

The Effects of Sexual Permissiveness, Target Gender, Subject Gender, and Attitude Toward Women on Social Perception: In Search of the Double Standard¹

Melvin M. Mark² and Mark L. Miller

The Pennsylvania State University

The sexual double standard, if held by perceivers, should result in more negative evaluations of sexually permissive females than males. Previous research on the double standard has generally ignored this normative issue, and has instead relied on self-report methods to measure personal sexual behavior and the stated limits of acceptable behavior for others. Male and female subjects, either liberal or traditional in their sex role attitudes, were exposed to a male or female target of one of four levels of sexual permissiveness. On most scales, representing a wide range of social judgments, there was no evidence of a sexual double standard. Limited evidence emerged in that male, but not female, subjects may have exhibited a double standard in their ratings of how sexual the target was. In addition, liberal males and traditional females rated female targets who had casual sex as less agreeable than comparable male targets. Despite the general absence of a double-standard effect, sexual permissiveness affected ratings such that more permissive targets were judged as less moral, less conventional, more assertive, more sexual, marginally more likable and less conforming. The findings are discussed in terms of the double standard, the effects of sexual permissiveness on social perception, and gender differences in perceiving sexuality.

¹The authors would like to thank the following: Janet Coster, Mary Fran Errigo and Vickie Klein for their assistance in composing the "transcript" and in data collection; Rich Metzger, Marylee Taylor, and Pete Whaley for allowing us to recruit subjects and to collect data during their classes; and Toni Abbey, Lance Shotland, and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments on a previous draft of this paper.

²To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, 542 Moore Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Researchers commonly study how person perception is influenced by gender (e.g., Abbey, 1982; Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985). One way gender might affect perception is through the "double standard." Although sometimes applied to judgments unrelated to sexual behavior (Galper & Luck, 1980), the term *double standard* generally refers to sexual activity (e.g., promiscuity or extramarital affairs) being judged as less acceptable for women than for men.

Two interpretations of the double standard are implicit in various writings. One focuses on the personal standard of sexual behavior that men and women adopt (e.g., Curran, 1975), while the second focuses on social, normative factors (e.g., Komarovsky, 1976). Inherent in the latter interpretation is that, if people endorse the double standard as a social norm, they not only see different bounds of sexual activity as appropriate for males and females, but they will also judge negatively those who violate the norm. Thus, a female who exhibits sexual permissiveness would be evaluated more negatively than a male who did the same. The present paper examines this social, normative interpretation of the double standard.

Some recent evidence exists that suggests that, in terms of self-reports of premarital and extramarital sexual behavior (Curran, 1975; Hunt, 1974), and the stated acceptability of most sexual behavior for females and males (Hunt, 1974; Komarovsky, 1976; Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977), the double standard is in decline. However, other evidence suggests that the double standard persists. First, males are often allowed greater latitude than females for sex without affection and for promiscuity (Hunt, 1974; Kaats & Davis, 1970; Komarovsky, 1976; Peplau et al., 1977). Second, actual behavior and stated preferences are often inconsistent with verbal rejection of the double standard. For example, while Peplau et al. (1977) found little explicit endorsement of a double standard, other results indicated implicit acceptance (e.g., men saw sex as a more important part of a relationship, and men initiated sexual activity, while women set limits; also see Carns, 1973).

Such evidence suggests that the double standard may continue to influence behavior and perception, but that explicit endorsement of the double standard in surveys is rare because of social desirability. In addition, survey methods in this literature often tap *personal* standards rather than normative standards and social sanctions. In short, an alternative research method is called for. A useful and, in this literature, underused alternative involves the presentation of target individuals of varying levels of sexual permissiveness and gender. The double standard would be observed if female targets are judged more negatively than males for equal levels of sexual permissiveness.

Janda, O'Grady, and Barnhart (1981) employed a similar method to examine the effects of expressed sexual attitudes, but only with female targets. More sexually permissive women were rated higher on personality but lower

on measures of overall evaluation and interpersonal attraction. However, because only female targets were used, it is unclear whether a double standard was in operation. Male targets may have been judged in the same way. In addition, Janda et al.'s (1981) manipulation of permissiveness (as a short "autobiographical sketch") may have inflated effects, due to possible demand characteristics or the perception of an inappropriate early self-disclosure (Wortman, Adesman, Herman, & Greenberg, 1976).

