing a mark in the space below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of and understand the nature and purpose of this study, and freely consent to participate. Further, I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Give your consent to participate by marking an ***X*** here _____
Today's date is __/__/_____

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEY

Demographic Survey

Are you a California resident?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If **no** please specify your state or country/province of residence _____

Age ____ **Date of Birth** ___/___/___

Ethnicity (please check one box)

☐ African American

☐ Latin American

☐ Asian American

☐ European American

☐ Other (please specify)_____

Occupation (if you are unemployed, please state your most recent job title)_____

Yearly household income (please check one box)

☐ Under $25, 000

☐ $25, 001-50, 000

☐ $50, 001-100, 000

☐ Over $100, 001

When in a relationship, do you expect monogamy?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Are you currently under the influence of alcohol or some other mind-altering substance?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Highest Education Level

- ☐ Less than high school
- ☐ High school
- ☐ High school equivalency
- ☐ Some college
- ☐ College degree
- ☐ Graduate degree
- ☐ Vocational training

Please indicate your biological (birth) sex

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Intersex
- ☐ Male

Please indicate your relationship status (Please check one box)

- ☐ single, not in a relationship
- ☐ single, in a relationship
- ☐ registered as domestic partners
- ☐ married
- ☐ cohabitating, not registered as domestic partners
- ☐ other (please specify)_____

APPENDIX C

VIOLATIONS OF TRUST QUESTIONNAIRE

Violations of Trust Questionnaire

A. For the following items:

Please think of a serious committed romantic relationship that you had in the past, currently have, or would like to have. Imagine you discover that the woman, with whom you are seriously involved, became interested in someone else.

1) What would upset or distress you more? (Please check one box)

☐ Imagining your partner trying different sexual positions with another woman

☐ Imagining your partner falling in love with another woman

2) What would upset or distress you more? (Please select one box)

☐ Imagining your partner enjoying passionate sex (but not becoming emotionally attached) with another woman

☐ Imagining your partner forming a deep emotional attachment (but not a sexual relationship) with another woman

3) Imagine that your partner both fell in love with and tried different sexual positions with that other woman. Which aspect of your partner's involvement would upset or distress you more? (Please check one box)

☐ Trying different sexual positions with the other woman

☐ Falling in love with the other woman

B. For the following items:

Please think of a serious committed romantic relationship that you had in the past, currently have, or would like to have.

1) What would upset or distress you more?

☐ My partner no longer desires to work and gives up on her career.

☐ My partner no longer makes and effort to look physically attractive.

2) What would upset or distress you more?

☐ My partner accumulates $25,000 in credit card debt.

☐ My partner loses interest and no longer wants to have sex.

3) What would upset or distress you more?

☐ My partner no longer makes an effort to look physically attractive.

☐ My partner accumulates $25,000 in credit card debt.

4) What would upset or distress you more?

☐ My partner loses interest and no longer wants to have sex.

☐ My partner no longer desires to work and gives up on her career.

APPENDIX D

LOVE AND SEX BELIEFS SCALE

Love & Sex Beliefs Scale

Please think of a serious committed romantic relationship that you had in the past, currently have, or would like to have. Please respond the following items.

1) Imagine that you discover that *YOUR PARTNER* has sexual contact with another woman. How likely do you think it is that *SHE* is also in love with this woman? (Please check one box)

Unlikely						Very likely
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7

2) Imagine that you discover that *YOUR PARTNER* is in love with another woman. How likely do you think it is that *SHE* is also engaging in sex with this woman? (Please check one box)

Unlikely						Very likely
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7

3) Imagine that *YOU* have had sexual contact with another woman. How likely do you think it is that *YOU* are also in love with this woman? (Please check one box)

Unlikely						Very likely
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7

4) Imagine that *YOU* fall in love with another woman. How likely do you think it is that *YOU* are also engaging in sex with this woman? (Please check one box)

Unlikely						Very likely
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7

APPENDIX E

RELATIONSHIP REWARDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Relationship Rewards Questionnaire

For the following items, please rate your level of agreement by checking one box below each statement.

