
Add complete departmental affiliations for each author here. Each new line herein must be indented, like this line.

Enter author note here.

The authors made the following contributions. Ithurburn, Andrew: .

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ithurburn, Andrew, 7 George Square, Edinburgh, EH8 9JZ. E-mail: a.ithurburn@sms.ed.ac.uk

8

9

10

11

The psychology of risk and power: Power desires and sexual choices

12

Andrew Ithurburn



13

Doctor of Philosophy

14

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

17	1 Chapter 1:	8
18	1.1 Literature Review	8
19	1.1.1 General Introduction	8
20	1.1.2 Who is at risk?	9
21	1.2 Risky Sexual Behaviors and STIs	12
22	1.3 Moral Judgment and Decision-Making	16
23	1.4 Power	21
24	1.5 Cognition	28
25	1.5.1 Aggression and Cognition	32
26	1.5.2 Exploratory Experiment	35
27	1.6 Method	35
28	1.6.1 Participants	35
29	1.6.2 Demographic Questionnaire	36
30	1.6.3 Spitefulness Scale	36
31	1.6.4 Sexuality Self-Esteem Subscale	36
32	1.6.5 Sexual Jealousy Subscale	37
33	1.6.6 Sexual Relationship Power Scale	37
34	1.6.7 Scenario Realism Question	38
35	1.6.8 Spiteful Vignettes	38
36	1.7 Procedure	39
37	1.8 Data Analysis	41
38	1.9 Experiment One	41
39	1.10 Method	41
40	1.10.1 Participants	41
41	1.10.2 Demographic Questionnaire	41
42	1.10.3 Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation	41
43	1.10.4 Spitefulness Scale	42

44	1.10.5 Sexuality Self-Esteem Subscale	42
45	1.10.6 Sexual Jealousy Subscale	43
46	1.10.7 Sexual Relationship Power Scale	43
47	1.10.8 Scenario Realism Question	44
48	1.10.9 Spiteful Vignettes	44
49	1.11 Procedure	45
50	1.12 Data Analysis	45
51	1.13 Results and Discussion	47
52	1.13.1 Spitefulness	48
53	1.14 Limitations and Future Directions	48
54	1.15 Experiment 2	48
55	1.16 Methods	48
56	1.17 Materials	49
57	1.17.1 <i>Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory</i>	49
58	1.18 Procedure	49
59	1.19 Data analysis	50
60	1.20 Results	51
61	1.21 Preregistered Analyses	51
62	1.21.1 <i>Demographic and DoPL</i>	51
63	1.22 Domain-Specific Risk-Taking	51
64	1.23 Interactions	51
65	1.24 Discussion	51
66	1.25 Limitations	51
67	1.26 Future Implications	51
68	2 Introduction	52
69	2.1 Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership orientation	52
70	2.1.1 <i>Dominance</i>	53
71	2.1.2 <i>Prestige</i>	54

72	2.1.3	<i>Leadership</i>	55
73	2.2	Risk	55
74	2.3	The Present Studies	56
75	3	Experiment 1	57
76	3.1	Methods	57
77	3.2	Materials	57
78	3.2.1	<i>Demographic Questionnaire</i>	57
79	3.2.2	<i>Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation</i>	57
80	3.2.3	<i>Domain Specific Risk-taking Scale</i>	58
81	3.3	Procedure	58
82	3.4	Data analysis	59
83	3.5	Results	59
84	3.5.1	Preregistered Analyses	60
85	3.5.1.1	<i>Demographic and DoPL</i>	60
86	3.5.1.2	General Risk and DoPL	60
87	3.5.2	Domain-Specific Risk-Taking	60
88	3.5.3	Interactions	61
89	3.5.4	DOSPRT Sub-categorizations	61
90	3.5.5	Discussion	62
91	4	Experiment 2	62
92	4.1	Methods	62
93	4.2	Participants	62
94	4.3	Materials	62
95	4.3.1	<i>Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory</i>	62
96	4.4	Procedure	63
97	4.5	Data analysis	64
98	4.6	Results and Discussion	64

99	4.6.1	Preregistered Analyses	65
100	4.6.1.1	Dominance	65
101	4.6.1.2	Prestige	65
102	4.6.1.3	Leadership	65
103	4.6.2	Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory	65
104	4.6.3	Risk and interactions	66
105	4.6.4	Domain-Specific Risk-Taking	66
106	4.6.5	Interactions	67
107	5	Figures and Tables	68
108	5.1	Figures	68
109	5.2	Tables	71
110	6	Chapter 3:	71
111	6.1	Experiment 1:	71
112	6.2	Experiment 1 Review	71
113	6.3	Narcissism	72
114	6.4	The present Experiments	74
115	6.5	Methods	75
116	6.6	Materials	75
117	6.6.1	<i>Demographic Questionnaire</i>	75
118	6.6.2	<i>Sexual Risk-taking Behavior Scale</i>	75
119	6.6.3	<i>Sociosexual Orientation Inventory</i>	76
120	6.6.4	<i>Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership</i>	76
121	6.6.5	<i>Pathological Narcissism</i>	76
122	6.7	Procedure	76
123	6.8	Data analysis	77
124	6.9	Results	78
125	6.9.1	Preregistered Analyses	78

126	6.9.2 <i>Demographic and DoPL</i>	78
127	6.10 Domain-Specific Risk-Taking	78
128	6.11 Interactions	78
129	6.12 Discussion	78
130	7 References	79

1 Chapter 1:

1.1 Literature Review

1.1.1 General Introduction

Research in decision-making is not only concerned with understanding monumental decisions done in a study or saving a life, but equally in more mundane decisions such as understanding choosing what tea to drink in the morning, what clothes to wear that day or whether a couple should have a divorce. Making models of decisions can be difficult given uncertainty is involved along with risk [citation]. For example, two adult men [or a man and a woman] that are intending to have sex need to make the decision of whether or not to use a condom. Added uncertainty is involved with the decision-making process. One partner may have multiple sexual partners while the other may have only had one, one partner may have a sexually transmitted infection and might not feel the need or feel comfortable with informing their partner of their status. Consequences of not informing can have dire consequences on both partners.

In 2016, the year of most recent global data collection, there were 376 million necases of the four curable sexually transmitted infections, chlamydia, gonorrheatrachomoniasis, and syphilis (World Health Organization, 2018). The World Health Organization [WHO] further estimates that there are one million new cases of a curable sexually transmitted infection each day. Due to multiple factors, certain minority populations are more at risk for contracting new sexually transmitted infections, e., men who have sex with men and female sex workers (World Health Organization, 2018). Some factors include certain societal beliefs men who have sex with men might engage in nonrelational sex “just trying to figure things out it’s just a hook up phase” (Elder et al., 2015) , ambiguous laws concerning the legality of sex work interfering with safe and available locations for such activity, as well as. There may also be some difficulties in their willingness

158 in their activities be it forced by another sheer necessity. For countries like
159 Scotland there have been a reduction in the amount of new cases of STIs like
160 HIV amongst key populations, however new risks antibiotic resistant gonorrhea,
161 *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*, have shown a new prevalence in many countries (Ison &
162 Alexander, 2011).

163 **1.1.2 Who is at risk?**

164 There is then the arduous task of how to research the topic of sexually
165 transmitted infections and methods of then understanding what is occurring in
166 the individual. There are neurobiological explanations such as certain brain for-
167 mations occurring that cause individuals to have difficulty understanding the
168 consequences of their actions (Moll et al., 2005; Schaich Borg et al., 2008; Tsoi
169 et al., 2018). There are also more cognitive explanations as well that have shown
170 promising results. For example in the cognitive sub-area of metacognition there
171 is an understanding that there are certain cognitive mechanisms that aid in the
172 individuals ability to regulate their own cognitive understanding of their deci-
173 sions (C. A. Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Yeung & Summerfield, 2012). This
174 self-regulation then contributes to their ability to control whether they act on
175 their baser needs or are able to understand the consequences of what they might
176 or might not engage in (C. A. Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Crandall et al., 2017).
177 How individuals had reached the information on the effectiveness of certain be-
178 havioral changes that reduce the chances of contracting an STI is also in question.
179 For example, research shows that individuals that have a greater understanding
180 of the impact and chances of contracting HIV, actually engage in risky sexual
181 behaviors and therefore increase their chances of contracting the very infection
182 they have more knowledge (D. B. Kirby et al., 2007). Skills based training showed
183 more positive results on practicing safer sex practices. How an individual sees
184 themselves as either a sexual person or person in general is also a factor in how

185 they later may meet an STI (Andersen et al., 1994, 1999; Elder et al., 2015;
186 Gesink et al., 2016). Aggression, in the cognitive sense, also has an impact as
187 well demonstrating a dominance over another person that may cause difficulties
188 in their own ability to make decisions on their sexual health (Malamuth et al.,
189 1996; Williams et al., 2017).

190 Aggression is one method of exerting control over another individual.
191 Overall, the exertion of control itself denotes a power disparity between parties
192 which varies in effects, methods, and domains. [citation]. For example, most re-
193 search has looked at power-over or one person controlling the behavior of another
194 person. This area of research connects the cognitive explanation to behavioral
195 outcomes. Research in power also includes looking at minority populations and
196 aspects of power over to help explain the increased prevalence of certain STIs
197 by discussing and researching certain power dynamics [citations]. The institu-
198 tional support of those power dynamics often reflect power based on age, gender,
199 political orientation, sexual orientation and gender identity (C. A. Anderson &
200 Bushman, 2002; Chiappori & Molina, 2019; Volpe et al., 2013; Winter, 1988).
201 Investigations of the power structure of a family unit has shown to have some
202 interesting consequences on sexual health depending on the type of parenting
203 style and parental attachment [Bugental and Shennum (2002); Chiappori and
204 Molina (2019); Kim and Miller (2020); citations]. A new area of research coming
205 out of power and cognition is the phenomenon where an individual will harm
206 themselves in some way to also inflict harm on another. This type of behavior
207 has been researched extensively in the animal kingdom and is known as spiteful
208 behavior in that one brings down their own wellbeing to spite the other person.
209 There would be interesting avenues to research how spiteful thinking may affect
210 an individual in how they choose one course of action over another. ### Cur-
211 rent Methodology An interesting aspect of the power dynamics and cognition is
212 the moral aspect of decision-making. Often, sexually transmitted infections and

213 risky sexual behavior are used as examples to discuss moral issues. Methods at
214 understanding these situations and other moral issues are through dilemmas or
215 vignettes where individuals are presented with a short scenario and given the
216 opportunity to choose one outcome over another (Ellemers et al., 2019). A trade-
217 mark example is the trolley car experiment where there is a runaway trolley car
218 that is going towards five people (Greene, 2001). The decision is thus, allow the
219 trolley to careen towards the five people or you could divert the trolley by pushing
220 and sacrificing a large man for the sake of the other five. This type of dilemma
221 poses an interesting method of understanding how and what the decision maker
222 would choose. The researcher can then change the dilemma on its severity and
223 complexity. There could also be a change in situation and the types of individuals
224 that are at risk. Individual choice tasks investigating risky sexual behaviors and
225 STIs could be furthered with investigating the moral decision-making aspect of
226 those issues. Current STI research has focused on methods of ways of curbing why
227 individuals act a certain way when presented with a risky sexual situation (D. B.
228 Kirby et al., 2007). Current methods have shown mixed results. In many coun-
229 tries, how people are taught about risk and sex can vary wildly (Unesco, 2015).
230 For example, some countries may have one standard that is a mix of religious
231 and scientific findings of STIs. While others may not even have a formal sexual
232 education program. Some aspects of sexual activity are not even discussed, for
233 example non-heterosexual sex is not always present in education (Ellis & High,
234 2004). This becomes problematic in that men who have sex with men tend to be
235 more at risk to contracting an STI than their peers who engage in heterosexual
236 intercourse. There has also been a lot of research in STI rates. Evidence by
237 governments and international health organizations constantly partnering with
238 universities and healthcare providers to collect new incidences of STIs. There
239 might be one way of researching the topic however, it might not look at all the
240 aspects. Some may be more focused on the outcome while ignoring the causes

241 or hypothesized causes of the outcome. Continued research into the understand-
242 ing of decision-making is important in that understanding the general helps later
243 understanding of the specific.

244 1.2 Risky Sexual Behaviors and STIs

245 Sexual activity/ability to reproduce being one of the seven characteristics
246 of life can cause health, financial, and/or social dangers (to all participants)
247 through risk and neglect [citation]. The curability or manageability also plays
248 a factor in how an STI will affect an individual or community. For example, if
249 the treatment is simple and cheap the effect could be minimal. However, if the
250 treatment cost is expensive the drain on multiple resources could be detrimental.

251 There is a large array of different sexually transmitted infections. Cur-
252 rently, there are eight common types of STIs, chlamydia, gonorrhea, trichomo-
253 niasis, genital warts, genital herpes, pubic lice, scabies, and syphilis (Carmona-
254 Gutierrez et al., 2016), chlamydia being the most common. Treatment for these
255 STIs can range from a simple course of antibiotics such as is the case with chlamy-
256 dia or gonorrhea. Conversely, treatment for syphilis or human immunodeficiency
257 virus [HIV], can be increasingly more involved, cause difficulty in daily life, and
258 have higher costs [citation]. Globally, 37.9 million people are living with HIV
259 [104,000 in the United Kingdom], with 1.7 million being under the age of 15
260 years old (Ison & Alexander, 2011). The treatment for HIV currently is through
261 antiretroviral medication, which is often a combination of multiple medications
262 to account for the high adaptability of the virus (Costa-Lourenço et al., 2017).

263 New difficulties appear from the most common treatment strategies. The
264 main strategy for arises given the fluctuating nature of STI treatment and costs.
265 As such, costs for treatments have seen a markable increase with some treatments
266 costing [enter average amount]. An increasing number of antibiotic resistant gon-
267 orrhea is occurring globally, with a recent discovery in Japan with a strain that

268 is resistant to ceftriaxone, the most prescribed antibiotic [citations]. Two in-
269 dividuals in the United Kingdom recently [2019] separately tested positive with
270 different strains resistant to not just ceftriaxone but also azithromycin [citations].
271 The confirmed cases may seem small however, 10% of men and half of women do
272 not show visible symptoms when infected with the bacteria. Medical treatment
273 alone has not been the only strides made in STIs around the with strides in ac-
274 ceptances and less persecution for those that have HIV for example. However,
275 while persecution and stereotyping has gone down in recent years, treatments and
276 availability to those treatments have become increasingly more costly.

277 Sexually active individuals can become infected with an STI through various
278 forms. The first and most prominent vector is through risky sexual behaviors,
279 i.e., multiple sexual partners, unknown sexual history of partners/high-risk indi-
280 viduals, and unprotected sex [citations]. The most common vector is through en-
281 gaging in unprotected sex. Condoms are the most common and effective method
282 of protection, with spermicides increasing their effectiveness [citation]. Once in-
283 fected, the STIs may have detrimental health effects. For example, genital herpes
284 may cause infertility in women and certain types of cancers [citations]. Infections
285 can also be transmitted to infants during childbirth. If left untreated death is
286 possible for example in the case of syphilis which results in an agonizing death
287 [citations]. Condoms are still one of the most effective strategies to practice safe
288 sex along with asking partners about their sexual histories.

289 Even though condoms are the most effective prophylactic, there is still a
290 chance that an individual may contract an STI. Other risky sexual behaviors can
291 increase an individual's susceptibility such as having multiple sexual partners.
292 The age of first sexual intercourse is one of the leading factors that has been
293 associated with increased sexual risk taking and later transmission of STI (de
294 Sanjose et al., 2008; Dickson et al., 1998; Tuoyire et al., 2018). Dickson and
295 colleagues investigated the age at first sexual intercourse and found that women

that had their first sexual intercourse before 16 years-old were more likely to report having contracted an STI. In the United Kingdom, age at first heterosexual intercourse has decreased over the last 70 years (Mercer et al., 2013). Mercer and colleagues conducted a longitudinal analysis of age at first sexual intercourse by separating individuals into birth cohorts. Individuals age 65-74 years reported their age at first heterosexual intercourse at 18 years. Every ten years that number has steadily decreased by one with the most recent being 16 years old. Thirty percent of individuals between the ages of 16-24 report have had heterosexual intercourse before the age of sixteen.

Individuals 18-24 years of age are not just having intercourse at earlier ages, they are the group with the highest susceptibility of contracting an STI, amounting for #### of new incidences [citation]. College students/aged individuals have also increased alcohol consumption which contributes to lowered inhibitions and increased risky sexual behavior. Because many are developing sexually including some living away from home for the first time, they are more likely to engage in sexual experimentation such as multiple sex partners and in some cases may not use protection such as a condom. Lack of communication has also been shown to influence the likeliness of contracting an STI. Desiderato and Crawford investigated risky sexual behaviors in college students and found that failing to report the number of previous sexual partners and their STI status was common in both men and women (1995). The social stigma of having contracted or being suspected of contracting an STI is one of the most common barriers that inhibits open communication between sexually active individuals (Cunningham et al., 2009). Stigma concerning a positive STI diagnosis can affect not just the physical health of an individual but the psychological health as well. In a series of five experiments, Young and colleagues investigated how the belief of having an STI has an individual's likelihood of getting tested/treatment (2007). They discovered two key points on stigma, others perceive those that have an STI as

324 being less moral and others believe that others will see them as being immoral.
325 This threat of appearing to be immoral may cause the individual to feel as though
326 the mere perception of having an STI is shameful (Cunningham et al., 2009).