In the present research, subjects evaluated both male and female targets of varying levels of sexual permissiveness, with the permissiveness manipulation embedded in other information about the target. We examined four levels of the sexual permissiveness variable: virginity, i.e., abstinence; relationship sex, i.e., sex with affection; casual sex, i.e., sex without affection; and a control condition, containing no information about sexual permissiveness. The former three conditions represent the three sexual standards identified by Reiss (1967, other than the double standard; also see Jurich & Jurich, 1974).

If the double standard affects normative judgments, then a Target \times Sexual Permissiveness interaction would occur whereby permissive behavior results in more negative ratings for females than for males. However, it is unclear which judgments should be so affected. The double standard might have an extremely limited effect (e.g., only on ratings such as "promiscuous"), or it might create a halo effect affecting nearly all social judgments, or it might have some intermediate range of effects. To address this issue, about which previous research is generally lacking, we asked subjects to make a wide range of judgments.

We hypothesized that subjects with more liberal sex role attitudes would show less endorsement of the double standard. Thus, a Target Gender \times Sexual Permissiveness \times Sex Role Attitude interaction was predicted. This prediction was based on evidence that individuals with more liberal attitudes toward women are more accepting of variations in sexual behavior (e.g., Richardson, Bernstein, & Hendrick, 1980).

We also investigated gender differences in adherence to the double standard. Available research, however, is not consistent as to whether males or females are more likely to endorse the double standard (Hendrick et al., 1985; Jurich & Jurich, 1974), so no hypothesis was made about subject gender.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 467 students at The Pennsylvania State University, 210 male and 257 female (3 students did not report gender and were deleted). Subjects came from several classes: introductory psychology, $n = 118$; in-

introductory social psychology, $n = 215$; introductory developmental psychology, $n = 45$; organizational behavior and personnel management, $n = 92$. In most courses, participants received an extra credit point. Subjects were assigned to the conditions of a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 4$ factorial (Subject Gender \times Attitude Toward Women \times Target Gender \times Sexual Permissiveness of Target).

Procedures

Subjects in group sessions were told that they would read a computer-generated edited transcript of one of several interviews between a clinical psychologist and a student, and that their ratings of the student would be compared with evaluations made by psychologists. Open and honest ratings were encouraged. The experimenter also explained that subjects would complete some personality measures to test whether personality traits affected the ratings.

Subjects first completed an 80-item "personality and attitude" questionnaire. This included the 25-item short form of the Attitude Toward Women Scale (ATW; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) embedded among filler items, all answered on a 5-point scale.

Subjects then read a six-page "transcript," printed on computer paper, that was purportedly one of several interviews between a clinical psychologist and normal students recruited for research. The instructions explained that, because the transcript was computer generated and edited, topics might sometimes change abruptly. (The transcript accordingly contained numerous notations of "Segment of Interview Omitted.") The transcript dealt with such topics as the students' feelings toward school, and his or her experiences with getting in trouble as a child.³

Two independent variables were manipulated in the transcript. One was target gender. The interviewee was described either as "John H., a male. . ." or as "Jane H., a female. . ." In addition, the target's sexual permissiveness was manipulated about four-fifths of the way through the interview. The topic had changed to dating and the interviewer asked if the target would "mind if we talked about how sexually active you are. . . in general terms." The target agreed and the interviewer prompted, "Well?" The target's response contained the sexual permissiveness manipulation.

³Pilot testing had shown that the target seemed to be a relatively typical student and that description was appropriate to either target gender. Pilot subjects either read the interview (minus the permissiveness manipulation) with a male or female target, or they rated an imagined typical male or female on the dependent measures (see below). The final transcript target did not differ from the imagined typical person on more than a chance number of items for either gender.

Targets in the virgin condition said, "I guess the best is to start with the basic facts. I'm a virgin. The opportunity has been there, to have sex here at school. I'm sure I'll enjoy sex. But for me, having sex before marriage just isn't right." Targets in the relationship-sex and casual-sex conditions began, "I guess the best is to start with the basic facts. I'm not a virgin. I've had sex with several people here at school. I enjoy sex." In the relationship-sex condition, targets continued, "But I only get involved sexually if I'm really involved in a relationship. To me, sex just isn't right unless two people have a commitment." Targets in the casual-sex condition continued: "And I sometimes get involved sexually even in fairly casual relationships. To me, it's OK to have sex without any commitment as long as two people agree." No reply was given in the control condition. Instead, these interviews were interrupted by the notation, "Segment of Interview Omitted."⁴

Following this manipulation, the interview closed with a few questions about the interviewee's parents and job aspirations.

