

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

Ithurburn, Andrew¹ & Moore, and Adam¹

¹ The University of Edinburgh

Introduction

Every day individuals make decisions be they mundane such as which cereal to eat in the morning to the more complex of which job should they accept. The consequences for making those decisions can be equally complex. Some decisions are more difficult to quantify and understand while others can be relatively easy like choosing what cereal to eat in the morning. However, some are increasingly more difficult to model. For example, two adult males (or a man and a woman) who are intending to have sex must decide whether or not to have sex with or without a condom. The consequences can have lasting effects depending on what the couple chooses.

Spitefulness These lasting effects can be twofold. For example, deciding not to wear a condom could result in an unplanned pregnancy or exposing one or another person to a sexually transmitted infection. Behaviors/decisions that have negative consequences for both individuals is the original understanding of spite to where psychologically spite is understood as intentionally harming oneself to punish another (Marcus et al., 2014; Critchfield et al., 2008). Spiteful behavior that has often been overlooked in psychological research. Spite has been seen in behavioral economic experiments, preschoolers with ultimatum games, and daily life (Marcus et al., 2014; Bauer et al., 2014; Bügelmayer & Katharina Spiess, 2014). Preschool boys tended to be more spiteful than their female counterparts. Younger men followed suit and tended to be more spiteful than their counterparts [!marcus2014]. Age plays a role whereas people age they tend to be less spiteful and more egalitarian (Bügelmayer & Katharina Spiess, 2014).

DoPL

Dominance The dominance motive is one of the more researched methods and well depicted power motives. Individuals with a dominance orientation display the more primal of human behavior. These individuals will seek power through direct methods such as asserting dominance, control over resources, or physically assaulting someone (Johnson et al., 2012; Winter, 1993). Early research in dominance motives has shown that acts of dominance ranging from asserting physical dominance over another to physical displays of violence has been shown in many mammalian species, including humans.

Individuals high in dominance are often high in machiavellianism, narcissism, and often are prone to risky behavior (discussion further in the next section). Continued research has hinted at a possible tendency for males to display these dominant seeking traits more than females (citation needed). When high dominance individuals assert themselves they are doing so to increase their own individual sense of power (citation needed). Asserting ones own sense of dominance over another can be a dangerous task. In the animal kingdom it can often leader to injury. While, in humans asserting dominance can take a multitude of actions such as leering behaviors, physical distance, or other non-verbal methods to display dominance (citation needed). Power from a dominance perspective is often never bestowed upon someone. Often, high dominance individuals will take control and hold onto it.

Prestige Contrary to the dominance motivation of using intimidation and aggression to gain more power, a prestige motivation or prestige in general is bestowed upon an individual from others in the community (citation needed). Differently from the dominance motivation, a prestige motivation is generally unique to the human species (citation needed). Do in part to ancestral human groups being smaller hunter-gatherer societies, individuals that displayed and used important behaviors beneficial to the larger group were often valued and admired by the group. Therein, the social group bestows the authority onto the individual. Generally, this type of behavior can be passively achieved by the prestigious individual. However, this does not remove the intent of the actor in that they too can see prestige from the group, but method of achieving that social status greatly differs from that of dominance seeking individuals.

Apart from dominance motivated individuals that continu-

University of Edinburgh Department of Psychology

The authors made the following contributions. Ithurburn, Andrew: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing; Moore, Adam: Writing - Review & Editing.

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

ally have to fight for their right to have power over others,¹²⁴
 individuals that seek or were given power through a prestige¹²⁵
 motivation are not generally challenged in the same sense¹²⁶
 as dominant individuals. Displaying behaviors that the¹²⁷
 community would see as beneficial would indere them¹²⁸
 into the community making the survival of the community¹²⁹
 as a whole better (citation needed). Evolutionarily this¹³⁰
 would increase viability of the prestigious individual and¹³¹
 their genes. Similar to the dominance perspective, the¹³²
 prestige perspective overall increases the power and future¹³³
 survivability of the individual. However, due to the natural¹³⁴
 difference between prestige and dominance, dominance¹³⁵
 seeking individuals are challenged more often resulting in¹³⁶
 more danger to their position (citation).¹³⁷