327 The social effects of sexuality in general influence how people see them-
328 selves. For gay men in particular there is not just the social stigma that some
329 may have of homosexuality, within the gay community there are some that are
330 expected to be promiscuous or appear to be promiscuous (Elder et al., 2015). In
331 a study based on grounded theory, Elder and colleagues asked gay men all aspects
332 of sexuality to discover and investigate their sexual schemas. A sexual schema
333 is, “a generalization about the sexual aspects of oneself.” (Elder et al., 2015, pg.
334 943). The effects of negative sexual self-schema are also seen in bisexual and
335 straight men and women (Andersen et al., 1994; CYRANOWSKI et al., 1999;
336 Elder et al., 2012, 2015). Having poor sexual self-schema can result in women
337 having issues with sexual desire and an inability of reaching orgasm while in men
338 can result in climaxing too early and erectile dysfunction (CYRANOWSKI et al.,
339 1999; Kilimnik et al., 2018). Long lasting impairments can often lead to more
340 psychological issues.

341 Individuals that have contracted an STI are also more likely to be ostrac-
342 ized from their immediate community. For example, gay men who contracted
343 HIV in the beginning of the AIDs crisis were often ostracized by society even
344 when they were seeking treatment in the hospital. Nurses would often, for lack
345 of knowledge of transmission of the virus, would often drop medication in front
346 of the patient’s door and would rarely physically interact with them [citations].
347 This ostracization further compounds the psychological and physical trauma that
348 individuals with HIV already have. As more knowledge of how HIV is transmitted
349 individuals can get more efficient and better treatment. However, ostracization
350 often occurs [citations].

351 1.3 Moral Judgment and Decision-Making

352 Sam has frequent and unprotected sex with multiple partners, resulting
353 in a sexually transmitted infection that causes visible sores on the mouth and
354 hands. On the way to the chemist one day, Sam has an acute heart attack. By-
355 standers rush to help, but see the sores on Sam's mouth and hands. How would
356 the bystanders react? Would they resuscitate Sam? Would it be morally wrong
357 for them not to risk contracting an unknown disease from Sam, even if it may
358 cost Sam's life? Similar sorts of dilemmas are often used to study moral decision
359 making of various sorts (Clifford et al., 2015). the thought experiment of the
360 trolley dilemma. Research by Haidt and colleagues, compared psychologically
361 normal adults to psychopathic traits and performance on the Moral Foundations
362 Questionnaire [MFQ; Graham et al. (2011)]. Findings included higher psycho-
363 pathic tendencies were associated with lower likelihood of following justice-based
364 norms, a weak relationship with disgust-based and in-group norms, and finally
365 an increased willingness to violate any type of norms for money (Glenn et al.,
366 2009). The key factor in the Moral Foundations Questionnaire are these moral
367 foundations of which there are five moral domains: harm versus care, fairness
368 versus cheating, loyalty versus betrayal, authority versus subversion, and purity
369 versus degradation (Clifford et al., 2015). Each of these moral domains have a
370 good and bad component compared to the action type.

371 The MFQ has been extensively used in research on moral decision-making,
372 with common subjects being on political thought [citation]. In the early studies of
373 moral foundations theory, Haidt investigated the moral foundational differences
374 between individuals that lean either politically liberal or conservative. Of the five
375 moral domains, differences appeared in the likelihood of how either conservatism
376 or liberalism affects the likelihood of individuals to endorse each domain. For
377 example, liberalism suggests protecting the individual from harm by the society,
378 especially if they are a member of a minority group. Conversely, conservatism,

379 namely religious conservatism suggests a propensity for sanctity and purity, along
380 with respecting authority and following the societal moral codes [citations]. Emo-
381 tional valence is often the best predictors of moral judgments [citation]. The more
382 emotional valence the faster the response time the decision-maker decides and the
383 more staunchly held they are to their decision. Interestingly, participants would
384 be unable to express or support the decisions that they made. Often, partici-
385 pants would downplay their decisions by laughing or stuttering (Haidt, 2001).
386 Additionally, as their emotional valence of the decision is higher, people are con-
387 sistently holding on to their judgments regardless if they were able to support
388 their judgements when asked or not. It then makes sense why some individuals
389 are more politically intransigent given their deeply held moral codes.

390 Politically held beliefs are often emotionally laden (G. Marcus, 2000). Ac-
391 cordingly, moral foundations theory postulates that there is a good versus bad
392 in the moral domains. When participants are asked to respond to statements
393 that are only offensive but were not harming anyone, participants had issues sup-
394 porting whether the statement was good or bad. For example, when participants
395 were given a story of cleaning the toilet with the national flag, participants would
396 respond that it is bad and said that they just knew that it was wrong [citation].
397 Often when individuals violate the moral rules of “cleaning the toilet with the
398 national flag” violators will be judged as immoral and sometimes punished for
399 their actions [citations]. Intuitively the participants responded that the actions
400 were morally were obviously morally wrong. Requiring little to no explanation
401 as to whAn interesting facet of moral judgment is how individuals react to moral
402 decisions when they are reminded of their own mortality (Greenberg et al., 1990;
403 Rosenblatt et al., 1989). Reminding individuals of their mortality causes them,
404 according to terror management theory, to want to push away from the thought
405 of their eventual death. To do this people often cling to their deeply held cultural
406 beliefs to remove their thoughts from reality (Greenberg et al., 1990). In the

407 first of a series of experiments Rosenblatt and colleagues found that participants
408 that were reminded of their mortality judged prostitutes more harshly, more so
409 if the participants already had negative opinions on prostitution. This was also
410 seen conversely with heroes that follow the cultural norms. Those participants
411 advocated for a larger reward for those individuals (Rosenblatt et al., 1989). The
412 already held opinions were further investigated to where Christians were asked
413 to report their impressions of Christian and Jewish individuals after mortality
414 became salient. Those that were a member of the in-group, Christian, were more
415 likely to be regarded as more positive than their out-group counterparts, Jewish
416 individuals (Greenberg et al., 1990). In-group bias is an oft studied concept in
417 psychological research. Mortality salience and moral violations tend to increase
418 the strength of the in-group bias and then moral judgement and condemnation
419 [citation].

420 When a person does a negative action, the reason for the action is often
421 judged and assumed. An action is commonly seen as being intentional when
422 the individual actively does the action directly. However, intentionality becomes
423 problematic participants have already had negative evaluations of the individ-
424 ual. In an experiment where participants were asked to judge the culpability of
425 an airline passenger that was forced by high-jackers to kill another passenger,
426 the high-jackers were the external force forcing the passenger to commit murder.
427 However, when the participants were told that the passenger already wanted to
428 kill that passenger before the hijacking was occurring, they were judged as more
429 culpable. With or without the internal motivation of wanting to already kill the
430 other passenger, the resulting death still occurs. When participants were given
431 a, less vivid, story of a manager that was only mistreated a black employee and
432 another story of a non-bigoted manager that was mistreating all of their employ-
433 ees, participants judged the bigoted manager more negatively. Even though there
434 were differences in those affected between the managers, participants already held

435 a negative opinion for those that hold bigoted views, and thus judged the bigoted
436 manager more severely [citation].

437 Research in attributional blame continued with an experiment investigat-
438 ing passengers on a sinking boat (Uhlmann et al., 2013). Participants were given
439 a story where there were several individuals on a sinking lifeboat. There were too
440 many people in the boat and the only course of action given was that some of the
441 passengers had to be thrown overboard. In the utilitarian perspective, used for
442 this example, the morally correct judgment was a few must be sacrificed for the
443 safety of the larger group [citation]. However, the participants often judged the
444 surviving passengers as acting selfishly. Thus, they were seeing the passengers as
445 immoral.

446 When individuals commit a moral violation, as would be the case for the
447 surviving passengers, it is not only important to investigate how others would
448 judge and react but also how the individual reacts to their own action (Tangney
449 et al., 2006). Emotional reactions occur when someone does a behavioral action,
450 or they expect a behavioral action to follow. An interesting aspect of emotional
451 reactions are emotional reactions tied to moral judgment. When an individual
452 violates a moral norm, they often feel a personal feeling of shame or guilt which
453 are two of the most commonly studied of these self-evaluative emotions (Tangney
454 et al., 2006). There is an inherent difference between these two emotions, shame is
455 inferred as being negative feelings of oneself that has a public display, while guilt
456 is similar sans the public display (Tangney et al., 1996). Individuals who violate
457 the community's customs on purity often feel a sense of shame. While guilt is
458 commonly felt with a violation of community [citations]. People with STIs are
459 often left feeling shame from their suspected purity violation and thus are often
460 stigmatized for their behavior and punished in some form by the community.
461 This can lead, as discussed in the previous section, to increasing their sense of
462 isolation and negative self-worth. How the moral violators react to their shame

463 or guilt is dependent on whether they experience the former or the latter. There
464 are often attempts to amend the situation when individuals have violated moral
465 norms. Depending on the self-evaluative emotion that is being felt, people will
466 make amends to try to change the situation or they may hide it (Tangney et al.,
467 1996). Guilt is the former and shame is the latter. In most cases individuals that
468 are feeling shame will attempt to ignore their moral violation where they will deny
469 or evade the situation that is causing them shame. Conversely, people with guilt
470 are often motivated by those negative feelings to fix the situation that caused
471 them to feel the guilt. Guilt is often feeling negativity towards a specific action
472 while feeling ashamed or shame is usually a reflection of the entire self [citations].
473 Thus, in relation to how to repair the guilt inducing act, it would appear to be
474 more manageable if the inducing situation was a singular event rather than a
475 feeling of the entire self. Participants that were prompted to feel shame were less
476 likely to express empathy for someone with a disability (Marschall, 1998 as cited
477 in Tangney et al., 2006). When people feel a sense of shame, they self-evaluate
478 and reflect on themselves. This hinders the empathy process that would require
479 them to focus their attention on the emotions of another person.

480 Barnett and Mann investigated sexual offenders to understand how feelings
481 of empathy are blocked for their victim at time of the offense (2013). In empathy
482 research, emotions cannot only just be inferred by the situation but be “felt” to be
483 classified as expressed empathy. Earlier research looking at empathy by sexual
484 offenders has not shown them as being unempathetic. However, Barnett and
485 Mann contend that sexual offenders may have a disruption in seeing distress in
486 their victim. The offender may then believe and assert that their victim deserves
487 the distress that they are experiencing and have a cascading effect where they
488 may be powerful and enjoy the distress of the victim (Barnett & Mann, 2013).

489 1.4 Power

490 A common denominator in research on the dark personality and moral
491 judgment is the influence of power. To define power, one would have to first
492 define the actor and the recipient of the power. Therefore, there is either power-
493 over, power-to, and power-with. Each aspect has their own different consequences
494 [citation]. Power-over is when there is one individual, the one with power, which
495 wields control over a subordinate individual [citation]. Power-to is when an in-
496 dividual of privilege uses their status and power to control and enact a certain
497 consequence [citation]. Finally, power-with is an interesting concept where a per-
498 son of power uses their own power to lift or elevate someone without power to a
499 power position [citation]. This is often seen in community projects where some-
500 one in power goes into a troubled community and facilitates the situation so that
501 those that have less power can have their voices be heard. Power also has var-
502 ious sources each with their own complex consequences: institutional, cultural,
503 gender, age, ethnicity, orientation, and gender-identity [citations]. Some sources
504 of power compound on one another to increase the level of power over other sin-
505 gular sources of power. For example, in many areas of the world a straight white
506 cisgender man would hold the most power relative to other individuals.

507 Power influences relationships be it romantic or familial, work, academics,
508 including each of their derivatives. The three variations of power have various
509 influences on each of the areas of life. Power is neither good nor bad, it is how
510 the power is used that makes it either good or bad [citation]. Power and power
511 structures are often in the media. Often when there is a military coup in a far-
512 off country, individuals discuss power-over. When a humanitarian goes into an
513 impoverished community to help their voices heard, power-with is discussed. As
514 with the previous example, when a legislator uses their influence to pass a law,
515 that legislator uses power-to.

516 Early discussions of power descended from Greek and Roman political

517 philosophy (Aristotle, 1984). Greek Philosopher, Plato's brothers Glaucon and
518 Adeimantus discuss the viability or requirement of citizens being just and lawful if
519 they are able to escape conviction because of some social power or fortune (Aris-
520 totle, 1984). Aristotle continued the discussion by posing the questions, "There is
521 also doubt as to what is to be the supreme power in the state: Is it the multitude?
522 Or the wealthy? Or the good?..." (Aristotle, 1984). Power discussions such as
523 that by Aristotle point to what is the source of someone's power. Does the power
524 come from the majority? Does it come from money? Does it come from those
525 that are just? Each source of power has different effects on those that are gov-
526 erned by those with that power. Polybius of Greece discussed how a constitution
527 should be created and power should be delineated. Polybius power should be
528 split between multiple groups, each with a different form of power and distinct
529 genre to wield that power [citation]. Power continued to be discussed well beyond
530 the Greek philosophers and continued by political researchers and philosophers.
531 Discussions of power soon developed into research on how it influences at the
532 community level.

533 Sociologists, following many of the philosophical thought experiments pre-
534 vious and current to the time, began to research power. Sociologists soon devel-
535 oped the area of research in social power, where political power was a subset.
536 According to Bierstadt, power is always successful, whenever it fails then it is no
537 longer power [1950]. Sociologists asserted that power be conceived of as a force,
538 something that is applied to control a situation. Power can also be conceived of
539 as more passive authority. There are three sources of power: number of people,
540 social organization, and resources. From that individuals that are the class or
541 group or have the most resources that are in need are those that will have the
542 most power. Resources need not be physical objects they can also be more psy-
543 chological such as skills or knowledge. From history there are many examples
544 where power becomes toxic and the leader becomes the oppressor. Be it Mao

545 Ze Dong, Stalin, Lenin, or Hitler. The question then becomes what causes the
546 powerful to become oppressors? In some cases, those that are in power are trying
547 to do good for the community, restrictive from the example.

548 Recently, issues and abuses of power have become much of the forefront
549 of news due to the explosion caused by the me-too movement [citation]. The me-
550 too movement was first coined by activist and sexual harassment survivor Tarana
551 Burke. A decade after she disclosed her sexual assault, the me-too movement and
552 the abuse of power dominated the new cycle with accusations against film pro-
553 ducer Harvey Weinstein [citation]. Weinstein was known for doing philanthropic
554 initiatives during his career by using his influence and money to aid the certain
555 initiatives that he had chosen. However, soon news of his sexual assault accu-
556 sations and threats became news. Soon multiple women came forward accusing
557 Weinstein of assaulting them as well and using his power over them to intimidate
558 and silence them [citation]. This exemplifies how resources and position aid in
559 individuals become powerful. Weinstein had the resources and the authority to
560 abuse his power with many of his peers knowing what he was doing [citation].

561 In psychology, it was originally conceived that power corrupted individ-
562 uals exemplified by the Stanford prison experiment where “regular” individuals
563 were instructed to play the prison guards of a simulated prison. Similar indi-
564 viduals were instructed to portray the prisoners [citation]. Zimbardo, the lead
565 researcher for the experiment, soon noted that the individuals that portrayed the
566 prison guards became aggressive with the prisoners. They verbally and physically
567 assault them. The experiment was halted to stop any more damage from occur-
568 ring. News spread of the results of the experiment and power was seen as causing
569 or influencing the “prison guards” to become aggressive and abuse towards the
570 “prisoners.” However, the nature of the participants became into question [cita-
571 tion]. Later researchers noted that there could have been a self-selection bias of
572 the participants. The experiment was advertised such that the prison experiment

573 was known to the participant. This would then cause individuals to self-select
574 into the group which could possibly skew the results given that the participants
575 may have had authoritarian tendencies and the experiment and added power
576 may have given the opportunity for the participants to express their authoritar-
577 ian tendencies already present [citation]. Similar explanations have occurred in
578 politics.

579 Throughout political history individuals that have reached powerful posi-
580 tions on multiple occasions have given some powerful people the outlet to express
581 their prejudiced and problematic beliefs [citation]. Fear of communist infiltration
582 in the United States caused many fears and blacklisting was a frequent practice.
583 Joseph McCarthy, a Wisconsin senator, would soon use his power as a legisla-
584 tor/senator [citation]. McCarthy would call individuals to the front of the House
585 Un-American Activities Committee because they were suspected of being spies
586 for the Soviet Union. McCarthy and the committee used strong arm tactics and
587 would often threaten individuals brought in front of the committee. Many in-
588 dividuals brought forward often had their lives irrevocably changed [citation].
589 Soon Senator Margaret Chase Smith and six others condemned McCarthy for his
590 actions and tactics. McCarthy was soon censured, and the House Un-American
591 Activities Committee was disbanded. The political issue of power being used
592 as an outlet for prejudiced and authoritarianism became apparent recently after
593 the 2016 United States Presidential Election [citation]. Donald Trump's political
594 exploits would soon highlight his past and present use of power and his uneth-
595 ical dealings. Often Donald Trump would use his power for personal gain and
596 to express his prejudicial and racist beliefs. Examples range from in the 1990's
597 Donald Trump advocated for the Central Park Five, five African-American men
598 accused of raping and murdering a young White woman in Central Park, to be
599 put to death [citation]. However, DNA evidence exonerated on the men of the
600 crime [citation]. Recently, Donald Trump on the campaign trail accused Mexico

601 of sending individuals across the border that were rapists and drug dealers. How-
602 ever, there was no physical proof of the case and became a common trope used by
603 Donald Trump supporters. Because of the misuse of power and authority, there
604 have been increased hate crimes towards Mexican Americans and African Amer-
605 icans [citation]. The Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization that records
606 the number of hate groups currently active in the United States has documented
607 a clear increase in the number of active hate groups after the 2016 election [cita-
608 tion]. The supporters feel a sense of validation for their own beliefs and opinions
609 which they feel allows them some power in and of itself. This then poses an
610 interesting question in power research in psychology. What are the correlates of
611 the power complex? What are the consequences of power? How does a power
612 imbalance affect relationships? The list of questions is vast and varied.