Measures. After reading the transcript, subjects rated the target individual on 54 bipolar adjective pairs (e.g., good-bad, independent-dependent), including 24 of the 25 adjective pairs from Janda et al. (1981) (four of these were slightly revised). Subjects also completed 15 Likert-type items (e.g., "What is the likelihood of this person having a psychological disturbance?"), including the five items developed by Poe (1973). All items had 9-point response scales.

To derive scales, the 54 bipolar adjectives were subjected to a principal axis factor analysis with an oblique rotation. Twelve factors emerged with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The last three factors, which accounted for only 5.9% of the common variance, seemed uninterpretable and were removed from further consideration. The remaining nine factors accounted for 54.8% of the common variance.

The nine factors are as follows, with our label for the factor, the coefficient alpha reliability (estimated for the summated scales), the percent of the variance accounted for, and an example of the adjective pairs that loaded on it (re-ordered here so that the first adjective was scored 1 and the second, 9): poor adjustment, .76, 23.6% (e.g., adjusted-maladjusted); unconventional, .72, 10.6% (e.g., traditional-nontraditional); likable, .85, 4.1% (e.g., unpopular-popular); agreeable, .55, 3.7% (e.g., competitive-cooperative); assertive, .83, 3.1% (e.g., passive-aggressive); immoral, .68, 2.7% (e.g., good-bad); conforming, .52, 2.6% (e.g., individualistic-conforming); trusting, .53, 2.2% (e.g., doubtful-trusting); caring, .73, 2.1% (e.g., cruel-kind).

⁴A pilot test had confirmed the permissiveness manipulation's effects on four ratings (e.g., moral-immoral, sexually permissive-nonpermissive), multivariate $F(2, 68) = 9.43, p < .001$, all univariate p s $< .001$.

One scale was constructed based on a priori expectations. This "sexual scale" consisted of four adjective pairs: chaste-promiscuous, modest-immodest, nonsexuctive-sexuctive, and moral-immoral. This summative scale, which had a reliability of .51, overlaps in large part with measures used in studies of male-female differences in perceiving sexuality (Abbey, 1982; Abbey & Melby, 1985; Shotland & Craig, 1985).

Results from this scale must admittedly be viewed cautiously, given the scale's low reliability and the fact it did not emerge in the factor analysis. Nevertheless, we elected to examine the scale because it corresponds to the judgments that seemed most likely to be affected by sexual permissiveness. Our labeling of this as the "sexual scale" may also warrant comment. Judging someone as chaste, modest, nonsexuctive, and moral seems clearly to imply less sexual activity or interest than labeling them as promiscuous, immodest, sexuctive, and immoral. Further, other researchers have used some of these terms to assess "sexual interest" (Abbey, 1982) or "sexuality" (Shotland & Craig, 1985). Also, Shotland and Craig (1985) provided validity evidence in that several of the adjectives we use provide similar results to those found for question such as "How sexually interested is this person?"

The 15 Likert-type items were also subjected to a principal axis factor analysis with oblique rotation. Two factors emerged. One accounted for 56.1% of the common variance, and had a reliability of .94. We labeled this factor general positive evaluation, because its 13 items seemed to represent a global evaluative factor (e.g., "How admirable is the life-style of this person?"). The second factor accounted for 9.3% of the common variance, and had a reliability of .88. This factor, the mental health scale, included two items in which respondents predicted whether the target would need psychotherapy or have a psychological disturbance.

RESULTS

Examination of the correlations between the empirically derived scales revealed three clusters. One, the "evaluative cluster," consisted of the poor adjustment, assertive, immoral, trusting, mental health, and general positive evaluation scales, which had a median (absolute value) correlation of .49. The second, "normative cluster," included the unconventional and the conforming scales ($r = -.38$). The final, "prosocial cluster," included the caring and the agreeable scales ($r = .32$).

Each of these three clusters of scales was analyzed with a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 4$ multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with subject gender, subject's attitude toward women, target gender, and sexual permissiveness of

Table I. Main Effects of Sexual Permissiveness^a

	Immoral	Likable	Assertive	Conforming	Unconventional
Virgin	12.74 _a	48.16 _a	29.35 _a	11.15 _a	29.89 _a
Control	13.39 _{a,b}	49.37 _a	30.33 _a	11.28 _a	35.51 _b
Relationship sex	14.47 _b	50.14 _a	31.97 _b	10.49 _a	38.48 _c
Casual sex	14.66 _b	50.30 _a	33.10 _b	10.58 _a	40.83 _d

^aWithin a column, entries that do not share a common subscript differ at $\alpha = .05$ by a Newman-Keuls test.

target as the independent variables.⁵ The analyses revealed several significant main effects of subject and target gender, but these are of little substantive interest and are not reported here.