1) Being involved in a sexual relationship with someone is very important to me

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

2) It is important that my dating relationships include a great deal of emotional intimacy and sharing

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

3) The best part of intimate dating relationships is the emotional sharing and closeness

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

4) Sex is the best part of intimate dating relationships

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

5) Being involved in an emotionally close dating relationship is important to me

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

6) It is important that my steady dating relationships include sexual activity

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

APPENDIX F

SEX PARTNER PREFERENCE SCALE

Sex Partner Preference Scale

Below is a list of characteristics you may or may not find desirable in an ideal sex partner in the context of a long-term relationship. Consider the extent to which you would like your long-term sex partner to display each characteristic and use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Write a number between 1 and 7 in the space provided.

1 = Strongly Disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Slightly Disagree	4 = Neutral	5= Slightly Agree	6 = Agree	7 = Strongly Agree

1) ____ Be open to discussing sex

2) ____ Be uninhibited

3) ____ Be physically attractive

4) ____ Be knowledgeable about sex

5) ____ Pay me compliments during sex

6) ____ Clearly communicate desires

7) ____ Be easily sexually aroused

8) ____ Experience orgasm easily

9) ____ Like erotic videos, books, magazines

10) ____ Take the dominant role during sex

APPENDIX G

LESBIAN LIFESTYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Lesbian Lifestyle Questionnaire

A. **Using the scale below**

1 = Never consider	2 = Not likely to consider	3 = Might consider	4 = Likely to consider	5 = Always consider

Please rate to what degree you would consider dating…

(Place one number from 1 to 5 in the space provided next to each statement.)

1) ____ A heterosexual woman for the purpose of casual sex

2) ____ A lesbian for the purpose of a long-term relationship

3) ____ A heterosexual man for the purpose of casual sex

4) ____ A gay man for the purpose of a long-term relationship

5) ____ A heterosexual woman for the purpose of a long-term relationship

6) ____ A gay man for the purpose of casual sex

7) ____ A lesbian for the purpose of casual sex

8) ____ A heterosexual man for the purpose of a long-term relationship

B. **Please answer the following questions regarding your personal experience/values with children.**

1) How many children do you have (please include adopted, biological, and step children) _____

(If you ***DO NOT*** have children please proceed to item 2)

Please report your parental relationship to your child (children).

1a) Did you adopt?

☐ Yes

☐ No

1b) Did you personally give birth?

☐ Yes

☐ No

1c) Did your partner give birth?

☐ Yes

☐ No

1d) Are you a step-parent?

☐ Yes

☐ No

2) Would you like to have (have more) children?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you answered ***YES*** to the previous item, *please answer the following items.*

If you answered ***NO*** to the previous item, *proceed to next page.*

2a) Please report your MOST PREFERED method of having children.

(Please check only one box)

☐ to personally give birth

☐ to have a partner give birth

☐ to adopt only

☐ other preference (please specify)_____

2b) Please report your MOST PREFERRED method of fertilization.

(Please check only one box)

☐ alternative (artificial) insemination with a sperm donor KNOWN to you

☐ alternative (artificial) insemination with a sperm donor NOT KNOWN to you

☐ to conceive naturally (engage in sexual intercourse with a male)

☐ other preference (please specify)_____

C. **Using the scale below**

1 = Never prefer	2 = Not likely to prefer	3 = Might prefer	4 = Likely to prefer	5 = Always prefer

Please rate to what degree you would prefer participating in the following activities…

(Place one number from 1 to 5 in the space provided next to each statement.)