Leadership Apart from dominance and prestige, leadership¹³⁸
 raises some interesting questions on deference and why in-¹³⁹
 dividuals would defer to others in power. Psychologically,¹⁴⁰
 leadership is the deference to authority and working together¹⁴¹
 towards a shared common goal (Van Vugt, 2006).¹⁴²

Methods¹⁴³

Participants: Participants were a convenience sample of¹⁴⁴
 82 (Mage = 26.14, SD = 8.65) individuals from Prolific¹⁴⁵
 Academic crowdsourcing platform (“www.prolific.co”). Re-¹⁴⁶
 quirements for participation were: (1) be 18 years of age¹⁴⁷
 or older and (2) and as part of Prolific Academics policy,¹⁴⁸
 have a prolific rating of 90 or above. Participants received¹⁴⁹
 £4 or £8 an hour as compensation for completing the survey.¹⁵⁰
 The University of Edinburgh’s Research Ethics Committee¹⁵¹
 approved all study procedures (approval reference number:¹⁵²
 330-1920/1).¹⁵³

Methodology:¹⁵⁴

Demographic Questionnaire: Prior to the psychometric¹⁵⁵
 scales, participants are asked to share their demographic¹⁵⁶
 characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and¹⁵⁷
 educational attainment).¹⁵⁸

Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation. The 18-¹⁵⁹
 item Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership scale [DoPL;¹⁶⁰
 Suessenbach et al. (2019)], is used to measure dominance,¹⁶¹
 prestige, and leadership orientation. Each question corre-¹⁶²
 sponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is scored,¹⁶³
 across six unique items related to those domains (e.g., “I rel-¹⁶⁴
 ish opportunities in which I can lead others” for leadership),¹⁶⁵
 rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly,¹⁶⁶
 agree). Internal consistency reliability for the current sample,¹⁶⁷
 is \$¹⁶⁸

Spitefulness Scale. The Spitefulness scale (Marcus et al.,¹⁶⁹
 2014) is a measure with seventeen one sentence vignettes to¹⁷⁰

assess the spitefulness of participants. The original spite-
 fulness scale has 31-items. In the original Marcus and col-
 leagues’ paper, fifteen were removed. For the present study
 however, 4-items were removed because they did not meet
 the parameters for the study i.e., needed to be dyadic, more
 personal. Three reverse scored items from the original thirty-
 one were added after meeting the requirements. Example
 questions included, “It might be worth risking my reputa-
 tion in order to spread gossip about someone I did not like.”
 ,and “Part of me enjoys seeing the people I do not like fail
 even if their failure hurts me in some way.” Items are scored
 on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to
 5 (“Strongly agree”). Higher spitefulness scores represent
 higher acceptance of spiteful attitudes.

Sexuality Self-Esteem Subscale: The Sexuality Self-Esteem
 subscale (SSES; Snell and Papini (1989)) is a subset of the
 Sexuality scale that measures the overall self-esteem of par-
 ticipants. Due to the nature of the study, the sexuality sub-
 scale was chosen from the overall 30-item scale. The 10-
 items chosen reflected questions on the sexual esteem of par-
 ticipants on a 5-point scale of +2 (Agree) and -2 (Disagree).
 For ease of online use the scale was changed to 1 (“Dis-
 agree”) and 5 (“Agree”), data analysis will follow the sex-
 uality 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 ac-
 ceptance of high self-esteem statements.

Sexual Jealousy Subscale: The Sexual Jealousy subscale by
 Worley and Samp (2014) are 3-items from the 12-item Jeal-
 ousy 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 go-
 ing 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 rang-
 ing from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”). Higher
 scores indicate a tendency to be more sexually jealous.

Sexual Relationship Power Scale: The Sexual Relation-
 ship 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 imbal-
 ance in the relationship where the participant indicates they
 believe they have less control in the relationship.

The DMDF measures the dominance level of sexual and social decisions in the relationship. Example questions include “Who usually has more say about whether you have sex?” and “Who usually has more say about when you talk about serious things?” Items on the DMDF are scored on a 3-item scale of 1 (“Your Partner”), 2 (“Both of You Equally”), and 3 (“You”). Higher scores indicate more dominance by the participant in the relationship.