The MANOVA also revealed a main effect of sexual permissiveness on the evaluative and the normative clusters; $F(21, 1112) = 3.53, p < .001$, and $F(6, 826) = 39.85, p < .001$, respectively. Univariate ANOVAs revealed that sexual permissiveness affected ratings on the immoral, likable, unconventional, and assertive scales (all $F_s > 3.15$, all $p_s < .05$), and marginally affected the conforming scale, $F(3, 414) = 2.35, p < .10$. As shown in Table I, virgins were seen as more moral, but marginally less likable, than targets who engaged in either relationship or casual sex. The relationship and casual sex groups were also judged more assertive and marginally less conforming than the virgin and control groups. Ratings of unconventionality differed significantly across all groups. (For the unconventionality and conformity scales, these effects were moderated by a Sexual Permissiveness \times Subject Gender interaction; however, these interactions are of little substantive interest.)

For the prosocial cluster, a significant Subject Gender \times ATW \times Target Gender \times Sexual Permissiveness interaction was observed, $F(6, 838) = 2.92, p < .01$. Univariate ANOVAs revealed that the four-way interaction was significant for the agreeable scale, $F(3, 420) = 3.75, p < .05$. This effect is of interest in that it allows the possibility of a double-standard effect, for at least some subject gender-ATW group(s).

An analysis of the simple main effects of target gender was conducted to examine the source of the four-way interaction (Winer, 1971). This analysis allows us to determine whether male and female targets are rated differently,

⁵The ATW factor was created by dichotomizing ATW scores separately for each subject sex, because females ($M = 100.13$) were more liberal than males ($M = 90.68$), $F(1, 433) = 59.70, p < .001$. A single cutoff would have led to highly unbalanced cell N_s . We did not use ATW as a covariate because we expected it to interact with other independent variables. Empirically, this does not seem critical for we find limited effects for ATW.

for each combination of the other independent variables. For traditional females and liberal males, the only significant difference occurred in the casual-sex condition. Traditional females rated female targets ($M = 16.93$) who engaged in casual sex as less agreeable than casual sex males [$M = 20.77$; $F(1, 29) = 8.62, p < .01$]. Liberal males made the same distinction between female ($M = 16.67$) and male ($M = 19.60$) targets in the casual-sex condition, $F(1, 17) = 6.16, p < .05$. This could indicate a double standard, whereby traditional females and liberal males see females who engage in casual sex as less agreeable than males who do the same. Liberal females exhibit a pattern quite unlike the double standard. They judged female targets ($M = 18.77$) as less agreeable than male targets ($M = 20.60$) in the virgin condition [$F(1, 26) = 4.40, p < .05$] and tended to make the same distinction between female ($M = 18.94$) and male ($M = 21.10$) targets in the control condition [$F(1, 25) = 3.08, p < .10$]. In contrast, traditional males saw females as less agreeable than males regardless of sexual permissiveness levels (averaging across permissiveness levels, $M = 17.26$ and $M = 18.96$ for females and males, respectively). Thus, traditional males showed judgments that are apparently sexist but not due to a sexual double standard.

The Sexual Scale

The sexual scale was subjected to a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 4$ analysis of variance. Female targets ($M = 17.19$) were seen in more sexual terms than male targets [$M = 16.15$; $F(1, 417) = 10.29, p < .01$]. Subjects with traditional attitudes toward women ($M = 17.11$) ascribed more sexuality than liberal subjects [$M = 16.25$; $F(1, 417) = 5.39, p < .05$]. An effect of sexual permissiveness was also observed, $F(3, 417) = 47.76, p < .001$. Virgin targets ($M = 13.41$) were seen as less sexual than control targets ($M = 16.45$), while significantly more sexuality was ascribed to the relationship-sex ($M = 17.97$) and casual-sex ($M = 18.74$) conditions, which did not statistically differ from each other by a Newman-Keuls test.