1) ____ Performing clitoral manipulation

2) ____ Performing oral genital stimulation

3) ____ Practicing simultaneous vaginal penetration

4) ____ Receiving clitoral manipulation

5) ____ Receiving oral genital stimulation

6) ____ Practicing simultaneous clitoral manipulation

7) ____ Performing vaginal penetration

8) ____ Practicing simultaneous oral genital stimulation

9) ____ Receiving vaginal penetration

D. **Please indicate your SEXUAL ORIENTATION by checking one of the boxes below.**

- ☐ Lesbian/gay
- ☐ Bisexual
- ☐ Straight
- ☐ Questioning
- ☐ Other (please specify)_____

E. **Please check the box next to the number that best represents your level of sexual orientation.**

Completely same-sex oriented						Completely other-sex oriented
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7

F. **Within the lesbian community there is a wide range of characteristics, and though "butch" and "femme" labels are theoretically controversial, in the present research they are essential for purposes of classifying the variety of roles within the lesbian community. They will in no way be used to promote stereotypes. The terms "butch" and "femme" are common descriptors within this region of the country, however it is important to note that there are similar classifications worldwide. Thus, the constructs that they represent are universal while the terms themselves are irrelevant. We ask that you do your best to rate yourself on these dimensions so that the present study's findings can compare with other similar studies.**

1) If you had to choose either butch or femme to identify yourself, which would you choose?

- ☐ Butch
- ☐ Femme

G. **For the following items please circle the number that corresponds with the degree to which you identify as butch and/or femme:**

1) I think of myself primarily as butch

Definitely Not true								Definitely True
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7	☐8	☐9

2) I think of myself primarily as femme

Definitely Not true								Definitely True
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7	☐8	☐9

H. **Please indicate your *TYPICAL* attraction preferences.**

1) Which type of LESBIAN do you MOST OFTEN develop DATING relationships with? (Please check one box)

Exclusively Femme								Exclusively Butch
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7	☐8	☐9

2) Which type of LESBIAN do you MOST OFTEN develop strictly plutonic FRIENDSHIP relationships with? (Please check one box)

Exclusively Femme								Exclusively Butch
☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	☐6	☐7	☐8	☐9

I. **Imagine you and your partner are participating in a wedding registry. When asked to indicate your status, which of the following would you select?**

☐ Bride

☐ Groom

APPENDIX H

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

This research conducted by Sarah Carver McNay Steil, examined contemporary issues in lesbian psychology including emotional and sexual interests, lifestyle preferences, and family relationships. The goal of the research was to investigate individual differences in the lesbian community, such as personal preferences and gender expression as well as specific perspectives regarding relationships: committed and casual, in addition to sexual and emotional. It is important to note that butch and femme criteria are not meant to perpetuate stereotypes and where chosen based on previous studies and similar terms cross-culturally.

If you have any questions regarding this research or if you would like to obtain the results, please contact Professor Robert Cramer at (909) 537-5576 or rcramer@csusb.edu. The results of this research will be available after December 2008.

Also, if participating in this research upset you in any way, please contact Professor Cramer at (909) 537-5576.

Recall that all responses will be analyzed in anonymous, self-report form and at no time will your responses be linked to you specifically.

For procedural interests, please do not discuss the nature of this research with any potential participants. Discussing the research can invalidate results.

If you know anyone who may wish to participate in this study, please feel free to request information via email at: LesbianStudy@gmail.com. In addition, this email will be used for all raffle prize correspondence. This email and all it's contents will be deleted no later than June 2008.

Your participation in the research is greatly appreciated.

REFERENCES

Abraham, W., Cramer, R., Fernandez, A. & Mahler, E. (2001). Infidelity, race, and gender: An evolutionary perspective on asymmetries in subjective distress to violations-of-trust. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, Winter 2001-02, 20*(4), 337-348.

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 5th ed.*

Bailey, M., Gaulin, S., Agyei, Y. & Gladue, B. (1994). Effects of gender and sexual orientation on evolutionary relevant aspects of human mating psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(6),* 1081-1093.

Bassett, J., Pearcey, S., & Dabbs, J. M., Jr. (2001). Jealousy and partner preference among butch and femme lesbians. *Psychology, Evolution, and Gender, 3(2),* 155-165.

Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a

review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5(3),* 242-273.

Bjorklund, D. F. & Shakelford, T. K. (1999). Differences in parental investment contribute to important differences between men and women. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8(3),* 86-89.

Buss, D. M. (1994). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating.* New York: Basic Books.