613 Power imbalances in relationships can have negative effects spanning the
614 entirety of an individual's life, be it emotionally, physically, psychologically, and
615 socially [citation]. Dr. Helene Papanek, director of the Alfred Adler institute, a
616 sub-clinic of the Alfred Adler Mental Hygiene Clinic, discussed at a meeting of
617 the Association of Humanistic Psychology, multiple cases of controlling and power
618 disturbances in personal relationships. A relational example was presented where
619 a father, Mr. A had complete control over his wife and daughter. Controlling
620 when they should be home and where they should go. Mr. A even controlled
621 the frequency and positions of sex (Papanek, 1972). Power-over someone can
622 also manifest feelings of low self-worth and destructive behaviors. For example,
623 Ms. C was a young mother of a child born out of wedlock. She was abandoned
624 by her parents and the father of her child. She was constantly controlled by
625 her mother and their disdain for her child out of wedlock. Soon she developed
626 panic attacks but also a sense of superiority over others as a defense mechanism.
627 Dr. Papanek noted that Ms. C developed and lived a life of spiteful behaviors one
628 after the other.

629 The behaviors of Ms. C and Mr. A are not the only examples of individu-
630 als having power over another person or being subjected to the power over them.
631 Power-over has occurred throughout human history and is ingrained in all cultures
632 [citation]. Institutional power-over is quite common cross-culturally. Contracep-
633 tion and control over one's own reproductive system is a prescient debate globally
634 [citation]. In 1960 and 1963 Enovid was approved for use in the United States and
635 United Kingdom respectively [citation]. Doses for contraception early on were of-
636 ten high and news of multiple deaths was reported widely. Cases were brought
637 forward to control the use of contraception. The Roman Catholic Church's stance
638 on hormonal contraception shifted from permission to outlawing anything that
639 would be believed as stopping the ability to propagate [citation]. Interestingly
640 in 1989 researchers working for Pfizer in the United Kingdom were researching a
641 new drug that would aid in treating heart conditions [citations]. The researchers
642 soon discovered sildenafil also could treat erectile dysfunction. Ten years later,
643 sildenafil, brand name Viagra, would be patented and approved for use for the
644 primary treatment for erectile dysfunction [citation]. The same individuals that
645 were trying to reduce the use of female contraception were not trying to do the
646 same for Viagra. The Japanese government and officials had similar attempts
647 to quell the use of female contraception while not doing the same for erectile
648 dysfunction treatments [citation].

649 The Council on Foreign Relations [CFR] a non-profit that specializes in the United
650 States and international affairs, conducts an international index on women's work-
651 place equality by rating each country on factors: accessing institutions, getting a
652 job, going to court, protecting women from violence etc. [citation]. Scores range
653 from 0 to 100 where 100 is near total equality in all areas. Of 189 countries on the
654 list only 9 scores over 90% in the ranking. One hundred and thirty-eight score be-
655 low 75 with Yemen having the lowest score of 24.5. Including those that intersect
656 with other minorities have even less power like women of color and trans individ-

657 uals [citation]. Women having less power than their male counterparts can have
658 multiple negative outcomes such as continued and sustained sexual aggression,
659 low self-esteem, financial insecurity, lack of freedom of movement, lack of freedom
660 of thought, and in some extreme cases even death [citations]. Cultural relativism
661 creates a difficulty in cultures that have opposing views on the rights and how to
662 navigate that can in and of itself reflect institutional power imbalances.

663 Power imbalances can create a dissociative state where those with less
664 power are seen as more of an object than a person (Gwinn et al., 2013; Haslam &
665 Loughnan, 2014; Lammers & Stapel, 2011; Smith, 2016). While others with more
666 power may see those with less as be less human, some individuals attribute the
667 dehumanization to themselves as well and self-dehumanize (Bastian et al., 2013;
668 Bastian et al., 2012; Bastian & Haslam, 2010; Kouchaki et al., 2018). Effects of
669 prolonged dehumanization by those with more power often, unchecked and under
670 constant pressure, can lead some individuals to believe what the powerholders
671 say is true. The question remains, why do people in power begin to dehumanize
672 those with less power? Commonly when an individual harms another usually
673 there is some perspective taking by the harmer. However, to dehumanize the
674 other person it lessens the sense of empathy that one would normally feel thus
675 allowing for more damage and harm to be committed [citations]. “With great
676 power comes great responsibility” often quoted by Uncle Ben in the Spider-Man
677 comic books, yet has its possible historical foundations in the French National
678 Convention in 1793, leads credence to the wane and flow of the effects of power
679 (Nationale (Paris), 1793). Those in power make decisions for those for which they
680 are leaders. As is the case with every decision there is a reaction to the decision.
681 Sometimes those effects are negative and those with less power may be harmed in
682 the process. Dehumanization of those in less power acts as a defense mechanism
683 to continue making life changing decisions.

684 Often dehumanization is left to more extreme occasions such as war,

685 infrahumanization, where ascriptions of nonhuman qualities are more subtle
686 and not as extreme (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014). Research in dehumaniza-
687 tion/infrhumanization by Gwinn and colleagues used game theory and univer-
688 sity students to simulate power differentials (2013). In their research, they found
689 that once individuals began to gain power, they would ascribe fewer humanlike
690 personality traits than those with less power ascribing traits to the powerful.
691 Interestingly, there is a reciprocal relationship between self-dehumanization and
692 immoral behavior (Kouchaki et al., 2018). When individuals would commit an
693 immoral behavior, they would afterwards often feel less human, which in turn has
694 them act more immoral.

695 1.5 Cognition

696 When deciding, the decisions are not subject to a vacuum. Every decision
697 that is made is contingent on the prior understanding and knowledge of the
698 situation and the possible outcomes of those decisions. The woman choosing one
699 tie over another or the little boy choosing one doll to play with is contingent on
700 the knowledge that they both separately have gained in their lives so far. It could
701 be said that the time at which an infant is first learning about the world is when
702 individual decisions are made by instinct without gained knowledge. When the
703 infant ages and acquires more memories from the environment, it will begin to
704 use those memories in making future decisions.

705 The first step at acquiring new knowledge is interacting with the environ-
706 ment. One explanation that has been garnering more cognitive and biological
707 attention is from Dr. Nelson Cowan’s integrated working memory model (Cowan,
708 1999). In the integrated working memory model there are four key areas in at-
709 taining new information: [1] a brief sensory store, [2] a long term store, [3] the
710 focus of attention, [4] and the central executive. Each key area has a separate
711 function[s] that allows for new information to be “judged” against the existing

712 information. The information that is then held temporarily in a sensory store
713 to where it is then sent to the long term store to be “directed” by the central
714 executive which is a metacognitive process that controls and directs where atten-
715 tion should be placed on the incoming information. There is then a controlled
716 more conscious action or an automatic action based on the type of incoming in-
717 formation. Information that is automatic usually is considered habituated to the
718 memory system and is therefore not a novel stimulus. More focus is given to
719 information/stimuli that is more novel. In the integrated working memory model
720 information that is incoming in the brain is often “filtered” through a lens that
721 is understandable to the individual, novel stimuli. From here the information is
722 then encoded and stored in long-term memory for reactivation by new stimuli.

723 The integrated working memory model is similar in thought to how indi-
724 viduals make decisions based on the laws and customs of a society. Johnathan
725 is a normal member of his community. They participate in a common game in
726 the park with some friends. Johnathan says an inappropriate joke to one of their
727 friends. The others overhear and judge, automatically, the content of the joke to
728 the governed norms of the community. Because this joke is outside the common
729 norms of the community, the others see Johnathan as violating their moral code.
730 Johnathan’s friends would then automatically analyze the joke against existing
731 information and attend to the key features. Like how the central executive guides
732 and directs attention to the new novel stimuli, the inappropriate joke. Interesting
733 research has been done with morality and metacognition.

734 Common to research in metacognition and moral reasoning is theory of
735 mind. A theory of mind is the ability for an individual to attribute or recognize
736 the inner workings of the mind and differentiate those from the self and others
737 [citation]. Research in theory of mind has contributed to our understanding of
738 autism, schizophrenia, and traumatic brain injury (Byom & Mutlu, 2013). An
739 individual with deficits of theory of mind would for example be unable to attribute

740 signs of happiness on other people, such as a smile or a frown [citation]. In the
741 case of Johnathan, if they had a theory of mind deficits, they would be unable or
742 have difficulty in noticing the dissatisfaction of their joke. Research using theory
743 of mind to investigate social situations such as the example with Jonathan helps
744 psychologists get a better understanding of how moral judgement works and is
745 affected by deficits in the cognitive system.

746 As discussed thus far, cognitively, each component contributes and affects
747 the individual in a multitude of ways. As previously discussed in the section
748 on risky sexual behaviors, how the individual sees themselves and how they be-
749 lieve others see them is exceptionally important to their overall cognitive health.
750 These sexual schemas that each of us create about ourselves is influenced by daily
751 interactions and prior history, whether sexual. Outside of how the sexual schema
752 individuals create about themselves affects their later sexual health, it can change
753 how they see and interact with the world around them.

754 The prior knowledge that individuals have can have a negative effect on
755 their ability to gain and hold new information. Those with lower prior knowledge
756 of a given technology often have difficulty in reconstructing the information of a
757 new product compared to those that have less prior knowledge [Wood & Lynch,
758 2002]. When people are presented with new information, a new technology, en-
759 coding of the new information takes place. As that occurs, prior information of
760 the technology is retrieved, and an inference is made on subsequent information
761 by comparing the new and old information. This affects the ability to encode the
762 new information “correctly” and can disrupt later retrieval of the former. Similar
763 effects are seen when investigating motivational forces. Individuals with prior
764 knowledge may also have an overconfidence of the information that they already
765 have and are not as motivated to attend to the information they are learning.

766 Extending the research on prior knowledge and new technology, prior
767 knowledge and complacency has also been seen with contracting an STI, a virus,

768 or chances of getting pregnant [citations]. The decisional factors that occur cog-
769 nitively to choose safe sex practices is complex and subject to frequent change.
770 Many people that are confronted with decisions, such as the mundane choice of
771 what shoes to wear, base their decisions from using a variety of cognitive methods.
772 Often, the choice to wear a condom or other safe sex practices is through a risk
773 heuristic of contracting or transmitting a sexually transmitted infection. With
774 decisions based on issues of purity, such as sex, one heuristic that is commonly
775 employed is the affect heuristic. The affect heuristic in judgements of risk is where
776 the thought or priming of a specific word triggers a quick emotional response to
777 that stimuli word (Finucane et al., 2000). When presented with words that are
778 physically harmful such as cigarettes or pesticides, participants rated the words
779 as too risky and reported negative feelings concerning those stimulus words. Af-
780 fective considerations of high-risk situations are often put into perspective with
781 individuals in risky situations.

782 An artifact of how issues such as HIV, Human Immunodeficiency Virus,
783 discussed in the media and the community that it affects creates a cognitive
784 problem with individuals judging the likelihood of catching the virus, especially
785 women. In the media it is often discussed how men who have sex with men
786 are the main individuals catching and spreading HIV. While HIV still affects the
787 LGBTQ+ community, the discussion around susceptibility affects other individu-
788 als outside of the LGBTQ+ community negatively as well. Women, for example,
789 have a genetically higher susceptibility to the virus [citation]. That being so,
790 often due to unintended ignorance to their chances are one of the leading groups
791 contracting new cases of HIV [citation]. Downlow culture as well increases the
792 chances of contracting the virus. Amongst some men that do not wish to ac-
793 knowledge their own homosexuality will choose to forgo the condom, implies a
794 premeditation, and do not necessarily believe they will contract the virus [cita-
795 tion]. Both examples are contributed by the representation of HIV in the media

796 and the current zeitgeist.

797 Common in all decisions is the difficulty and uncomfortability between
798 different decisions and opposing situations, is cognitive dissonance (Festinger,
799 1957). An interesting cognitive dissonant series of thoughts that some males
800 have is when choosing to wear a condom. Often, there will be the cognition of not
801 wanting to contract an STI, but also believing that condoms are uncomfortable
802 (MacPhail & Campbell, 2001). In addition to believing they are uncomfortable
803 there is an interesting cultural belief amongst some young men that wearing a
804 condom makes them less of a man (Pleck et al., 1993; Vincent et al., 2016). To
805 some the main decisional factor in whether to wear a condom is not contracting an
806 STI or getting pregnant [citation]. While, as noted with perceptions on condoms,
807 often comfort and how others will see them is the main factor. Sexually active
808 or those thinking to become sexually active often get their opinions on sexual
809 activity and safety practices from their peers. Often, the opinions of peers are
810 more influential than those of the parent[s]. Interestingly, some men believe that
811 due to the cultural cognition around contraception, discussions and decisions of
812 contraception is a female decision (Castro-Vázquez, 2000).

813 **1.5.1 Aggression and Cognition**

814 Connected to spitefulness, moral judgment, and cognition is human ag-
815 gression. Traditionally, aggression is differentiated between the outcome or moti-
816 vation of the incident. Aggression as it is operationally defined is behavior that is
817 committed by the actor to another with the intent to harm the other (C. A. An-
818 derson & Bushman, 2002). This is then further differentiated to violence where
819 violence is the intent to cause severe harm such as death. From aggression re-
820 search and moral judgment, cognitive neoassociation theory [CNT] was beginning
821 to become tantamount in research on aggressive behavior.

822 In CNT, similar to the study of disgust association where some research

suggests that inducing the disgust response to smell causes individuals to become more conservative against breaking moral norms (Eskine et al., 2011; Horberg et al., 2009; Laakasuo et al., 2017; Tybur et al., 2009). Important to the present discussion on sexual judgment, research by Laakasuo and colleagues suggest that disgust is only predictive of sexual disgust (2017). From CNT, Anderson and Bushman developed the General Aggression Model [GAM] is a theoretical outline that combines multiple smaller domain specific theories on aggression like CNT (2002). The GAM has processes: inputs, routes, and outcomes of a social situation. The inputs separate into a person and situation centered inputs. The individual then has an internal examination of the person or situation, cognitions like affective processes, availability heuristics, theory of mind evaluations, scripts and schemata [Barnett and Mann (2013); Kahneman and Tversky (1972); scripts and schemata citation]. Appraisal and a decision process are the last step in the GAM, where the individual evaluates the situation based on the inputs and routes. Anderson and Bushman contend that there are two types of outcomes, thoughtful and impulsive actions. Like the affective heuristic, the impulsive action is often fast and does not require as much deliberation. While the thoughtful action requires more time and evaluation of all the possible outcomes.

Scripts and schemata are key components of the GAM. Schema, more broadly than sexual schema, are cognitive compositions or structures that represent objects or ideas interconnected by their features (DiMaggio, 1997). Multiple representations of schema and stereotypical event sequences are labelled as scripts (Abelson, 1981). A classic example of a cognitive script is events surrounding reading the menu at a restaurant (Abelson, 1981). An individual is at a restaurant and needs to order from the menu. However, they lost their reading glasses. As Abelson contends, the reader must infer what is needed in reading a menu, what occurs at a restaurant, and so on. The automatic process of schematic activation begins with certain key features of an object or event being noticed

851 by the individual. For example, recognizing a tree one of the first features that
852 are noticed that distinguishes a tree are the leaves. From the leaves, the bark is
853 activated, and so on making up the concept of a tree.

854 Often aggression and discrimination can be understood through the
855 schematic model. Media and social representations of individuals, especially men
856 of color, have often made assumptions and portrayed them as violent and crim-
857 inals. Currently a majority of US adults in a recent Pew Research Center poll
858 report that race relations are currently worse, Black Americans and people of
859 color in general report more cases of discrimination, and a majority say Black
860 Americans in particular are treated unfairly by the police (Pew Research Center,
861 2019). Aggression or discrimination is often the result of associating one group
862 with negative connotations. For example, in the case of those that believe Black
863 Americans are criminals they have through cognitive associations have related
864 the schematic concept of criminal with the features/schema of what they believe
865 is a Black American. The discrimination and aggression then occur through the
866 GAM processes with negative actions being the outcome.

867 Pertinent after the advent of the me-too movement, see section 3, issues of
868 how these power over views of women, especially women of color and trans women
869 of color, become learned and develop in sexual aggression. Sexual aggression in
870 and of itself is a subgroup of aggression where the intent to harm is sexual in
871 nature (C. A. Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Malamuth et al., 1995). Many of
872 the targets of sexual aggression are women of color and trans women of color
873 [citations]. In the reported cases men are often the perpetrators of the crimes
874 (C. A. Anderson & Bushman, 2002). The aggression itself appears to be domain
875 specific to one gender, women. Often, acts of sexual aggression are verbal in
876 nature, such as asking repeatedly for sex or threatening to break up with them
877 (Testa et al., 2015). When individuals gain power they may aggress more over
878 those that have less power, which may pay head to the continued sexual aggression

879 and sexual violence against women of color and trans women of color for whom
880 have historically low levels of power [citations].

881 Recent research by Garnett and Mann investigate the cognitive and em-
882 pathetic processes of those that commit a sexual aggression or sexual violence,
883 labeled as sexual offending (2013). Common to research on sexual offenses, re-
884 search contends that those that do offend do so with a lack of empathy towards
885 their victims (Marshall et al., 1993). As noted in the previous section on moral
886 judgment, see section 3, empathetic processing by these offenders are more com-
887 plex than the simple inability to “feel” or identify the emotions of others. There
888 is a recurring theme amongst offenders of women being deceitful and sexually en-
889 titled (Barnett & Mann, 2013; Gannon, 2009). The offenders often feel slighted
890 when a woman denies their sexual advances which then tends to lead to some
891 sexual aggression (Gannon, 2009; Williams et al., 2017).