Scenario Realism Question: Following Worley and Samp in their 2014 paper on using vignettes/scenarios in psychological studies, a question asking the participant how realistic or how much they can visualize the scenario is. The 1-item question is “This type of situation is realistic.” The item is scored on a 5-point scale of the participants agreement with the above statement, 1 (“Strongly agree”) to 5 (“Strongly disagree”). Higher scores indicate disagreement with the statement and reflects the belief that the scenario is not realistic.

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

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

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

Procedure:

Participants were recruited on Prolific Academic. Participants must be 18-years of age or older, restriction by study design and Prolific Academic’s user policy. The published study is titled, “Moral Choice and Behavior.” The study description follows the participant information sheet including participant compensation. Participants were asked to accept their participation in the study. Participants were then automatically sent to the main survey (Qualtrics, Inc.). Once participants accessed the main survey, they were presented with the consent form for which to accept they responded with selecting “Yes.” Participants were then asked

to provide demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and educational attainment. Participants would then complete in order, the spitefulness scale, the sexual relationship power scale, the sexual jealousy subscale, and sexuality self-esteem subscale. Next, participants were presented ten vignettes where they were instructed to rate on the level of justification for the action carried out in the vignette. After each vignette, participants would rate the realism of the scenario. Upon completion of the survey (median completion time 20 minutes $SD = 10$ Minutes 30 seconds), participants were shown a debriefing message and shown the contact information of the Primary Investigator (Andrew Ithurburn). Participants were then compensated at £8/hr. via Prolific Academic.

Data Analysis:

Demographic characteristics were analyzed using a one-way analysis for continuous variables (age) and Chi-squares tests for categorical variables (sex, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and educational attainment). Means and standard deviations were calculated for the surveys along with correlational analyses (e.g., spitefulness, SESS, SRPS, SJS). Bayesian multilevel models were used to test differences between levels of justifications of vignettes that are either sexually or non-sexually vindictive in behavior. Model 1

Results

Discussion

References

- 250 303
- 251 304
- 252 305
- 253 306
- 254
- 255
- 256
- 257
- 258
- 259
- 260
- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- 276
- 277
- 278
- 279
- 280
- 281
- 282
- 283
- 284
- 285
- 286
- 287
- 288
- 289
- 290
- 291
- 292
- 293
- 294
- 295
- 296
- 297
- 298
- 299
- 300
- 301
- 302
- Bauer, M., Chytilová, J., & Pertold-Gebicka, B. (2014). Parental background and other-regarding preferences in children. *Experimental Economics*, 17(1), 24–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-013-9355-y>
- Bügelmayer, E., & Katharina Spiess, C. (2014). Spite and cognitive skills in preschoolers. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 45, 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2014.10.001>
- Critchfield, K. L., Levy, K. N., Clarkin, J. F., & Kernberg, O. F. (2008). The relational context of aggression in borderline personality disorder: using adult attachment style to predict forms of hostility. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20434>
- Johnson, S. L., Leedom, L. J., & Muhtadie, L. (2012). The Dominance Behavioral System and Psychopathology: Evidence from Self-Report, Observational, and Biological Studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(4), 692–743. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027503>
- Marcus, D. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mercer, S. H., & Norris, A. L. (2014). The psychology of spite and the measurement of spitefulness. *Psychological Assessment*, 26(2), 563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036039>
- 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>
- Snell, W. E., & Papini, D. R. (1989). The Sexuality Scale: An Instrument to Measure Sexual-Esteem, Sexual-Depression, and Sexual-Preoccupation. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 26(2), 256–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498909551510>
- Suessenbach, F., Loughnan, S., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Moore, A. B. (2019). The dominance, prestige, and leadership account of social power motives. *European Journal of Personality*, 33(1), 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2184>
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary Origins of Leadership and Followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 354–371. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_5
- 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>
- Worley, T., & Samp, J. (2014). Exploring the associations between relational uncertainty, jealousy about partner's friendships, and jealousy expression in dating relationships. *Communication Studies*, 65(4), 370–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.833529>