Buss, D. M. (2003). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating -revised edition.* New York: Basic Books.

Buss, D. & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 559-570.

Buss, D. M., Larsen, Westen, D. & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science, 3,* 251-255.

Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Choe, J. C., Lim, H. K., Hasegawa, M., Hasegawa, T., & Bennett, K. (1999). Jealousy and the nature of beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competing hypotheses about sex differences in the United States, Korea and Japan. *Personal Relationships, 6,* 125-150.

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

Buunk, B., Angleitner, A., Oubaid, V. & Buss, D. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy in evolutionary and cultural perspective: Tests from the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. *Psychological Science* 7(6), 359-363.

Byrne, D. (1971). The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press.

Camello, L. R. (2002). *Sexual Jealousy in Gay and Lesbian Partnerships*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, San Bernardino.

Carr, C. L. (2005). Tomboyism or lesbianism? Beyond sex/gender/sexual conflation. *Sex Roles. 53 (1/2),* 119-131.

Carter, D. (2004). Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution. New York: St. Martins Griffin.

Case, S. E. (1993). Toward a butch-femme aesthetic. *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader.* 294-306.

Cohen, A. B. & Tannenbaum, I. J. (2001). Lesbian and Bisexual Women's Judgments of the attractiveness of different body types. *The Journal of Sex Research, 38(3)*, 226-232.

Cramer, R. E., Abraham, W. T., Johnson, L. & Manning-Ryan, B. (2001). Gender differences in subjective distress to emotional and sexual infidelity: Evolutionary or logical inference explanation? *Current Psychology 20*(4), 327-336.

Cramer, R. E., Lipinski, R. E., Bowman, A. & Carollo, T. (2009). Subjective distress to violations of trust in Mexican American close relationships conforms to evolutionay principles. *Current Psychology, 28*, 1-11.

Cramer, R. E., Lipinski, R. E., Meteer, J. & Houska, J. (in press). Sex differences in subjective distress to unfaithfulness: Testing evolutionary and violations of infidelity expectations hypotheses. *Journal of Social Psychology*.

Cramer, R. E., Manning-Ryan, B., Johnson, L. & Barbo, E. (2000). Sex differences in subjective distress to violations of trust: Extending an evolutionary perspective. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 22*(2), 101-109.

Cramer, R. E., Weiss, R. F., Steigleder, M. K., & Balling, S. S. (1985). Attraction in context: Acquisition and blocking of person-directed action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49,* 1221-1230.

Darwin, C. (1871). *The decent of man and selection in relation to sex.* London: Murray.

DeSteno, D. & Salovey, P. (1996). Evolutionary origins of sex differences in jealousy? Questioning the "fitness" of the model. *Psychological Science, 7,* 367-372.

Dijkstra, P., Groothof, H. A. K., Poel, G. A., Laverman, T. T. G., Schrier, M., & Buunk, B. P. (2001). Sex differences in the events that elicit jealousy among homosexuals. *Personal Relationships, 8*(1), 41-45.

Fenigstein, A., & Peltz, R. (2002). Distress over the infidelity of a child's spouse: A crucial test of evolutionary and socialization hypotheses. *Personal Relationships, 9,* 301-312

Fernandez, A. M. (2000). *Asymmetries Among Homosexual Men and Women in Subjective Distress to Sexual and Emotional Infidelity: A Critical Test of Evolutionary Hypotheses.* Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, San Bernardino.

Fernandez, A. M., Sierra, J. C., Zubeidat, I., & Vera-Villarroel, P. (2006). Sex differences in response to sexual and emotional infidelity among Spanish and Chilean students. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 37*, 359-365.

Geary, D., Rumsey, M., Bow-Thomas C., & Hoard, M. (1995). Sexual jealousy as a facultative trait: Evidence from the pattern of sex differences in adults from China and the United States. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 16*, 255-283.

Green, S. K., Buchanan, D. R., & Heuer, S. K. (1984). Winners, losers, and choosers: A fields investigation of dating initiation. *Social Psychology Bullitin, 10*(4), 502-511.