892 The rejection of the sexual advances of the man often damage their sense
893 of masculinity (Malamuth et al., 1996). Relating back to beliefs on condom
894 use amongst men, even the request of wearing condom could be interpreted as
895 damaging their sense of masculinity (Castro-Vázquez, 2000). If the woman, in
896 a heterosexual relationship, brings the condom they are damaging the males
897 masculinity but if the male brings the condom he could also be considered a
898 thoughtful individual. While the woman would be seen as easy. This could
899 then lead to bullying behavior and ostracization from the moral judgment of the
900 community on the woman’s purity, see section moral judgment.

901 **1.5.2 *Exploratory Experiment***

902 **1.6 Method**

903 **1.6.1 *Participants***

904 Participants were a convenience sample of 92 (Mage = 26.14, SD = 8.69)
905 individuals from Prolific Academic crowdsourcing platform (“www.prolific.co”).

906 Requirements for participation were: (1) be 18 years of age or older and (2) and
907 as part of Prolific Academics policy, have a prolific rating of 90 or above. Par-
908 ticipants received £4 or £8 an hour as compensation for completing the survey.
909 Table 1 shows the demographic information for experiment one.

910 **1.6.2 Demographic Questionnaire**

911 Prior to the psychometric scales, participants are asked to share their
912 demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and edu-
913 cational attainment).

914 **1.6.3 Spitefulness Scale**

915 The Spitefulness scale (D. K. Marcus et al., 2014) is a measure with seven-
916 teen one-sentence vignettes to assess the spitefulness of participants. The original
917 spitefulness scale has 31-items. In the original Marcus and colleagues’ paper, fif-
918 teen were removed. For the present study, however, 4-items were removed because
919 they did not meet the parameters for the study i.e., needed to be dyadic, more
920 personal. Three reverse-scored items from the original thirty-one were added af-
921 ter meeting the requirements. Example questions included, “It might be worth
922 risking my reputation in order to spread gossip about someone I did not like,” and
923 “Part of me enjoys seeing the people I do not like to fail even if their failure hurts
924 me in some way”. Items are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly
925 disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”). Higher spitefulness scores represent higher
926 acceptance of spiteful attitudes. Internal consistency reliability for the current
927 sample is $\alpha = 0.84$.

928 **1.6.4 Sexuality Self-Esteem Subscale**

929 The Sexuality Self-Esteem subscale (SSES; Snell and Papini (1989)) is a
930 subset of the Sexuality scale that measures the overall self-esteem of participants.
931 Due to the nature of the study, the sexuality subscale was chosen from the overall

30-item scale. The 10-items chosen reflected questions on the sexual esteem of participants on a 5-point scale of +2 (Agree) and -2 (Disagree). For ease of online use the scale was changed to 1 (“Disagree”) and 5 (“Agree”), data analysis will follow the sexuality scale scoring procedure. Example questions are, “I am a good sexual partner,” and “I sometimes have doubts about my sexual competence.” Higher scores indicate a higher acceptance of high self-esteem statements. Internal consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.95$.

1.6.5 *Sexual Jealousy Subscale*

The Sexual Jealousy subscale by Worley and Samp (2014) are 3-items from the 12-item Jealousy scale. The overall jealousy scale measures jealousy in friendships ranging from sexual to companionship. The 3-items are “I would worry about my partner being sexually unfaithful to me.”, “I would suspect there is something going on sexually between my partner and their friend.”, and “I would suspect sexual attraction between my partner and their friend.” The items are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”). Higher scores indicate a tendency to be more sexually jealous. Internal consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.72$.

1.6.6 *Sexual Relationship Power Scale*

The Sexual Relationship Power Scale (SRPS; Pulerwitz et al. (2000)) is a 23-item scale that measures the overall power distribution in a sexually active relationship. The SRPS is split into the Relationship Control Factor/Subscale (RCF) and the Decision-Making Dominance Factor/Subscale (DMDF). The RCF measures the relationship between the partners on their agreement with statements such as, “If I asked my partner to use a condom, he[they] would get violent.”, and “I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship.” Items from the RCF are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly agree”) to 4 (“Strongly disagree”). Lower scores indicate an imbalance in the relationship where the par-

959 participant indicates they believe they have less control in the relationship. Internal
960 consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.87$.

961 The DMDF measures the dominance level of sexual and social decisions in
962 the relationship. Example questions include, “Who usually has more say about
963 whether you have sex?”, and “Who usually has more say about when you talk
964 about serious things?” Items on the DMDF are scored on a 3-item scale of 1
965 (“Your Partner”), 2 (“Both of You Equally”), and 3 (“You”). Higher scores indi-
966 cate more dominance by the participant in the relationship. Internal consistency
967 reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.64$.

968 **1.6.7 Scenario Realism Question**

969 Following Worley and Samp in their 2014 paper on using vi-
970 gnettes/scenarios in psychological studies, a question asking the participant how
971 realistic or how much they can visualize the scenario is. The 1-item question is
972 “This type of situation is realistic.” The item is scored on a 5-point scale with how
973 much the participants agreed with the above statement, 1 (“Strongly agree”) to
974 5 (“Strongly disagree”). Higher scores indicate disagreement with the statement
975 and reflect the belief that the scenario is not realistic.

976 **1.6.8 Spiteful Vignettes**

977 After participants complete the above scales, they are presented with 10-
978 hypothetical vignettes. Each vignette was written to reflect a dyadic or triadic
979 relationship with androgynous names to control for gender. Five vignettes have
980 a sexual component while five are sexually neutral. An example vignette is,

981 “Casey and Cole have been dating for 6 years. A year ago, they both
982 moved into a new flat together just outside of the city. Casey had an
983 affair with Cole’s best-friend. Casey had recently found out that they
984 had an STI that they had gotten from Cole’s best-friend. Casey and
985 Cole had sex and later Cole found out they had an STI.”

986 For each vignette, the participant is asked to rate each vignette on how
987 justified they believe the primary individual, Casey in the above, is with their
988 spiteful reaction. Scoring ranges from 1 (“Not justified at all”) to 5 (“Being
989 very justified”). Higher scores overall indicate higher agreement with spiteful
990 behaviors.

991 1.7 Procedure

992 Participants were recruited on Prolific Academic. Participants must be
993 18-years of age or older, restriction by study design and Prolific Academic’s user
994 policy. The published study is titled, “Moral Choice and Behavior”. The study
995 description follows the participant information sheet including participant com-
996 pensation. Participants were asked to accept their participation in the study.
997 Participants were then automatically sent to the main survey (Qualtrics, Inc.).

998 Once participants accessed the main survey, they were presented with the
999 consent form for which to accept they responded by selecting “Yes”. Participants
1000 were then asked to provide demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnic-
1001 ity, and educational attainment. Participants would then complete in order, the
1002 spitefulness scale, the sexual relationship power scale, the sexual jealousy sub-
1003 scale, and sexuality self-esteem subscale. Next, participants were presented ten
1004 vignettes where they were instructed to rate on the level of justification for the
1005 action carried out in the vignette. After each vignette, participants would rate
1006 the realism of the scenario. Upon completion of the survey (median completion
1007 time 20 minutes SD = 10 Minutes 30 seconds), participants were shown a de-
1008 briefing message and shown the contact information of the Primary Investigator
1009 (Andrew Ithurburn). Participants were then compensated at £8/hr. via Prolific
1010 Academic.

Table 1*Participant Demographic Information (Experiment 1)*

Demographic Characteristic	
Age	
Mean (SD)	26.14 (8.69)
Median [Min, Max]	23 [18,60]
Gender	
Female	30 (32.6%)
Male	62 (67.4%)
Ethnic Origin	
Scottish	2 (2.2%)
English	10 (10.9%)
European	69 (75.0%)
Latin American	2 (2.2%)
Asian	5 (5.4%)
Arab	1 (1.1%)
Other	2 (2.2%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (1.1%)
Education	
Primary School	3 (3.3%)
GCSEs or Equivalent	8 (8.7%)
A-Levels or Equivalent	32 (34.8%)
University Undergraduate Program	31 (33.7%)
University Post-Graduate Program	17 (18.5%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (1.1%)
Ethnicity	
White	82 (89.1%)
Mixed or Multiple ethnic origins	4 (4.3%)
Asian or Asian Scottish or Asian British	5 (5.4%)
Other ethnic group	1 (1.1%)

1011 1.8 Data Analysis

1012 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using a one-way analysis for
1013 continuous variables (age) and Chi-squares tests for categorical variables (sex,
1014 ethnicity, ethnic origin, and educational attainment). Means and standard de-
1015 viations were calculated for the surveys along with correlational analyses (e.g.,
1016 spitefulness, SESS, SRPS, SJS).

1017 Bayesian multilevel models were used to test differences between levels of
1018 justifications of vignettes that are either sexually or non-sexually vindictive in
1019 behavior.

1020 1.9 Experiment One

1021 1.10 Method

1022 1.10.1 *Participants*

1023 Participants were a convenience sample of 92 ($M_{age} = 26.14$, $SD = 8.69$)
1024 individuals from Prolific Academic crowdsourcing platform (“www.prolific.co”).
1025 Requirements for participation were: (1) be 18 years of age or older and (2) and
1026 as part of Prolific Academics policy, have a prolific rating of 90 or above. Par-
1027 ticipants received £4 or £8 an hour as compensation for completing the survey.
1028 Table 1 shows the demographic information for experiment one.

1029 1.10.2 *Demographic Questionnaire*

1030 Prior to the psychometric scales, participants are asked to share their
1031 demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and edu-
1032 cational attainment).

1033 1.10.3 *Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation*

1034 The 18-item Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership scale [DoPL; Suessen-
1035 bach et al. (2019)], is used to measure dominance, prestige, and leadership orien-

1036 tation. Each question corresponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is
1037 scored across six unique items related to those domains (e.g., “I relish opportuni-
1038 ties in which I can lead others” for leadership) rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly
1039 disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Internal consistency reliability for the current
1040 sample is $\alpha = 0.85$.

1041 **1.10.4 Spitefulness Scale**

1042 The Spitefulness scale (D. K. Marcus et al., 2014) is a measure with seven-
1043 teen one-sentence vignettes to assess the spitefulness of participants. The original
1044 spitefulness scale has 31-items. In the original Marcus and colleagues’ paper, fif-
1045 teen were removed. For the present study, however, 4-items were removed because
1046 they did not meet the parameters for the study i.e., needed to be dyadic, more
1047 personal. Three reverse-scored items from the original thirty-one were added af-
1048 ter meeting the requirements. Example questions included, “It might be worth
1049 risking my reputation in order to spread gossip about someone I did not like,” and
1050 “Part of me enjoys seeing the people I do not like to fail even if their failure hurts
1051 me in some way”. Items are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly
1052 disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”). Higher spitefulness scores represent higher
1053 acceptance of spiteful attitudes. Internal consistency reliability for the current
1054 sample is $\alpha = 0.84$.

1055 **1.10.5 Sexuality Self-Esteem Subscale**

1056 The Sexuality Self-Esteem subscale (SSES; Snell and Papini (1989)) is a
1057 subset of the Sexuality scale that measures the overall self-esteem of participants.
1058 Due to the nature of the study, the sexuality subscale was chosen from the overall
1059 30-item scale. The 10-items chosen reflected questions on the sexual esteem of
1060 participants on a 5-point scale of +2 (Agree) and -2 (Disagree). For ease of online
1061 use the scale was changed to 1 (“Disagree”) and 5 (“Agree”), data analysis will
1062 follow the sexuality scale scoring procedure. Example questions are, “I am a good

sexual partner,” and “I sometimes have doubts about my sexual competence.”
Higher scores indicate a higher acceptance of high self-esteem statements. Internal
consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.95$.

1.10.6 Sexual Jealousy Subscale

The Sexual Jealousy subscale by Worley and Samp (2014) are 3-items
from the 12-item Jealousy scale. The overall jealousy scale measures jealousy
in friendships ranging from sexual to companionship. The 3-items are “I would
worry about my partner being sexually unfaithful to me.”, “I would suspect there
is something going on sexually between my partner and their friend.”, and “I
would suspect sexual attraction between my partner and their friend.” The items
are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly
agree”). Higher scores indicate a tendency to be more sexually jealous. Internal
consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.72$.

1.10.7 Sexual Relationship Power Scale

The Sexual Relationship Power Scale (SRPS; Pulerwitz et al. (2000)) is
a 23-item scale that measures the overall power distribution in a sexually active
relationship. The SRPS is split into the Relationship Control Factor/Subscale
(RCF) and the Decision-Making Dominance Factor/Subscale (DMDF). The RCF
measures the relationship between the partners on their agreement with state-
ments such as, “If I asked my partner to use a condom, he[they] would get vi-
olent.”, and “I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship.” Items from the RCF
are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly agree”) to 4 (“Strongly
disagree”). Lower scores indicate an imbalance in the relationship where the par-
ticipant indicates they believe they have less control in the relationship. Internal
consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.87$.

The DMDF measures the dominance level of sexual and social decisions in
the relationship. Example questions include, “Who usually has more say about

1090 whether you have sex?”, and “Who usually has more say about when you talk
1091 about serious things?” Items on the DMDF are scored on a 3-item scale of 1
1092 (“Your Partner”), 2 (“Both of You Equally”), and 3 (“You”). Higher scores indi-
1093 cate more dominance by the participant in the relationship. Internal consistency
1094 reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.64$.

1095 **1.10.8 Scenario Realism Question**

1096 Following Worley and Samp in their 2014 paper on using vi-
1097 gnettes/scenarios in psychological studies, a question asking the participant how
1098 realistic or how much they can visualize the scenario is. The 1-item question is
1099 “This type of situation is realistic.” The item is scored on a 5-point scale with how
1100 much the participants agreed with the above statement, 1 (“Strongly agree”) to
1101 5 (“Strongly disagree”). Higher scores indicate disagreement with the statement
1102 and reflect the belief that the scenario is not realistic.

1103 **1.10.9 Spiteful Vignettes**

1104 After participants complete the above scales, they are presented with 10-
1105 hypothetical vignettes. Each vignette was written to reflect a dyadic or triadic
1106 relationship with androgynous names to control for gender. Five vignettes have
1107 a sexual component while five are sexually neutral. An example vignette is,

1108 “Casey and Cole have been dating for 6 years. A year ago, they both
1109 moved into a new flat together just outside of the city. Casey had an
1110 affair with Cole’s best-friend. Casey had recently found out that they
1111 had an STI that they had gotten from Cole’s best-friend. Casey and
1112 Cole had sex and later Cole found out they had an STI.”

1113 For each vignette, the participant is asked to rate each vignette on how
1114 justified they believe the primary individual, Casey in the above, is with their
1115 spiteful reaction. Scoring ranges from 1 (“Not justified at all”) to 5 (“Being

1116 very justified”). Higher scores overall indicate higher agreement with spiteful
1117 behaviors.

1118 **1.11 Procedure**

1119 Participants were recruited on Prolific Academic. Participants must be
1120 18-years of age or older, restriction by study design and Prolific Academic’s user
1121 policy. The published study is titled, “Moral Choice and Behavior”. The study
1122 description follows the participant information sheet including participant com-
1123 pensation. Participants were asked to accept their participation in the study.
1124 Participants were then automatically sent to the main survey (Qualtrics, Inc.).

1125 Once participants accessed the main survey, they were presented with the
1126 consent form for which to accept they responded by selecting “Yes”. Participants
1127 were then asked to provide demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnic-
1128 ity, and educational attainment. Participants would then complete in order, the
1129 spitefulness scale, the sexual relationship power scale, the sexual jealousy sub-
1130 scale, and sexuality self-esteem subscale. Next, participants were presented ten
1131 vignettes where they were instructed to rate on the level of justification for the
1132 action carried out in the vignette. After each vignette, participants would rate
1133 the realism of the scenario. Upon completion of the survey (median completion
1134 time 20 minutes SD = 10 Minutes 30 seconds), participants were shown a de-
1135 briefing message and shown the contact information of the Primary Investigator
1136 (Andrew Ithurburn). Participants were then compensated at £8/hr. via Prolific
1137 Academic.

1138 **1.12 Data Analysis**

1139 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using a one-way analysis for
1140 continuous variables (age) and Chi-squares tests for categorical variables (sex,
1141 ethnicity, ethnic origin, and educational attainment). Means and standard de-

Table 2*Participant Demographic Information (Experiment 1)*

Demographic Characteristic	
Age	
Mean (SD)	26.14 (8.69)
Median [Min, Max]	23 [18,60]
Gender	
Female	30 (32.6%)
Male	62 (67.4%)
Ethnic Origin	
Scottish	2 (2.2%)
English	10 (10.9%)
European	69 (75.0%)
Latin American	2 (2.2%)
Asian	5 (5.4%)
Arab	1 (1.1%)
Other	2 (2.2%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (1.1%)
Education	
Primary School	3 (3.3%)
GCSEs or Equivalent	8 (8.7%)
A-Levels or Equivalent	32 (34.8%)
University Undergraduate Program	31 (33.7%)
University Post-Graduate Program	17 (18.5%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (1.1%)
Ethnicity	
White	82 (89.1%)
Mixed or Multiple ethnic origins	4 (4.3%)
Asian or Asian Scottish or Asian British	5 (5.4%)
Other ethnic group	1 (1.1%)

Table 3*Bayesian Correlation with 95% Credibility Intervals*

	Estimate	Upper CI	Lower CI
SSES * SRPS	-0.40	-0.45	-0.34
SSES * Spite	0.08	0.02	0.14
SRPS * Spite	-0.16	-0.23	-0.10
SSES * SJS	0.23	0.17	0.29
SRPS * SJS	-0.27	-0.33	-0.21
Spite * SJS	0.19	0.12	0.25
SSES * Dominance	-0.20	-0.26	-0.14
SRPS * Dominance	0.07	0.00	0.13
Spite * Dominance	0.50	0.45	0.54
SJS * Dominance	0.25	0.19	0.31
SSES * Prestige	-0.07	-0.13	0.00
SRPS * Prestige	0.27	0.21	0.33
Spite * Prestige	0.06	0.00	0.13
SJS * Prestige	-0.01	-0.08	0.05
Dominance * Prestige	0.19	0.12	0.25
SSES * Leadership	-0.29	-0.35	-0.23
SRPS * Leadership	0.30	0.24	0.36
Spite * Leadership	-0.03	-0.09	0.04
SJS * Leadership	-0.08	-0.15	-0.02
Dominance * Leadership	0.31	0.25	0.36
Prestige * Leadership	0.37	0.31	0.42

1142 viations were calculated for the surveys along with correlational analyses (e.g.,
1143 spitefulness, SESS, SRPS, SJS).