However, the latter effect was moderated by an ATW \times Sexual Permissiveness interaction, $F(3, 417) = 2.95, p < .05$. As shown in Table II,

Table II. Ratings on the Sexual Scale by Sexual Permissiveness and Attitude Toward Women^a

	Virgin	Control	Relationship sex	Casual sex
Attitude toward women				
Liberal	12.58	15.75 _a	17.66 _{b,c}	19.25 _c
Traditional	14.34 _a	17.14 _b	18.38 _{b,c}	18.32 _{b,c}

^aEntries that do not share a common subscript differ at $\alpha = .05$ by a Newman-Keuls test.

Table III. Ratings of Sexual Scale by Subject Gender, Target Gender, and Sexual Permissiveness

Sex of target	Female subjects			
	Virgin	Control	Relationship sex	Casual sex
Female	14.40 ^a	16.69	18.36	19.35
Male	12.63 ^a	17.41	17.11	18.38
	Male subjects			
	Virgin	Control	Relationship sex	Casual sex
Female	12.97	17.29 ^a	19.00	19.73 ^a
Male	13.89	14.63 ^a	17.67	17.43 ^a

^aIndicates that an analysis of simple main effects revealed a significant difference ($p < .05$) between male and female targets.

liberals see both virgin and control targets as significantly less sexual than do traditional subjects. In addition, liberals rated the control group as significantly less sexual than the relationship- and casual-sex targets, and marginally differentiated between the latter two groups; traditionals did not differentiate between these three groups.

The final effect on the sexual scale, a Subject Gender \times Target Gender \times Sexual Permissiveness interaction, $F(3, 417) = 2.92, p < .05$, might result from a double standard in one subject gender. To identify the source of this interaction, we analyzed the simple main effect of target gender within sexual permissiveness levels for male and female subjects (Winer, 1971). As shown in Table III, male subjects ascribed significantly more sexuality to female than to male targets in the control [$F(1, 58) = 8.85, p < .01$] and casual-sex [$F(1, 41) = 7.59, p < .01$] conditions (and did so at $p = .17$ in the relationship sex condition). For female subjects, in contrast, the only simple main effect is in the virgin condition. Females rated virgin males as less sexual than virgin females, $F(1, 55) = 4.11, p < .05$.

DISCUSSION

The Double Standard

The primary purpose of this research was to probe the existence of a sexual double standard, by which perceivers give more negative evaluations to female than to male targets at equal levels of sexual permissiveness. In general, little evidence was found for a double standard of this sort. While sexual permissiveness affected ratings, it generally affected the ratings of male and female targets similarly. The only possible evidence for a double standard in social perception came on the sexual and agreeable scales, and here the evidence was somewhat equivocal.

Male subjects judged female targets as more sexual than male targets if they engaged in casual sex. Thus it seems that male subjects were exhibiting a double standard. Male subjects also ascribed greater sexuality to female targets in the control condition, perhaps because male subjects *assumed* that control targets were at least somewhat permissive. In contrast, female subjects' ratings of sexuality did not differ for male and female targets, except in the virgin condition, where males were seen as less sexual. However, these results for the sexual scale must be viewed cautiously, pending replication, particularly given the scale's low reliability and the fact it did not emerge empirically as a factor.

Limited evidence of the double standard was also observed on the agreeable scale, in that liberal males and traditional females rated females who had casual sex as marginally less agreeable than casual-sex males⁶; unexpectedly, some evidence of a reverse double standard emerged on this scale for liberal females, who rated females as less agreeable than males in the virgin and control conditions. Conservative males, in contrast, rated females as less agreeable, regardless of sexual permissiveness level. However, the findings on the agreeable scale must be viewed cautiously, given the absence of a double standard effect on all other empirically derived scales and no apparent explanation as to why an effect would occur only on this scale.

In sum, the present results provide at most highly limited evidence of a sexual double standard in social judgments. Of considerable importance is the total absence of evidence of a double standard on all scales other than the sexual and agreeable scales. These other scales assess a wide range of social judgments. Our results thus suggest that, at least in our sample, the double standard does not have a general effect on social perception. Additional research is desirable to probe the generality of this result.

Future research on the double standard, we believe, would do well to adopt the present social, normative interpretation. If the double standard is held by respondents as a normative standard, it should have observable consequences on person perception.

Effects of Sexual Permissiveness

While the double standard did not seem to generally affect social perception, we did find several interesting, important effects of sexual per-

⁶Perhaps traditional females and liberal males behaved similarly in this interaction because they are somewhat similar in ATW, given different ATW cutoffs for males and females: ATW means are 109.32, 101.12, 90.76, and 79.36 for liberal females, liberal males, traditional females, and traditional males, respectively. However, it is unclear why these two groups would behave alike *only* on the agreeable scale.

missiveness. Targets who engaged in relationship or casual sex were seen as less moral but (marginally) more likable than virgins. This replicates and extends the results of Janda et al. (1981), who used female targets only. Sexually active targets were also seen as less conventional, more sexual, more assertive, and marginally less conforming (although the latter three effects were moderated by interactions).