Greiling, H. & Buss, D. M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of extra-pair mating. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*, 929-963.

Harris, C. R. (2002). Sexual and romantic jealousy in heterosexual and homosexual adults. *Psychological Science, 13(1)*, 7-12.

Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996). Gender, jealousy, and reason. *Psychological Science,* 7(6), 364-366.

Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: University Press.

Kenrick, D. T., Keefe, R. C., Bryan, A., Barr, A., & Brown, S. (1995). Age preferences and mate choice among homosexuals and heterosexuals: A case fore modular psychological mechanisms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 1166-1172.

Lee, R. M., & Renzetti, C. M. (1990). The problems of researching sensitive topics an overview and introduction. *American Behavioral Scientist 33*, 510-528.

McGuirl, K. E., & Wiederman, M. W. (2000). Characteristics of the ideal sex partner: Gender differences and perceptions of the preferences of the other gender. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 6*(2), 153-159.

McNulty, J. K., Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2008). Beyond initial attraction: Physical attractiveness in newlywed marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(1), 135-143.

Nahemow, L. & Lawton, M. P. (1975). Similarity and propinquity in friendship formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(2), 205-213.

Newman, F. (2004). *The Whole Lesbian Sex Book: A Passionate Guide For All of Us -Revised Edition*. San Francisco: Cleis Press Inc.

Pearcey, S. M., Docherty, K. J., & Dabbs, J. M. (1996). Testosterone and sex role identification in lesbian couples. *Physiology & Behavior, 60*(3), 1033-1035.

Pietrzak, R. H., Laird, J. D., Stevens, D. A., & Thompson, N. S. (2002). Sex differences in human jealousy: A coordinated study of forced-choice, continuous rating scale, and physiological responses on the same subjects. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 23,* 83-94.

Rushton, J. P., & Nicholson, I. R. (1988). Genetic similarity theory, intelligence, and human mate choice. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 9*(1), 45-58.

Sangarin, B. J., Becker, D. V., Guadagno, R. E., Nicastle, L. D., & Millevoi, A. (2003). Sex differences (and similarities) in jealousy: The moderating influence of infidelity experience and sexual orientation of the infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior. 24,* 17-23.

Schmitt, D. P. (2003). Universal sex differences in the desire for sexual variety: Tests from 52 nations, 6 continents, and 13 islands. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(1)*, 85-104.

Schutzwohl, A. (2005). Sex differences in jealousy: the processing of cues to infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior 26*, 288-299.

Schutzwohl A. & Koch, S. (2004). Sex differences in jealousy: The recall of cues to sexual and emotional infidelity in personally more or less threatening context conditions. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 25*, 249-257.

Segal, M. W. (1974). Alphabet and attraction: An unobtrusive measure of the effect of propinquity in a field setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(5), 654-657.

Shackelford, T. K. & Buss, D. M. (1997). Cues to infidelity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 249-257.

Sheets, V., & Wolfe, M. (2001). Sexual jealousy in heterosexuals, lesbians, and gays. *Sex Roles, 44*(5), 255-276.

Singh, D., Vidaurri, M., Zambarano, R.J., & Dabbs, J.M. (1999). Lesbian erotic role identification: Behavioral, morphological, and hormonal correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76(6),* 1035-1049

Sprecher, S. (1989). The importance to males and females of physical attractiveness, earning potential, and expressiveness in initial attraction. *Sex Roles, 21,* 591-607.

Symons, D. (1979). The evolution of human sexuality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trivers. R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.). *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 136-179). Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Ward, J., & Voracek, M. (2004,). Evolutionary and social cognitive explanations of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 56*(3), 165-171.

Wiederman. M. & Allgeier, E. (1992). Gender differences in sexual jealousy: Adaptionist or social learning explanation? *Ethology and Sociobiology, 13,* 115-124.

Wiederman, M. & Kendall, E. (1999). Evolution, sex, and jealousy: investigation with a sample from Sweden. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 20*, 121-128.