1144 Bayesian multilevel models were used to test differences between levels of
1145 justifications of vignettes that are either sexually or non-sexually vindictive in
1146 behavior.

1147 1.13 Results and Discussion

1148 Ninety-Two individuals participated in the present experiment. A major-
1149 ity of the participants in experiment 1 identified as male ($n = 62$). Table 1 shows
1150 the demographic information for experiment 1. Table 2 presents the results of
1151 a Bayesian correlational matrix of all measures. As evidenced in the Bayesian

1152 correlational matrix, most surveys positively correlated with one another.

1153 **1.13.1 Spitefulness**

1154 For this analysis we used the Bayesian parameter estimation using R and
1155 brms (Bürkner, 2018; R Core Team, 2021). An annotated r script file, includ-
1156 ing all necessary information is available at <https://osf.io/jz6qb>. On average,
1157 individuals were not rated as being more spiteful, ($M = 33.92$, $SD = 9.32$, Min-
1158 max = [16 - 57]). Justification as a function of the four indices was moderately
1159 explained by the model ($R^2 = 0.54$). We conducted an exploratory Bayesian
1160 correlation analysis on the data, where we investigated correlations between 8 of
1161 the indices (e.g., Spite, Dominance, Prestige, Leadership, Sexual Jealousy, Sexual
1162 Self-Esteem, and Sexual Relationship Power Scale).

1163 Selected notable non-null correlations were found between Spite and Sex-
1164 ual Jealousy (95% CI: []), Spite and Dominance (95% CI: []), and Sexual Rela-
1165 tionship Power and Dominance (95% CI: []). Table 2 contains a complete list of
1166 all Bayesian correlations.

1167 **1.14 Limitations and Future Directions**

1168 **1.15 Experiment 2**

1169 **1.16 Methods**

1170 Materials remain the same in terms of the (1) Demographic Questionnaire,
1171 (2) Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Questionnaire, and (3) DOSPERT
1172 Questionnaire. However, we added the Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory to
1173 assess possible interactions of dominance and narcissism in risky decision-making.
1174 Materials and methods were approved by the University of ## Participants

1175 Following experiment 1, participants were a convenience sample of 111
1176 individuals from Prolific Academic’s crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io).
1177 Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing service that provides participants

1178 access to studies hosted on third-party websites. Participants were required to be
1179 18 years of age or older and be able to read and understand English. Participants
1180 received £4.00, which is above the current minimum wage pro-rata in the United
1181 Kingdom, as compensation for completing the survey. The Psychology Research
1182 Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study procedures
1183 [ref: 212-2021/2]. The present study was pre-registered along with a copy of
1184 anonymized data and a copy of the R code is available at (<https://osf.io/s4j7y>).

1185 **1.17 Materials**

1186 **1.17.1 Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory**

1187 The 28 item Brief Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI; Schoenleber
1188 et al., 2015) is a modified scale of the original 52-item Pathological Narcissism
1189 Inventory (PNI; Pincus et al., 2009). Like the PNI the B-PNI is a scale measuring
1190 individuals' pathological narcissism. Items in the B-PNI retained all 7 patholog-
1191 ical narcissism facets from the original PNI (e.g., exploitativeness, self-sacrificing
1192 self-enhancement, grandiose fantasy, contingent self-esteem, hiding the self, de-
1193 valuing, and entitlement rage). Each item is rated on a 5 point Likert scale
1194 ranging from 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (very much like me). Example items
1195 include "I find it easy to manipulate people" and "I can read people like a book."

1196 **1.18 Procedure**

1197 Participants were recruited via a study landing page on Prolific's website
1198 or via a direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific Academic, 2018). The study
1199 landing page included a brief description of the study including any risks and ben-
1200 efits along with expected compensation for successful completion. Participants
1201 accepted participation in the experiment and were directed to the main survey
1202 on pavlovia.org (an online JavaScript hosting website similar to Qualtrics) where
1203 they were shown a brief message on study consent.

1204 Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they an-
1205 swered a series of demographic questions. Once completed, participants com-
1206 pleted the Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific
1207 Risk-taking scale. An additional survey was added (the novel aspect of experi-
1208 ment 2) where participants, in addition to the two previous surveys, were asked to
1209 complete the brief-pathological narcissism inventory. The three scales were coun-
1210 terbalanced to account for order effects. After completion of the main survey,
1211 participants were shown a debriefing statement that briefly mentions the purpose
1212 of the experiment along with the contact information of the main researcher (AI).
1213 Participants were compensated £4.00 via Prolific Academic.

1214 **1.19 Data analysis**

1215 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using multiple regression for
1216 continuous variables (age) and Chi-square tests for categorical variables (gender,
1217 race, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and education). Means and standard deviations
1218 were calculated for the relevant scales (i.e., DoPL and DOSPERT). All analyses
1219 were done using (R Core Team, 2021) along with (Bürkner, 2017) package.

1220 The use of bayesian statistics has a multitude of benefits to statistical
1221 analysis and research design. One important benefit is through the use of prior
1222 data in future analyses. Termed as priors, is the use of prior distributions for
1223 future analysis. This allows for the separation of how the data might have been
1224 collected or what the intention was. In essence, the data is the data without the
1225 interpretation of the scientist.

1226 All relevant analyses were conducted in a Bayesian framework using the
1227 brms package (Bürkner, 2018) along with the cmdstanr packages notes (Gabry &
1228 Cesnovar, 2021). In addition to the aforementioned packages, we used bayestestR,
1229 rstan, and papaja for analysis along with the creation of this manuscript (Aust
1230 & Barth, 2020; Makowski et al., 2019; Stan Development Team, 2020).

1231	1.20	Results
1232	1.21	Preregistered Analyses
1233	1.21.1	Demographic and DoPL
1234	1.22	Domain-Specific Risk-Taking
1235	1.23	Interactions
1236	1.24	Discussion
1237	1.25	Limitations
1238	1.26	Future Implications

Table 4

	Parameter	CI	CI_low	CI_high
8	b_Intercept	0.95	0.74	3.27
18	b_Spite_z	0.95	0.06	0.24
5	b_Dominance_z:ContentSexual	0.95	0.01	0.28

2 Introduction

Throughout political history, tyrants, and despots have influenced great power over large swaths of land and communities. One common thread amongst these individuals is how they wield their great power, often through dominant tactics such as threats and political subversion. Recent history has shown with individuals like Donald Trump, Kim Jong-Un, and Rodrigo Duterte who display authoritarian traits often wield their power through fear and threats of violence (Bernstein, 2020; “Glamorizing Dictators,” 2018; M. Kirby, 2021). How this power is wielded is often different for each individual. Some individuals such as Duterte and Bolsonaro wielded their power more dramatically than the likes of Trump. Individuals wielding power need not be tyrants such as the former. Individuals like Angela Merkel used her position and leadership skills to be a world leader in most negotiations. While individuals more well known for their status demonstrated their power through prestige motives. To better understand how individuals such as world leaders or opinion makers gain and wield their power over others. Research in this field is often difficult to research yet strides have been made to understand power, namely through research in moral judgment and decision-making such as power orientation.

2.1 Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership orientation

Research in power desire motives has focused on three subdomains: dominance, leadership, and prestige (Suessenbach et al., 2019). Each of these three different power motives is explained as to different ways or methods that individ-

1261 uals in power sought power or were bestowed upon them. Often these dominant
1262 individuals will wield their power with force and potentially cause risk to them-
1263 selves to hold onto that power. @

1264 **2.1.1 Dominance**

1265 The dominance motive is one of the more researched methods and well-
1266 depicted power motives. Individuals with a dominant orientation display the
1267 more primal of human behavior. These individuals will seek power through di-
1268 rect methods such as asserting dominance, control over resources, or physically
1269 assaulting someone (M. W. Johnson & Bruner, 2012; Winter, 1993). Early re-
1270 search in dominance motives has shown that acts of dominance ranging from
1271 asserting physical dominance over another to physical displays of violence have
1272 been shown in many mammalian species, including humans (Petersen et al., 2018;
1273 Rosenthal et al., 2012).

1274 Individuals high in dominance are often high in Machiavellianism, and
1275 narcissism, and often are prone to risky behavior (discussion further in the next
1276 section). Continued research has hinted at a possible tendency for males to dis-
1277 play these dominant seeking traits more than females (Bareket & Shnabel, 2020;
1278 Sidanius et al., 2000). When high dominance individuals assert themselves they
1279 are doing so to increase their sense of power (C. Anderson et al., 2012; Bierst-
1280 edt, 1950). Asserting one's sense of dominance over another can be a dangerous
1281 task. In the animal kingdom, it can often lead to injury. While, humans asserting
1282 dominance can take a multitude of actions such as leering behaviors, physical dis-
1283 tance, or other non-verbal methods to display dominance (Petersen et al., 2018;
1284 Witkower et al., 2020). Power from a dominant perspective is not always be-
1285 stowed upon someone. Often, high dominance individuals will take control and
1286 hold onto it.

1287 2.1.2 Prestige

1288 Contrary to the dominant motivation of using intimidation and aggression
1289 to gain more power, a prestige motivation or prestige, in general, is bestowed
1290 upon an individual from others in the community (Maner & Case, 2016;
1291 Suessenbach et al., 2019). Different from the dominance motivation, a prestige
1292 motivation is generally unique to the human species (Maner & Case, 2016).
1293 Due in part to ancestral human groups being smaller hunter-gatherer societies,
1294 individuals that displayed and used important behaviors beneficial to the larger
1295 group were often valued and admired by the group. Therein, the social group
1296 bestows the authority onto the individual. Generally, this type of behavior
1297 can be passively achieved by the prestigious individual. However, this does
1298 not remove the intent of the actor in that they too can see prestige from the
1299 group, but the method of achieving that social status greatly differs from that of
1300 dominance-seeking individuals.

1301

1302 Apart from dominance-motivated individuals that continually have to fight
1303 for their right to have power over others, individuals that seek or were given
1304 power through a prestige motivation are not generally challenged in the same
1305 sense as dominant individuals. Displaying behaviors that the community would
1306 see as beneficial would endear them to the community making the survival of the
1307 community as a whole better (Maner & Case, 2016). Evolutionarily this would
1308 increase the viability of the prestigious individual and their genes. Similar to
1309 the dominance perspective, the prestige perspective overall increases the power
1310 and future survivability of the individual. However, due to the natural difference
1311 between prestige and dominance, dominance-seeking individuals are challenged
1312 more often resulting in more danger to their position (M. W. Johnson & Bruner,
1313 2012).

1314 **2.1.3 Leadership**

1315 With a shared goal a leader is someone that takes initiative and attracts
1316 followers for that shared goal (Van Vugt, 2006). Leadership is an interesting
1317 aspect of behavior in that it is almost exclusive to human interaction. Dis-
1318 cussions by evolutionary psychologists point to the formation of early human
1319 hunter-gatherer groups where the close interconnectedness created a breeding
1320 ground for leadership roles. As early humans began to evolve it would become
1321 advantageous for individuals to work together for a common goal (King et
1322 al., 2009). Often, individuals with more knowledge of a given problem would
1323 demonstrate leadership and take charge or be given power. Multiple explanations
1324 of the evolution of leadership exist such as coordination strategies, and safety,
1325 along with evidence for growth in social intelligence in humans (King et al.,
1326 2009; Van Vugt, 2006).

1327

1328 An interesting aspect of leadership motivation is the verification of the
1329 qualities of the leader by the communities. Individuals that are often put into
1330 leadership roles or take a leadership role often display the necessary goals, qual-
1331 ities, and knowledge to accomplish the shared/stated goal. However, this is not
1332 always the case, especially for those charismatic leaders who could stay on as a
1333 leader longer than the stated goal requires (Vugt & Ronay, 2014). Traditionally,
1334 leadership was thought to be fluid in that those with the necessary knowledge at
1335 the time would be judged and appointed as the leader. However, these charis-
1336 matic leaders use their charisma, uniqueness, nerve, and talent to hold onto their
1337 status.

1338 **2.2 Risk**

1339 Every time people leave the relative safety of their home, every decision
1340 they make they are taking some form of risk. Financial risk is often discussed

1341 in the media usually concerning the stock market. However, the risk is not
1342 just present in finances but also in social interactions such as social risk, sexual
1343 risk, health, and safety risk, recreational, and ethical risks (Breakwell, 2007;
1344 Kühberger & Tanner, 2009; Shearer et al., 2005; Weber et al., 2002). Each
1345 individual is different in their likelihood and perception of participating in those
1346 risks. Some will be more inclined to be more financially risky while others would
1347 risk their health and safety.

1348

1349 Whether to engage in a risky situation is very complex depending on a
1350 cost-benefit analysis (P. S. Johnson et al., 2015). Do the positives outweigh
1351 the negatives? In practice, not all individuals will do a cost-benefit analysis of
1352 a risky situation. Often, the timing of an event makes such an analysis dis-
1353 advantageous. The benefits are often relative to the individual decision-maker.
1354 Differences emerge in the general likelihood to engage in risky behavior such that
1355 males tend to be more likely to engage in risky behaviors than their female coun-
1356 terparts (Chen & John, 2021; Desiderato & Crawford, 1995). Women tended to
1357 avoid risky situations except for social risks.

1358 **2.3 The Present Studies**

1359 The present study sought to further our understanding of dominance, pres-
1360 tige, and leadership motivations in human decision-making. Furthering this, we
1361 seek to bridge the connection between risk-taking behaviors, from diverse do-
1362 mains, and the dominance, prestige, and leadership orientations. Following the
1363 literature, we predicted that participants that were high in dominance orientation
1364 would be more likely to not only engage in risky behaviors but praise the ben-
1365 efits of participating in those behaviors. Individuals with prestige or leadership
1366 orientation.

3 Experiment 1

3.1 Methods

Participants were a convenience sample of 111 individuals from Prolific Academic’s crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io). Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing service that provides participants access to studies hosted on third-party websites. Participants were required to be 18 years of age or older and be able to read and understand English. Participants received £4.00, which is above the current minimum wage pro-rata in the United Kingdom, as compensation for completing the survey. The Psychology Research Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study procedures [ref: 212-2021/1]. The present study was pre-registered along with a copy of anonymized data along with a copy of the R code and supplemental materials are available at (<https://osf.io/s4j7y>).

3.2 Materials

3.2.1 Demographic Questionnaire

In a demographic questionnaire administered prior to the main survey, participants were invited to respond to a series of questions about their self-identified demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, and ethnic origin.

3.2.2 Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation

The 18-item Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership scale, DoPL (Suessenbach et al., 2019), is used to measure dominance, prestige, and leadership orientation. Each question corresponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is scored across six unique items related to those domains (e.g., “I relish opportunities in which I can lead others” for leadership) and rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Included in this scale are 15 masking

1393 questions obtained from the unified motives scale (Schönbrodt & Gerstenberg,
1394 2012) consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.86$.

1395 **3.2.3 Domain Specific Risk-taking Scale**

1396 The 40-item Domain-Specific Risk-taking Scale, DOSPERT (Weber et al.,
1397 2002) is a scale assessing individuals' likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors
1398 within 5 domain-specific risky situations: financial ("Gambling a week's income
1399 at a casino."), social ("Admitting that your tastes are different from those of your
1400 friends"), recreational ("Trying out bungee jumping at least once"), health and
1401 safety ("Engaging in unprotected sex"), and ethical ("Cheating on an exam")
1402 situations. Each risky situation is then rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 being
1403 very unlikely and 5 being very likely). Two additional five-point Likert scales
1404 assess risk perception and expected benefits (1 being not at all risky and 5 being
1405 extremely risky; 1 being no benefits at all and 5 being great benefits) respectively.
1406 Example risky situations are "Admitting that your tastes are different from those
1407 of a friend" and "Drinking heavily at a social function." Internal consistency
1408 reliability for the current samples for the 3 sub-domains are $\alpha = 0.85$, $\alpha = 0.90$,
1409 $\alpha = 0.92$ respectively.

1410 **3.3 Procedure**

1411 Participants were recruited via a study landing page on Prolific's web-
1412 site or via a direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific Academic, 2018). The
1413 study landing page included a brief description of the study including any risks
1414 and benefits along with expected compensation for successful completion. Par-
1415 ticipants accepted participation in the experiment and were directed to the main
1416 survey (Qualtrics, Inc; Provo, UT) where they were shown a brief message on
1417 study consent.

1418 Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they an-
1419 swered a series of demographic questions. Once completed, participants com-

1420 pleted the Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific
1421 Risk-taking scale. The two scales were counterbalanced to account for order ef-
1422 fects. After completion of the main survey, participants were shown a debriefing
1423 statement that briefly mentions the purpose of the experiment along with the
1424 contact information of the main researcher (AI). Participants were compensated
1425 £4.00 via Prolific Academic.

1426 **3.4 Data analysis**

1427 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using multiple regression for
1428 continuous variables (age) and Chi-square tests for categorical variables (gender,
1429 race, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and education). Means and standard deviations
1430 were calculated for the relevant scales (i.e., DoPL and DOSPERT). All analyses
1431 were done using (R Core Team, 2021) along with the (Bürkner, 2017) package.