Interestingly, the effect of sexual permissiveness on sexuality ratings was moderated by subjects' sex role attitudes. Liberal subjects were more affected by variations in permissiveness. They ascribed less sexuality than traditional subjects did to virgin and control targets. Liberal subjects seem to believe that foregoing sex implies less sexual interest, while traditionalists do not presume this.

It is worth noting that sexual permissiveness did not affect the general positive evaluation, mental health, poor adjustment, trusting, or caring scales. Thus, sexual permissiveness did not seem to affect judgments of the targets' basic mental health.

Another noteworthy result is the general paucity of differences between the relationship-sex and casual-sex conditions. One possible explanation is that targets in both groups stated, "I've had sex with several people here at school. I enjoy sex." (We wished to vary the sexual standards of the two groups without implying a difference in frequency or desirability of sexual intercourse.) Perhaps these two conditions would differ more if casual sex targets appeared much more sexually active than relationship sex targets. More generally, future research on the double standard might profitably distinguish between sexual philosophy and sexual behavior as separate dimensions of permissiveness.

Gender Differences in Perceiving Sexuality

Recent evidence indicates that males perceive others in more sexual terms (Abbey, 1982; Shotland & Craig, 1985). The present research did not replicate this finding. Neither a subject gender main effect nor a Subject Gender \times Target Gender interaction emerged on the sexual scale.

One potential reason for this failure to replicate is that the sexual scale used in the present research differs somewhat from the measures used in previous research. However, analyses of the individual items revealed no sexual terms that males applied more often, while previous research has found significant effects on several of the individual items.

A second possible explanation is that the targets are presented differently in the present research than in past studies. Previously, targets have been presented interacting in couples, typically mixed-sex couples, with visual cues

available via live observation (Abbey, 1982), videotape (Shotland & Craig, 1985), or photograph (Abbey & Melby, 1985). In contrast, in the present research information about the target was presented outside of a mixed-sex or social encounter, with no visual cues, and with substantial background information.

Our failure to replicate suggests that males may see others in sexual terms in some circumstances but not others. The sexual double standard may well be similarly contingent, and it would be desirable to better determine the conditions under which it affects social perception.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1982, 42, 830-838.
- Abbey, A., & Melby, C. *The effects of nonverbal cues on gender differences in perceptions of sexual intent*. Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University, 1985.
- Carns, D. E. Talking about sex: Notes on first coitus and the double standard. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1973, 35, 677-688.
- Curran, J. Convergence toward a single sexual standard? *Social Behavior and Personality*, 1975, 3, 189-195.
- Galper, R. E., & Luck, D. Gender, evaluation, and causal attribution: The double standard is alive and well. *Sex Roles*, 1980, 6, 273-283.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M. J., & Foote, F. J. Gender differences in sexual attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1985, 48, 1630-1642.
- Hunt, M. *Sexual behavior in the 1970s*. Chicago, IL: Playboy, 1974.
- Janda, L. H., O'Grady, K. E., & Barnhart, S. A. Effects of sexual attitudes and physical attractiveness on person perception of men and women. *Sex Roles*, 1981, 7, 189-199.
- Jurich, A. P., & Jurich, J. A. The effect of cognitive moral development upon the selection of premarital sexual standards. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1974, 36, 736-741.
- Kaats, G. R., & Davis, K. E. The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970, 32, 390-399.
- Komarovsky, M. *Dilemmas of masculinity: A study of college youth*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.
- Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. T. Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1977, 33, 86-109.
- Poe, C. A. Development of a psychological effectiveness scale. *Journal of Psychology*, 1973, 85, 81-85.
- Reiss, I. L. *The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- Richardson, D., Bernstein, S., & Hendrick, C. Deviations from conventional sex-role behavior: Effect of perceivers' sex-role attitudes on attraction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 1980, 1, 351-356.
- Shotland, R. L., & Craig, J. M. *Can men differentiate women's platonic and sexually interested behavior?* Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University, 1985.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Winer, B. J. *Statistical principles in experimental design* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Wortman, C. B., Adesman, P., Herman, E., & Greenberg, R. Self-disclosure: An attributional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1976, 33, 184-191.