1432 The use of bayesian statistics has a multitude of benefits to statistical anal-
1433 ysis and research design. One important benefit is the use of prior data in future
1434 analyses. Termed as priors, is the use of prior distributions for future analysis.
1435 This allows for the separation of how the data might have been collected or what
1436 the intention was. In essence, the data is the data without the interpretation of
1437 the scientist.

1438 All relevant analyses were conducted in a Bayesian framework using the
1439 brms package (Bürkner, 2018) along with the cmdstanr packages notes (Gabry &
1440 Cesnovar, 2021). In addition to the aforementioned packages, we used bayestestR,
1441 rstan, and papaja (Aust & Barth, 2020; Makowski et al., 2019; Stan Development
1442 Team, 2020).

1443 **3.5 Results**

1444 One hundred and eleven individuals completed the main survey. Of these
1445 individuals, 111 completed all sections without incomplete data and were there-
1446 fore retained in most data analyses. In later analyses to account for outliers, two

1447 participants had to be excluded from the dataset. Table 1 shows the demographic
 1448 information for the participants. The average completion time for participants
 1449 was 20M 58s ($SD = 10M\ 43s$).

1450 **3.5.1 Preregistered Analyses**

1451 We first investigated DoPL orientation on general risk preference (Figure
 1452 1). General risk preference was anecdotally explained by dominance orientation,
 1453 participant gender, and participant age (see table 2).

1454 **3.5.1.1 Demographic and DoPL.** All participants completed the
 1455 dominance, leadership, and prestige scale (Suessenbach et al., 2019). Empirically,
 1456 men have generally been more dominance-oriented in their behavior (Rosenthal
 1457 et al., 2012). Following the literature, men tended to be more dominance ori-
 1458 entated than women. The marginal posterior distribution of each parameter
 1459 is summarized in Table #. Interestingly, older individuals tended to be more
 1460 dominance-oriented than younger individuals.

1461 **3.5.1.2 General Risk and DoPL.** Further investigations, as pre-
 1462 viously mentioned investigated DoPL’s interactions with general risk preference.
 1463 As stated, domianance appears to be the strongest predictor of general risk pref-
 1464 erence (95% CI $b = 3$, [1.07, 4.9]). Overall, younger individuals tended to have a
 1465 stronger preference for risk (95% CI $b = -2.85$, [-4.76, -0.95]). Those that tended
 1466 to be lower in leadership orientation had a tendency to be generally more risk
 1467 averse than their counterparts (95% CI $b = -1.91$, [-3.82, -0.02]). Following the
 1468 literature as well, dominant men tended to prefer risk moreso those than women
 1469 (95% CI $b = -3.02$, [-4.97, -1.06]).

1470 **3.5.2 Domain-Specific Risk-Taking**

1471 As predicted individuals that identified as male were more likely to endorse
 1472 risk-taking behaviors, namely ethical, social, financial, and recreational domains
 1473 (see fig. ##).

1474 **3.5.3 Interactions**

1475 When investigating dominance, prestige, and leadership motivations with
1476 domain-specific risk-taking findings supported the common expectations in the
1477 literature. Table 5 shows the interactions with like CI values. Dominance overall
1478 explained the relationship between DoPL orientation and preference, specifically
1479 for ethical, financial, social, health and safety, and recreational preferences (95%
1480 CI $b = 1.15$, $[0.61, 1.71]$, $b = 0.87$, $[0.13, 1.58]$, $b = 1.81$, $[0.64, 2.94]$, $b =$
1481 1.09 , $[0.41, 1.77]$, and $b = 1.22$, $[0.67, 1.76]$) respectively. Full interactions can be
1482 found in table 4. Participant age and gender also appeared to affect recreational
1483 preference (95% CI $b = -1.14$, $[-1.83, -0.47]$, $b = 0.46$, $[0.05, 0.86]$) respectively.

1484 Following these findings, we investigated the effect of DoPL on general
1485 risk preference and found that dominance overall predicted risk preference along
1486 with gender and age of the participant (Table 5).

1487 **3.5.4 DOSPERT Sub-categorizations**

1488 Risk preferences is generally made up of benefits and perceptions of risk.
1489 Outside of perceptions and benefits, dominance and males who are dominance
1490 oriented were the strongest predictors of likelihood in engaging in a risky situation
1491 (95% CI $b = 0.65$, $[0.36, 0.95]$ and $b = -0.48$, $[-0.85, -0.11]$). Dominance also
1492 appeared to be a strong predictor of perceiving more benefits of engaging in a
1493 risky situation (95% CI $b = 0.38$, $[0.07, 0.71]$) along with gender where males are
1494 more likely to perceive benefits (95% CI $b = -0.6$, $[-0.98, -0.22]$).

1495 Alternatiively, prestige appeared to be a stronger predictor of perceiving
1496 risks than others along with female participants and female participants that are
1497 higher in leadership orientation (95% CI $b = 0.31$, $[0.01, 0.61]$, $b = 0.43$, $[0.05,$
1498 $0.8]$, and $b = 0.43$, $[0.03, 0.82]$). Full predictors can be seen in table 5.

1500 **4 Experiment 2**1501 **4.1 Methods**

1502 Materials remain the same in terms of the (1) Demographic Questionnaire,
1503 (2) Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Questionnaire, and (3) DOSPERT
1504 Questionnaire. However, we added the Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory to
1505 assess possible interactions of dominance and narcissism in risky decision-making.

1506 **4.2 Participants**

1507 Following experiment 1, participants were a convenience sample of 279
1508 individuals from Prolific Academic’s crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io).
1509 Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing service that provides participants
1510 access to studies hosted on third-party websites. Participants were required to
1511 be 18 years of age or older and be able to read and understand English. In
1512 addition, similar to participant demographics in experiment 1, participants were
1513 majority white along with having a university undergraduate degree. Participants
1514 received £3.00, which is above the current minimum wage pro-rata in the United
1515 Kingdom, as compensation for completing the survey. The Psychology Research
1516 Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study procedures
1517 [ref: 212-2021/2]. The present study was pre-registered along with a copy of
1518 anonymized data and a copy of the R code is available at (<https://osf.io/s4j7y>).

1519 **4.3 Materials**1520 **4.3.1 Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory**

1521 The 28-item Brief Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI; Schoenleber
1522 et al. (2015)) is a modified scale of the original 52-item Pathological Narcissism
1523 Inventory (PNI; Pincus et al. (2009)). Like the PNI, the B-PNI is a scale mea-

1524 suring individuals' pathological narcissism. Items in the B-PNI retained all 7
1525 pathological narcissism facets from the original PNI (e.g., exploitativeness, self-
1526 sacrificing self-enhancement, grandiose fantasy, contingent self-esteem, hiding the
1527 self, devaluing, and entitlement rage). Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale
1528 ranging from 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (very much like me). Example items in-
1529 clude "I find it easy to manipulate people" and "I can read people like a book."
1530 B-PNI was well correlated within itself 0.90 along with strong internal consis-
1531 tency within the sub-domains of pathological narcissism, i.e., Grandiosity (0.79)
1532 and Vulnerability (0.89).

1533 4.4 Procedure

1534 Participants were recruited via a study landing page on Prolific's website
1535 or via a direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific Academic, 2018). The study
1536 landing page included a brief description of the study including any risks and ben-
1537 efits along with expected compensation for successful completion. Participants
1538 accepted participation in the experiment and were directed to the main survey
1539 on pavlovia.org (an online JavaScript hosting website similar to Qualtrics) where
1540 they were shown a brief message on study consent.

1541 Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they an-
1542 swered a series of demographic questions. Once completed, participants com-
1543 pleted the Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific
1544 Risk-taking scale. An additional survey was added (the novel aspect of experi-
1545 ment 2) where participants, in addition to the two previous surveys, were asked to
1546 complete the brief-pathological narcissism inventory. The three scales were coun-
1547 terbalanced to account for order effects. After completion of the main survey,
1548 participants were shown a debriefing statement that briefly mentions the purpose
1549 of the experiment along with the contact information of the main researcher (AI).
1550 Participants were compensated £3.00 via Prolific Academic.

1551 4.5 Data analysis

1552 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using multiple regression for
1553 continuous variables (age) and Chi-square tests for categorical variables (gender,
1554 race, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and education). Means and standard deviations
1555 were calculated for the relevant scales (i.e., DoPL and DOSPERT). All analyses
1556 were done using (R Core Team, 2021) along with the (Bürkner, 2017) package.

1557 The use of bayesian statistics has a multitude of benefits to statistical anal-
1558 ysis and research design. One important benefit is the use of prior data in future
1559 analyses. Termed as priors, is the use of prior distributions for future analysis.
1560 This allows for the separation of how the data might have been collected or what
1561 the intention was. In essence, the data is the data without the interpretation of
1562 the scientist.

1563 All relevant analyses were conducted in a Bayesian framework using the
1564 brms package (Bürkner, 2018) along with the cmdstanr packages notes (Gabry &
1565 Cesnovar, 2021). In addition to the aforementioned packages, we used bayestestR,
1566 rstan, and papaja for analysis along with the creation of this manuscript (Aust
1567 & Barth, 2020; Makowski et al., 2019; Stan Development Team, 2020).

1568 4.6 Results and Discussion

1569 Two hundred and eighty-nine individuals participated in the present ex-
1570 periment. Of those 54% identified as male ($n = 155$). Table 3 shows the demo-
1571 graphic information for Experiment 2. Furthering, table 4 illustrates a Bayesian
1572 correlational matrix of all the measures wherein content-based similar measures
1573 illustrated positive and negative correlations consistent with expectations.

1574 In general, male participants were more likely to endorse dominance-
1575 oriented statements, (95% CI $b = 0.27$, [0.03, 0.51]). Along with younger in-
1576 dividuals tending to also endorse dominant-oriented statements, (95% CI $b =$
1577 -0.02 , [-0.03, 0]).

1578 **4.6.1 Preregistered Analyses**

1579 **4.6.1.1 Dominance.** Following the previous basic results, we be-
1580 gan our pre-regisetered analysis found in the pre-registration found on OSF.io.
1581 Dominance-oriented individual was a strong predictor of multiple domains of risk-
1582 taking. Namely, participants that have a preference for both financial and social
1583 risk-taking, (95% CI $b = -0.19, [-0.22, -0.16]$) and (95% CI $b = -0.08, [-0.38,$
1584 $0.21]$) respectively. Investigating gender differences and found that males with a
1585 preference for financial risk-taking were more likely to endorse dominant-oriented
1586 statements, (95% CI $b = 0.1, [0.02, 0.18]$).

1587 **4.6.1.2 Prestige.** Differentiating between DoPL domains, males
1588 with a preference for social risk-taking were more likely to endorse prestige-
1589 oriented statements along with individuals with a general preference for social
1590 risk-taking, (95% CI $b = 0.31, [0.22, 0.4]$) and (95% CI $b = -0.25, [-0.28, -0.22]$) re-
1591 spectively. Additionally, younger individuals tended to endorse prestige-oriented
1592 statements, (95% CI $b = -0.02, [-0.03, -0.01]$).

1593 **4.6.1.3 Leadership.** Finally, leadership orientation follows a similar
1594 trend seen with dominance and prestige orientations. Males with a preference for
1595 social risk-taking were more likely to endorse leadership-oriented statements along
1596 with individuals with a less of a preference for recreational risk-taking endorsing
1597 leadership-oriented statements , (95% CI $b = 0.3, [0.18, 0.42]$) and (95% CI $b =$
1598 $-0.15, [-0.27, -0.03]$) respectively.

1599 **4.6.2 Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory**

1600 We furthered our analyses, as seen in the pre-registration found on OSF.io
1601 by investigating pathological narcissism and its components through the Brief-
1602 Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI). Preliminary investigations of patho-
1603 logical narcissism in our sample show that younger individuals on average tended
1604 to present more narcissistic opinions (95% CI $b = -0.02, [-0.03, -0.01]$). The

1605 B-PNI further differentiates between grandiose and vulnerability. Interestingly,
1606 women tended to present more vulnerable narcissism traits than men (95% CI
1607 $b = -0.24, [-0.45, -0.03]$). Younger individuals tended to present more grandiose
1608 narcissism traits (95% CI $b = -0.01, [-0.02, 0]$). This same tendency for younger
1609 individuals was seen with vulnerable narcissism traits (95% CI $b = -0.02, [-0.03,$
1610 $-0.01]$).

1611 Grandiose narcissism is then separated further into grandiose fantasy, ex-
1612 ploitativeness, and self-sacrificing and self-enhancement. Selected findings are
1613 males tend to demonstrate more exploitativeness and younger individuals tended
1614 to present more exploitative and grandiose narcissism (95% CI $b = -0.01, [-0.03,$
1615 $0]$ and (95% CI $b = -0.02, [-0.03, -0.01]$) respectively. Further analysis is shown
1616 in table 5.

1617 **4.6.3 Risk and interactions**

1618 Overall, anecdotally dominance appears to explain the overall individual
1619 perceptions, benefits, and likelihood of risk judgments (95% CI $b = -0.25, [-0.38,$
1620 $-0.11]$), (95% CI $b = 0.22, [0.09, 0.35]$), and (95% CI $b = 0.27, [0.13, 0.4]$) re-
1621 spectively. Similarly, when looking at further sub-categorizations of general risk
1622 preferences there does appear to be mainly a bias with regards to age, where
1623 younger individuals overall have a higher risk preference than their older coun-
1624 terparts.

1625 **4.6.4 Domain-Specific Risk-Taking**


1626 Looking at Domain Specific Risk-taking, we analyzed DOSPERT similarly
1627 to previous analyses. Overall, domain-specific risk-taking was explained by dom-
1628 inance orientation along with prestige and leadership. Interesting interactions
1629 were present with individual domains for narcissism as well.

1630 Overall, Age was an effective predictor for both grandiose and vulnerable
1631 narcissism with younger individuals tending towards being more narcissitic for


1632 both grandiose and vulnerable traits (95% CI $b = -0.02, [-0.03, 0]$), and (95% CI
1633 $b = -0.03, [-0.04, -0.02]$) respectively. Preferences for financial and males with a
1634 recreational risk preference tended to express more vulnerable narcissism traits
1635 (95% CI $b = -0.27, [-0.47, -0.06]$) and (95% CI $b = -0.04, [-0.28, 0.21]$) respectively.

1636 **4.6.5 Interactions**


1638 5.1 Figures



1639




1640



Experiment 1

1641




Experiment 1

1642


1643 `## Warning: Removed 8 rows containing non-finite values (stat_ydensity).`

1644 `## Warning: Removed 8 rows containing missing values (geom_point).`



Experiment 1

1645



Experiment 2

1646

Table 5

Experiment 1: Participant Demographics

Characteristic	N=109
Age	
Mean (SD)	27 (9.25)
Median [Range]	24 [18.00, 61]
Gender	
Female	54 (50%)
Male	55 (50%)
Ethnicity	
African	8 (7.3%)
Asian	6 (5.5%)
English	10 (9.2%)
European	76 (70%)
Latin American	2 (1.8%)
Other	5 (4.6%)
Scottish	2 (1.8%)
Education	
A-levels or equivalent	32 (29%)
Doctoral Degree	1 (0.9%)
GCSEs or equivalent	8 (7.3%)
Prefer not to respond	1 (0.9%)
Primary School	4 (3.7%)
University Postgraduate Program	21 (19%)
University Undergraduate Program	42 (39%)

6 Chapter 3:

1649 **6.1 Experiment 1:**

1650 **6.2 Experiment 1 Review**

1651 In an extension of the previous research, we sought other areas of possible
1652 interest in what could be affecting individuals' likelihood to engage in either im-
1653 moral or risky behaviors. So far we have shown a connection with power motives
1654 such as Dominance, Prestige, and leadership (DoPL); along with investigating

Table 6*Fixed Effects: DoPL * General Risk*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Intercept	3.62	0.95	1.41	5.86
Dominance	3	0.95	1.08	4.93
Gender	-3.02	0.95	-4.95	-1.08
Age	-2.86	0.95	-4.78	-0.93

Note. Table 2 represents fixed effects, confidence intervals low and high for a basic bayesian model of Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership predicting general risk preference. Matching signs for confidence intervals is displayed in the table.

the connection between DoPL and the domain-specific risk-taking scale. An intriguing area that has not been extensively researched is narcissism. Personality research is often the viewpoint at which narcissism is investigated such as using the five-factor model concept where the primary traits are extraversion and agreeableness (Hyatt et al., 2018).

6.3 Narcissism

Narcissism is a personality trait that originally was seen as a method or mechanism to shield the individual from feelings of low self-worth (Yakeley, 2018). The understanding of what narcissism soon shifted with a focus on empirical understandings of the individual. Researchers such as Jeffrey Young, who expanded on the work of Aaron Beck, theorized that the core beliefs of an individual along with negative self-schemas influence the individual to seek out or act in ways in line with a narcissitic personality (J. E. Young et al., 2006). Conceptualizations of narcissism would soon entail it to be an understanding of grandiose sense of self, fantastical beliefs of success and general superiority, along with a general lack of empathy (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Okada, 2010; Yakeley, 2018)./ The earliest understandings of narcissism were through Sigmund Freud. However, the term was first coined by Havelock Ellis who used the eponymous

Table 7*DOSPERT and DoPL Interaction: Experiment 1*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Ethical Preference * Intercept	3.61	0.95	2.79	4.37
Financial Preference * Intercept	8.6	0.95	7.47	9.66
Social Preference * Intercept	9.98	0.95	8.27	11.64
Health and Safety Preference * Intercept	5.6	0.95	4.6	6.54
Recreational Preference * Intercept	1.68	0.95	0.86	2.43
Ethical Preference * Dominance	1.15	0.95	0.61	1.71
Financial Preference * Dominance	0.87	0.95	0.13	1.58
Social Preference * Dominance	1.81	0.95	0.64	2.94
Health and Safety Preference * Dominance	1.09	0.95	0.41	1.77
Recreational Preference * Dominance	1.22	0.95	0.67	1.76
Recreational Preference * Gender	-1.14	0.95	-1.83	-0.47
Recreational Preference * Age	0.46	0.95	0.05	0.86

Note. Fixed effect results of Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership with gender interactions predicting each of the individual Domain Specific Risk Taking (DOSPERT) domains.

1673 Narcissus myth in the explanation of narcissism. Freud would then publish the
 1674 text *On Narcissism* to further our understanding of narcissism. Future under-
 1675 standings of narcissism would develop from a social cognitive framework of the
 1676 individual in relation to their environment. Such as Kernberg's assessment that
 1677 narcissism stems from an aggressive and conflict filled childhood affecting the
 1678 child's development and later aggression and envy towards others (Russell, 1985).

1679 • note on the early understandings of how narcissism was interpreted as being,
 1680 i.e., a defense mechanism Yakeley (2018)

1681 • continued lack of consensus on what constitutes narcissism Ackerman et al.
 1682 (2017)

1683 – Also the discussion of social dominance in regard to narcissistic per-
 1684 sonality disorder Ackerman et al. (2017)

Table 8*DOSPERT Benefit and Perception: Experiment 1*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Risk * Dominance	0.65	0.95	0.36	0.95
Risk * Gender	-0.5	0.95	-0.85	-0.14
Risk * Dominance : Gender	-0.48	0.95	-0.85	-0.11
Risk Perception * Gender	0.43	0.95	0.05	0.8
Risk Perception * Prestige	0.31	0.95	0.01	0.61
Risk Perception * Leadership : Gender	0.43	0.95	0.03	0.82
Risk Benefit * Dominance	0.38	0.95	0.07	0.71
Risk Benefit * Gender	-0.6	0.95	-0.98	-0.22

Note. Fixed effect results of Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership with gender interactions predicting the perceptions and benefits of risk.

Table 9*DOSPERT Benefit and Perception: Experiment 1*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Ethical Perception * Prestige	0.39	0.95	0.12	0.66
Recreational Perception * Prestige	0.33	0.95	0.06	0.6
Recreational Perception * Age	-0.22	0.95	-0.4	-0.04
Recreational Perception * Dominance : Gender	-0.4	0.95	-0.77	-0.04
Health and Safety Perception * Leadership : Gender	0.44	0.95	0.07	0.8

Note. Fixed effect results of Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership with gender interactions predicting the perceptions and benefits of risk.

1685 6.4 The present Experiments

1686 Pathological narcissism at it's core looks strikingly similar to self-esteem
1687 and in turn a grandiose sense of self. Investigations at risky situations have looked
1688 at sexual self-esteem, exploratory experiment one. The present experiment seeks
1689 to expand to investigate the relationship between pathological narcissism and see
1690 which is a stronger predictor of risky sexual situations and riskiness in general.

1691 **6.5 Methods**

1692 Participants were a convenience sample of 111 individuals from Prolific
1693 Academic’s crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io). Prolific Academic is an
1694 online crowdsourcing service that provides participants access to studies hosted
1695 on third-party websites. Participants were required to be 18 years of age or
1696 older and be able to read and understand English. Participants received £4.00,
1697 which is above the current minimum wage pro-rata in the United Kingdom, as
1698 compensation for completing the survey. The Psychology Research Ethics Com-
1699 mittee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study procedures [ref: 174-
1700 2122/5]. The present study was pre-registered along with a copy of anonymized
1701 data along with a copy of the R code and supplemental materials are available
1702 at (<https://osf.io/s4j7y>).

1703 **6.6 Materials**

1704 **6.6.1 Demographic Questionnaire**

1705 In a demographic questionnaire administered prior to the main survey,
1706 participants were invited to respond to a series of questions about their self-
1707 identified demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, and ethnic
1708 origin.

1709 **6.6.2 Sexual Risk-taking Behavior Scale**

1710 The 54-item Sexual Risk-taking Behavior Scale (SRTB; Spiegel and Pol-
1711 lak (2019)), is a scale measuring individuals on their risk-taking by requesting
1712 they respond to a series of statements and their agreement on three different do-
1713 mains (i.e., Risk perception, likelihood, and benefit perception). They are then
1714 given a series of statements of sexual activities and the frequency that they have
1715 engaged in those behaviors. Example items for the first three domains are “Sex-
1716 ual activity with multiple participants” and “Sex under influence of substances

1717 (drugs/alcohol).” For frequency, participants are asked to rate each sexual be-
1718 havior on a scale of never [1] to at least once a day [8].

1719 **6.6.3 Sociosexual Orientation Inventory**

1720 The Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R; Penke and Asendorpf
1721 (2008)) is a 9 item scale asking participants a series of questions of how many
1722 times participants have engaged in the questioned sexual behaviors. Example
1723 items are “With how many different partners have you had sex with in the past
1724 12 months?” and “With how many different partners have you had sexual inter-
1725 course on one and only one occasion?” rated on a scale from 0 to 20 or more.

1726 **6.6.4 Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership**

1727 The 18-item Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership scale (DoPL; Süssen-
1728 bach and Bohner (2011)), measures dominance, prestige, and leadership orienta-
1729 tion. Each question corresponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is
1730 scored across 6 unique items related to those domains (e.g., “I relish opportuni-
1731 ties in which I can lead others” for leadership) rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly
1732 disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

1733 **6.6.5 Pathological Narcissism**

1734 The brief Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI; Schoenleber et al.
1735 (2015)) is a 28 item inventory measuring individuals on 7 aspects of pathological
1736 narcissism facet scales. Example items are “I feel important when others rely
1737 on me” and “Sacrificing for others makes me the better person” rated on a scale
1738 from 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (Very much like me).

1739 **6.7 Procedure**

1740 In study 2, participants were recruited via a study landing page on Pro-
1741 lific’s website or via a direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific Academic,

1742 2018). The study landing page included a brief description of the study including
1743 any risks and benefits along with expected compensation for successful comple-
1744 tion. Participants accepted participation in the experiment and were directed to
1745 the main survey (Pavlov.org) where they were shown a brief message on study
1746 consent.

1747 Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they an-
1748 swered a series of demographic questions. Once completed, participants com-
1749 pleted the Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific
1750 Risk-taking scale. The two scales were counterbalanced to account for order ef-
1751 fects. After completion of the main survey, participants were shown a debriefing
1752 statement that briefly mentions the purpose of the experiment along with the
1753 contact information of the main researcher (AI). Participants were compensated
1754 with course credit on the University of Edinburgh’s SONA system.

1755 **6.8 Data analysis**

1756 Demographic characteristics were analyzed using multiple regression for
1757 continuous variables (age) and Chi-square tests for categorical variables (gender,
1758 race, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and education). Means and standard deviations
1759 were calculated for the relevant scales (i.e., DoPL and SRTB). All analyses were
1760 done using (R Core Team, 2021) along with (Bürkner, 2017) package.

1761 The use of bayesian statistics has a multitude of benefits to statistical
1762 analysis and research design. One important benefit is through the use of prior
1763 data in future analyses. Termed as priors, is the use of prior distributions for
1764 future analysis. This allows for the separation of how the data might have been
1765 collected or what the intention was. In essence, the data is the data without the
1766 interpretation of the scientist.

1767 All relevant analyses were conducted in a Bayesian framework using the
1768 brms package (Bürkner, 2018) along with the cmdstanr packages notes (Gabry &

1769 Cesnovar, 2021). In addition to the aforementioned packages, we used bayestestR,
1770 rstan, and papaja for further analysis and creation of this manuscript (Aust &
1771 Barth, 2020; Makowski et al., 2019; Stan Development Team, 2020).

1772 **6.9 Results**

1773 **6.9.1 *Preregistered Analyses***

1774 **6.9.2 Demographic and DoPL**

1775 **6.10 Domain-Specific Risk-Taking**

1776 **6.11 Interactions**

1777 **6.12 Discussion**

7 References

- Abelson, R. P. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologist*, 36(7), 715–729. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.7.715>
- Ackerman, R. A., Hands, A. J., Donnellan, M. B., Hopwood, C. J., & Witt, E. A. (2017). Experts' views regarding the conceptualization of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 31(3), 346–361. <https://doi.org/gbhv3>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (Fifth Edition). American Psychiatric Association. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Andersen, B. L., Cyranowski, J. M., & Espindle, D. (1994). *Women's sexual self-schema*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1079>
- Andersen, B. L., Cyranowski, J. M., & Espindle, D. (1999). Men's sexual self-schema. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(4), 645–661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.4.645>
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 27–51. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231>
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., & Keltner, D. (2012). The personal sense of power. *Journal of Personality*, 80(2), 313–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00734.x>
- Aristotle. (1984). *Complete works of aristotle, volume 2: the revised oxford translation*. Princeton University Press.
- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R Markdown* [R]. <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Bareket, O., & Shnabel, N. (2020). Domination and objectification: men's motivation for dominance over women affects their tendency to sexu-

- ally objectify women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 44(1), 28–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319871913>
- Barnett, G. D., & Mann, R. E. (2013). Cognition, empathy, and sexual offending. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 14(1), 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012467857>
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: the dehumanizing effects of social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(1), 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022>
- Bastian, B., Jetten, J., Chen, H., Radke, H. R. M., Harding, J. F., & Fasoli, F. (2013). Losing our humanity: the self-dehumanizing consequences of social ostracism. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(2), 156–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212471205>
- Bastian, B., Jetten, J., & Radke, H. R. M. (2012). Cyber-dehumanization: violent video game play diminishes our humanity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(2), 486–491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.009>
- Bernstein, R. (2020, February 22). The paradox of rodrigo duterte. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2020/02/philippines-rodrigo-duterte-china/606754/>
- Bierstedt, R. (1950). An analysis of social power. *American Sociological Review*, 15(6), 730–738. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2086605>
- Breakwell, G. M. (2007, November). *The psychology of risk*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819315>
- Bugental, D. B., & Shennum, W. (2002). Gender, power, and violence in the family. *Child Maltreatment*, 7(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559502007001005>
- Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: an R package for bayesian multilevel models

1834 using stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 80(1), 1–28. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01)
1835 [org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01)

1836 Bürkner, P.-C. (2018). Advanced bayesian multilevel modeling with the
1837 R package brms. *The R Journal*, 10(1), 395–411. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-017)
1838 [32614/RJ-2018-017](https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-017)

1839 Byom, L. J., & Mutlu, B. (2013). Theory of mind: mechanisms, methods,
1840 and new directions. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00413)
1841 [org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00413](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00413)

1842 Carmona-Gutierrez, D., Kainz, K., & Madeo, F. (2016). Sexually trans-
1843 mitted infections: old foes on the rise. *Microbial Cell*, 3(9), 361–362.
1844 <https://doi.org/10.15698/mic2016.09.522>

1845 Castro-Vázquez, G. (2000). Masculinity and condom use among mex-
1846 ican teenagers: the escuela nacional preparatoria no. 1’s case.
1847 *Gender and Education*, 12(4), 479–492. [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250020004117)
1848 [09540250020004117](https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250020004117)

1849 Chen, Z., & John, R. S. (2021). Decision heuristics and descriptive choice
1850 models for sequential high-stakes risky choices in the deal or no deal
1851 game. *Decision*, 8(3), 155–179. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dec0000153>

1852 Chiappori, P.-A., & Molina, J. A. (2019). *1 the intra-spousal balance of*
1853 *power within the family : cross-cultural evidence.*

1854 Clifford, S., Iyengar, V., Cabeza, R., & Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2015).
1855 Moral foundations vignettes: a standardized stimulus database of sce-
1856 narios based on moral foundations theory. *Behavior Research Methods*,
1857 47(4), 1178–1198. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0551-2>

1858 Costa-Lourenço, A. P. R. da, Barros dos Santos, K. T., Moreira, B. M.,
1859 Fracalanza, S. E. L., & Bonelli, R. R. (2017). Antimicrobial resistance
1860 in neisseria gonorrhoeae: history, molecular mechanisms and epidemi-
1861 ological aspects of an emerging global threat. *Brazilian Journal of Mi-*

- crobiology*, 48(4), 617–628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjm.2017.06.001>
- Cowan, N. (1999). An embedded-processes model of working memory. In A. Miyake & P. Shah (Eds.), *Models of Working Memory* (1st ed., pp. 62–101). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139174909.006>
- Crandall, A., Magnusson, B., Novilla, M., Novilla, L. K. B., & Dyer, W. (2017). Family financial stress and adolescent sexual risk-taking: the role of self-regulation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0543-x>
- Cunningham, S. D., Kerrigan, D. L., Jennings, J. M., & Ellen, J. M. (2009). Relationships between perceived std-related stigma, std-related shame and std screening among a household sample of adolescents. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 41(4), 225–230. <https://doi.org/10.1363/4122509>
- CYRANOWSKI, J. M., AARESTAD, S. L., & ANDERSEN, B. L. (1999). The role of sexual self-schema in a diathesis–stress model of sexual dysfunction. *Applied & Preventive Psychology : Journal of the American Association of Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 8(3), 217–228. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849\(05\)80078-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80078-2)
- de Sanjose, S., Cortés, X., Méndez, C., Puig-Tintore, L., Torné, A., Roura, E., Bosch, F. X., & Castellsague, X. (2008). Age at sexual initiation and number of sexual partners in the female spanish population: results from the AFRODITA survey. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 140(2), 234–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2008.04.005>
- Desiderato, L. L., & Crawford, H. J. (1995). Risky sexual behavior in college students: relationships between number of sexual partners, disclosure of previous risky behavior, and alcohol use. *Journal of Youth*

- 1890 *and Adolescence*, 24(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537560>
- 1891 Dickson, N., Paul, C., Herbison, P., & Silva, P. (1998). First sexual in-
- 1892 tercourse: age, coercion, and later regrets reported by a birth cohort.
- 1893 *BMJ*, 316(7124), 29–33. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.316.7124.29>
- 1894 DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology*,
- 1895 23(1), 263–287. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.263>
- 1896 Elder, W. B., Brooks, G. R., & Morrow, S. L. (2012). Sexual self-schemas
- 1897 of heterosexual men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(2), 166–
- 1898 179. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024835>
- 1899 Elder, W. B., Morrow, S. L., & Brooks, G. R. (2015). Sexual self-schemas
- 1900 of gay men: a qualitative investigation. *The Counseling Psychologist*,
- 1901 43(7), 942–969. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000015606222>
- 1902 Ellemers, N., van der Toorn, J., Paunov, Y., & van Leeuwen, T. (2019).
- 1903 The psychology of morality: A review and analysis of empirical studies
- 1904 published from 1940 through 2017. *Personality and Social Psychology*
- 1905 *Review*, 23(4), 332–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868318811759>
- 1906 Ellis, V., & High, S. (2004). Something more to tell you: gay, lesbian or
- 1907 bisexual young people’s experiences of secondary schooling. *British Ed-*
- 1908 *ucational Research Journal*, 30(2), 213–225. [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192042000195281)
- 1909 [0141192042000195281](https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192042000195281)
- 1910 Eskine, K. J., Kacinik, N. A., & Prinz, J. J. (2011). A bad taste in the
- 1911 mouth: gustatory disgust influences moral judgment. *Psychological*
- 1912 *Science*, 22(3), 295–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611398497>
- 1913 Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (pp. xi, 291). Stan-
- 1914 ford University Press.
- 1915 Finucane, M. L., Alhakami, A., Slovic, P., & Johnson, S. M. (2000). The
- 1916 affect heuristic in judgments of risks and benefits. *Journal of Behav-*
- 1917 *ioral Decision Making*, 13(1), 1–17. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)

1099-0771(200001/03)13:1%3C1::AID-BDM333%3E3.0.CO;2-S

Gabry, J., & Cesnovar, R. (2021). *cmdstanr: R interface to “CmdStan”*
[R]. <https://mc-stan.org/cmdstanr>, <https://discourse.mc-stan.org>

Gannon, T. A. (2009). Social cognition in violent and sexual offending:
an overview. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(2-3), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802190822>

Gesink, D., Whiskeyjack, L., Suntjens, T., Mihic, A., & McGilvery, P.
(2016). Abuse of power in relationships and sexual health. *Child Abuse
& Neglect*, 58, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.06.005>

Glamorizing dictators. (2018, February 22). *Towson University Journal
of International Affairs*. [https://wp.towson.edu/iajournal/2018/02/
21/glamorizing-dictators/](https://wp.towson.edu/iajournal/2018/02/21/glamorizing-dictators/)

Glenn, A. L., Raine, A., & Schug, R. A. (2009). The neural correlates of
moral decision-making in psychopathy. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 14(1),
5–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2008.104>

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H.
(2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology*, 101(2), 366–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., & et al.
(1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: the effects of mor-
tality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural
worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 308–
318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.308>

Greene, J. D. (2001). An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in
moral judgment. *Science*, 293(5537), 2105–2108. [https://doi.org/10.
1126/science.1062872](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1062872)

Gwinn, J. D., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2013). Less power = less human?
Effects of power differentials on dehumanization. *Journal of Experi-*

1946 *mental Social Psychology*, 49(3), 464–470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.01.005>

1947

1948 Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social in-

1949 tuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4),

1950 814–834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814>

1951 Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahu-

1952 manization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65(1), 399–423. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115045>

1953

1954 Horberg, E. J., Oveis, C., Keltner, D., & Cohen, A. B. (2009). Disgust

1955 and the moralization of purity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psy-*

1956 *chology*, 97(6), 963–976. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017423>

1957 Hyatt, C. S., Sleep, C. E., Lamkin, J., Maples-Keller, J. L., Sedikides, C.,

1958 Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Narcissism and self-esteem:

1959 A nomological network analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 13(8), e0201088. <https://doi.org/gdzd3c>

1960

1961 Ison, C. A., & Alexander, S. (2011). Antimicrobial resistance in neisseria

1962 gonorrhoeae in the UK: surveillance and management. *Expert Review*

1963 *of Anti-Infective Therapy*, 9(10), 867–876. [https://doi.org/10.1586/](https://doi.org/10.1586/eri.11.103)

1964 [eri.11.103](https://doi.org/10.1586/eri.11.103)

1965 Johnson, M. W., & Bruner, N. R. (2012). The sexual discounting task:

1966 HIV risk behavior and the discounting of delayed sexual rewards in

1967 cocaine dependence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 123(1-3), 15–21.

1968 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.09.032>

1969 Johnson, P. S., Herrmann, E. S., & Johnson, M. W. (2015). Opportunity

1970 costs of reward delays and the discounting of hypothetical money and

1971 cigarettes: OPPORTUNITY COSTS AND DISCOUNTING. *Journal*

1972 *of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 103(1), 87–107. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1002/jeab.110)

1973 [org/10.1002/jeab.110](https://doi.org/10.1002/jeab.110)

- 1974 Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1972). Subjective probability: A judgment
1975 of representativeness. *Cognitive Psychology*, 3(3), 430–454. [https://](https://doi.org/cmf8m8)
1976 doi.org/cmf8m8
- 1977 Kilimnik, C. D., Boyd, R. L., Stanton, A. M., & Meston, C. M. (2018).
1978 Identification of nonconsensual sexual experiences and the sexual self-
1979 schemas of women: implications for sexual functioning. *Archives of*
1980 *Sexual Behavior*, 47(6), 1633–1647. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1229-0)
1981 [018-1229-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1229-0)
- 1982 Kim, H. M., & Miller, L. C. (2020). Are insecure attachment styles related
1983 to risky sexual behavior? A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology: Official*
1984 *Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological*
1985 *Association*, 39(1), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000821>
- 1986 King, A. J., Johnson, D. D. P., & Van Vugt, M. (2009). The origins and
1987 evolution of leadership. *Current Biology*, 19(19), R911–R916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.07.027>
- 1988 Kirby, D. B., Laris, B. A., & Roller, L. A. (2007). Sex and HIV ed-
1989 ucation programs: their impact on sexual behaviors of young people
1990 throughout the world. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(3), 206–217.
1991 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.143>
- 1992 Kirby, M. (2021). North Korea on the brink of the Biden administration:
1993 human rights, peace, and security. *Indiana International & Compar-*
1994 *ative Law Review*, 31(2), 309–327. [http://journals.iupui.edu/index.](http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/iiclr/article/view/25607)
1995 [php/iiclr/article/view/25607](http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/iiclr/article/view/25607)
- 1996 Kouchaki, M., Dobson, K. S. H., Waytz, A., & Kteily, N. S.
1997 (2018). The link between self-dehumanization and immoral behav-
1998 ior. *Psychological Science*, 29(8), 1234–1246. [https://doi.org/10.1177/](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618760784)
1999 [0956797618760784](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618760784)
- 2000 Kühberger, A., & Tanner, C. (2009). Risky choice framing: task versions
2001

and a comparison of prospect theory and fuzzy-trace theory. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 23(3), 314–329. <https://doi.org/dtqksm>

Laakasuo, M., Sundvall, J., & Drosinou, M. (2017). Individual differences in moral disgust do not predict utilitarian judgments, sexual and pathogen disgust do. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 45526. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep45526>

Lammers, J., & Stapel, D. A. (2011). Power increases dehumanization. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210370042>

MacPhail, C., & Campbell, C. (2001). “I think condoms are good but, aai, I hate those things”: *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(11), 1613–1627. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00272-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00272-0)

Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M., & Ludecke, D. (2019). bayestestR: Describing Effects and their Uncertainty, Existence and Significance within the Bayesian Framework. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(40). <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01541>

Malamuth, N. M., Heavey, C. L., & Linz, D. (1996). The confluence model of sexual aggression. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 23(3-4), 13–37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v23n03_03

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men’s conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.2.353>

Maner, J. K., & Case, C. R. (2016). Dominance and prestige. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 54, pp. 129–180). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2016.02.001>

Marcus, D. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mercer, S. H., & Norris, A. L. (2014). The

2030 psychology of spite and the measurement of spitefulness. *Psychological*
 2031 *Assessment*, 26(2), 563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036039>
 2032 Marcus, G. (2000). Emotions in politics. *Annual Review of Political Sci-*
 2033 *ence - ANNU REV POLIT SCI*, 3, 221–250. [https://doi.org/10.1146/](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.221)
 2034 [annurev.polisci.3.1.221](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.221)
 2035 Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., & Hodgkinson, S. (1993). The importance
 2036 of attachment bonds in the development of juvenile sex offending. In
 2037 *The juvenile sex offender*. (pp. 164–181). Guilford Press.
 2038 Mercer, C. H., Tanton, C., Prah, P., Erens, B., Sonnenberg, P., Clifton, S.,
 2039 Macdowall, W., Lewis, R., Field, N., Datta, J., Copas, A. J., Phelps,
 2040 A., Wellings, K., & Johnson, A. M. (2013). Changes in sexual attitudes
 2041 and lifestyles in Britain through the life course and over time: findings
 2042 from the national surveys of sexual attitudes and lifestyles (natsal).
 2043 *The Lancet*, 382(9907), 1781–1794. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62035-8)
 2044 [6736\(13\)62035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62035-8)
 2045 Moll, J., Zahn, R., de Oliveira-Souza, R., Krueger, F., & Grafman, J.
 2046 (2005). The neural basis of human moral cognition. *Nature Reviews*
 2047 *Neuroscience*, 6(10), 799–809. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1768>
 2048 Nationale (Paris), C. (1793). *Collection générale des décrets rendus par la*
 2049 *convention nationale*. chez Baudouin.
 2050 Okada, R. (2010). The relationship between vulnerable narcissism and
 2051 aggression in Japanese undergraduate students. *Personality and Indi-*
 2052 *vidual Differences*, 49(2), 113–118. <https://doi.org/c73zz7>
 2053 Papanek, H. (1972). Pathology of power striving and its treat-
 2054 ment. *Journal of Individual Psychology; Chicago, Ill.*, 28(1),
 2055 25–32. [http://search.proquest.com/docview/1303447697/citation/](http://search.proquest.com/docview/1303447697/citation/C0139F0ECA044577PQ/1)
 2056 [C0139F0ECA044577PQ/1](http://search.proquest.com/docview/1303447697/citation/C0139F0ECA044577PQ/1)
 2057 Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orien-

tations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(5), 1113–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1113>

Petersen, R. M., Dubuc, C., & Higham, J. P. (2018). Facial displays of dominance in non-human primates. In C. Senior (Ed.), *The Facial Displays of Leaders* (pp. 123–143). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94535-4_6

Pew Research Center. (2019). *Views on race in america 2019*. Pew Research Center, Washinton, D.C. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2019/04/09/race-in-america-2019/>

Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 21(3), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016530>

Pleck, J., Sonenstein, F., & Ku, L. (1993). Masculinity ideology: its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49(3), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x>

Prolific Academic. (2018). *How do participants find out about my study?* <https://researcher-help.prolific.co/hc/en-gb/articles/360009221253-How-do-participants-find-out-about-my-study->

Pulerwitz, J., Gortmaker, S., & DeJong, W. (2000). Measuring sexual relationships in HIV/STD research. *Sex Roles*, 42(7), 637–660. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007051506972>

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* [R]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>

Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon,

- 2086 D. (1989). Evidence for terror management theory: I. the effects of
2087 mortality salience on reactions to those who violate or uphold cultural
2088 values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(4), 681–690.
2089 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.4.681>
- 2090 Rosenthal, L., Levy, S. R., & Earnshaw, V. A. (2012). Social dom-
2091 inance orientation relates to believing men should dominate sexu-
2092 ally, sexual self-efficacy, and taking free female condoms among un-
2093 dergraduate women and men. *Sex Roles*, 67(11-12), 659–669. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0207-6>
- 2094
- 2095 Russell, G. A. (1985). Narcissism and the narcissistic personality disorder:
2096 A comparison of the theories of Kernberg and Kohut. *British Jour-
2097 nal of Medical Psychology*, 58(2), 137–148. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.
2098 2044-8341.1985.tb02626.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8341.1985.tb02626.x)
- 2099 Schaich Borg, J., Lieberman, D., & Kiehl, K. A. (2008). Infection,
2100 incest, and iniquity: investigating the neural correlates of disgust
2101 and morality. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20(9), 1529–1546.
2102 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20109>
- 2103 Schoenleber, M., Roche, M. J., Wetzell, E., Pincus, A. L., & Roberts, B. W.
2104 (2015). Development of a brief version of the pathological narcissism
2105 inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 27(4), 1520–1526. [https://doi.
2106 org/10.1037/pas0000158](https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000158)
- 2107 Schönbrodt, F. D., & Gerstenberg, F. X. R. (2012). An IRT analysis of
2108 motive questionnaires: The Unified Motive Scales. *Journal of Research
2109 in Personality*, 46(6), 725–742. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.08.
2110 010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.08.010)
- 2111 Shearer, C. L., Hosterman, S. J., Gillen, M. M., & Lefkowitz, E. S.
2112 (2005). Are traditional gender role attitudes associated with risky sex-
2113 ual behavior and condom-related beliefs? *Sex Roles*, 52(5-6), 311–324.

2114 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-2675-4>

2115 Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Liu, J., & Pratto, F. (2000). Social dominance
2116 orientation, anti-egalitarianism and the political psychology of gen-
2117 der: an extension and cross-cultural replication. *European Journal of*
2118 *Social Psychology*, 30(1), 41–67. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(200001/02)30:1%3C41::AID-EJSP976%3E3.0.CO;2-O)
2119 [0992\(200001/02\)30:1%3C41::AID-EJSP976%3E3.0.CO;2-O](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(200001/02)30:1%3C41::AID-EJSP976%3E3.0.CO;2-O)

2120 Smith, D. L. (2016). Paradoxes of dehumanization. *Social Theory*
2121 *and Practice*, 42(2), 416–443. JSTOR. [https://doi.org/10.5840/](https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201642222)
2122 [soctheorpract201642222](https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201642222)

2123 Snell, W. E., & Papini, D. R. (1989). The sexuality scale: an in-
2124 strument to measure sexual-esteem, sexual-depression, and sexual-
2125 preoccupation. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 26(2), 256–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498909551510>

2126 Spiegel, T., & Pollak, Y. (2019). Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity disorder
2127 and increased engagement in sexual risk-taking behavior: the role of
2128 benefit perception. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 0. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01043)
2129 [3389/fpsyg.2019.01043](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01043)

2130 Stan Development Team. (2020). *RStan: the R interface to stan* (Version
2131 2.26.1) [R]. <https://mc-stan.org/>

2132 Suessenbach, F., Loughnan, S., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Moore, A. B.
2133 (2019). The dominance, prestige, and leadership account of so-
2134 cial power motives. *European Journal of Personality*, 33(1), 7–33.
2135 <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2184>

2136 Süssenbach, P., & Böhner, G. (2011). Acceptance of sexual aggression
2137 myths in a representative sample of german residents. *Aggressive Be-*
2138 *havior*, 37(4), 374–385. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20390>

2139 Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are
2140 shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Per-*
2141

- 2142 sonality and Social Psychology, 70(6), 1256–1269. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.6.1256)
2143 1037/0022-3514.70.6.1256
- 2144 Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2006). Moral emotions
2145 and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 345–372.
2146 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>
- 2147 Testa, M., Hoffman, J. H., Lucke, J. F., & Pagnan, C. E. (2015).
2148 Measuring sexual aggression perpetration in college men: A com-
2149 parison of two measures. *Psychology of Violence*, 5(3), 285–293.
2150 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037584>
- 2151 Tsoi, L., Dungan, J. A., Chakroff, A., & Young, L. L. (2018). Neural
2152 substrates for moral judgments of psychological versus physical harm.
2153 *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 13(5), 460–470. [https:](https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy029)
2154 [//doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy029](https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy029)
- 2155 Tuoyire, D. A., Anku, P. J., Alidu, L., & Amo-Adjei, J. (2018). Timing
2156 of first sexual intercourse and number of lifetime sexual partners in
2157 sub-saharan africa. *Sexuality & Culture*, 22(2), 651–668. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-017-9488-9)
2158 [org/10.1007/s12119-017-9488-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-017-9488-9)
- 2159 Tybur, J. M., Lieberman, D., & Griskevicius, V. (2009). Microbes, mating,
2160 and morality: individual differences in three functional domains of
2161 disgust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1), 103–122.
2162 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015474>
- 2163 Uhlmann, E. L., Zhu, L. (Lei)., & Tannenbaum, D. (2013). When it
2164 takes a bad person to do the right thing. *Cognition*, 126(2), 326–334.
2165 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.10.005>
- 2166 Unesco. (2015). *Emerging evidence, lessons and practice in comprehensive*
2167 *sexuality education: a global review 2015*.
- 2168 Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership.
2169 *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 354–371. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8988.10.4.354)

- doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_5
- Vincent, W., Gordon, D. M., Campbell, C., Ward, N. L., Albritton, T., & Kershaw, T. (2016). Adherence to traditionally masculine norms and condom-related beliefs: emphasis on african american and hispanic men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17(1), 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039455>
- Volpe, E. M., Hardie, T. L., Cerulli, C., Sommers, M. S., & Morrison-Beedy, D. (2013). What’s age got to do with it? Partner age difference, power, intimate partner violence, and sexual risk in urban adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(10), 2068–2087. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512471082>
- Vugt, M. van, & Ronay, R. (2014). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4(1), 74–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386613493635>
- Weber, E. U., Blais, A.-R., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 15(4), 263–290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.414>
- Williams, M. J., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Guillory, L. E. (2017). Sexual aggression when power is new: effects of acute high power on chronically low-power individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(2), 201–223. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000068>
- Winter, D. G. (1988). The power motive in women—and men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(3), 510–519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.3.510>
- Winter, D. G. (1993). Power, affiliation, and war: three tests of a motivational model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(3), 532–545. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.532>

- 2198 Witkower, Z., Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., & Henrich, J. (2020). Two
2199 signals of social rank: prestige and dominance are associated with dis-
2200 tinct nonverbal displays. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
2201 *118*(1), 89–120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000181>
- 2202 World Health Organization. (2018). *Report on global sexually trans-*
2203 *mitted infection surveillance. 2018.* WHO. [https://apps.who.int/iris/](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/277258/9789241565691-eng.pdf?ua=1)
2204 [bitstream/handle/10665/277258/9789241565691-eng.pdf?ua=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/277258/9789241565691-eng.pdf?ua=1)
- 2205 Worley, T., & Samp, J. (2014). Exploring the associations between rela-
2206 tional uncertainty, jealousy about partner’s friendships, and jealousy
2207 expression in dating relationships. *Communication Studies*, *65*(4),
2208 370–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.833529>
- 2209 Yakeley, J. (2018). Current understanding of narcissism and narcissistic
2210 personality disorder. *BJPsych Advances*, *24*(5), 305–315. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/gfwddh)
2211 [org/gfwddh](https://doi.org/gfwddh)
- 2212 Yeung, N., & Summerfield, C. (2012). Metacognition in human decision-
2213 making: confidence and error monitoring. *Philosophical Transactions*
2214 *Of The Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, *367*(1594), 1310–1321.
2215 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0416>
- 2216 Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2006). *Schema Therapy:*
2217 *A Practitioner’s Guide* (1st edition). Guilford Press.
- 2218 Young, L., Cushman, F., Hauser, M., & Saxe, R. (2007). The neural
2219 basis of the interaction between theory of mind and moral judgment.
2220 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(20), 8235–8240.
2221 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701408104>

Table 10*Experiment 2: Participant Demographics*

Characteristic	N=279
Age	
Mean (SD)	30 (9.92)
Median [Range]	26 [18.00, 78]
Gender	
Female	124 (44%)
Male	155 (56%)
Ethnicity	
African	49 (18%)
Asian or Asian Scottish or Asian British	5 (1.8%)
Mixed or Multi-ethnic	7 (2.5%)
Other ethnicity	3 (1.1%)
Prefer not to respond	1 (0.4%)
White	214 (77%)
Education	
A-Levels or Equivalent	64 (23%)
Doctoral Degree	4 (1.4%)
GCSEs or Equivalent	17 (6.1%)
Prefer not to respond	4 (1.4%)
Primary School	5 (1.8%)
University Post-Graduate Program	62 (22%)
University Undergraduate Program	123 (44%)
Ethnic Origin	
African	48 (17%)
Asian	7 (2.5%)
English	16 (5.7%)
European	193 (69%)
Latin American	6 (2.2%)
Other	9 (3.2%)

Table 11*General Risk * DoPL: Experiment 2*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Intercept	0.81	0.95	0.4	1.22
Dominance	0.51	0.95	0.17	0.86
Prestige	0.42	0.95	0.07	0.78
Age	-0.02	0.95	-0.03	-0.01

Note. Fixed effect results of Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership with gender interactions predicting general risk preference.

Table 12*B-PNI * DOSPERT : Gender: Experiment 2*

Parameter	Estimate	CI	CI Low	CI High
Vulnerability * Intercept	0.82	0.95	0.44	1.21
Vulnerability * Financial Preference	-0.27	0.95	-0.47	-0.06
Vulnerability * Age	-0.03	0.95	-0.04	-0.02
Vulnerability * Recreational Preference : Gender	-0.34	0.95	-0.62	-0.07
Grandiosity * Gender	0.27	0.95	0.03	0.51
Grandiosity * Social Preference	0.3	0.95	0.11	0.49
Grandiosity * Recreational Preference : Gender	-0.41	0.95	-0.69	-0.13

Note. Fixed effect results of individual DOSPERT domains with gender interactions predicting vulnerable and grandiose narcissism respectively.