

University of Texas at Arlington

MavMatrix

2015 Spring Honors Capstone Projects

Honors College

5-1-2015

ISSUES WITH ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION, HOOKING-UP, AND CONDOM USE: IS THERE A SEXUAL DOUBLE STANDARD?

Tonychris Nnaka

Follow this and additional works at: https://mavmatrix.uta.edu/honors_spring2015

Recommended Citation

Nnaka, Tonychris, "ISSUES WITH ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION, HOOKING-UP, AND CONDOM USE: IS THERE A SEXUAL DOUBLE STANDARD?" (2015). *2015 Spring Honors Capstone Projects*. 20.
https://mavmatrix.uta.edu/honors_spring2015/20

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at MavMatrix. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2015 Spring Honors Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of MavMatrix. For more information, please contact leah.mccurdy@uta.edu, erica.rousseau@uta.edu, vanessa.garrett@uta.edu.

Copyright © by Tonychris O. Nnaka 2015

All Rights Reserved

ISSUES WITH ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION, HOOKING-UP,
AND CONDOM USE: IS THERE A SEXUAL
DOUBLE STANDARD?

by

TONYCHRIS OLISAEBUKA NNAKA

Presented to the Faculty of the Honors College of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

HONORS BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2015

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to my Undergraduate Research Mentor, Dr. Michael Young, PhD. His excellent mentorship was the foundation and pillar of my success in completing this Honors thesis. Prior to meeting Dr. Young, I had little to no knowledge of what research is about, but with his teaching, guidance, encouragement, and advice, research became the center of my universe. Without Dr. Young, none of this would be a reality.

A special thank you to my incredible and loving family, most especially to my Mother (Mrs. Victoria Nnaka), Sister (Mrs. Vivian Akidi), Mr. Glenn Bolton, and Mrs. Kelli Bolton. I am extensively grateful for the love, care, and compassion you showered upon me throughout my undergraduate career. Words alone cannot describe the magnitude of the positive influence you have all had in my life; thank you.

Lastly, I would like to thank the UTA College of Nursing and Health Innovation and the UTA Honors College for providing me a world-class education and the tools to be successful in the professional world. In addition, I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Beborah Behan and Mrs. Bobbie Brown, and to all faculty, staff, friends, and colleagues who have played a significant role in my academic journey.

May 14, 2015

ABSTRACT

ISSUES WITH ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION, HOOKING-UP, AND CONDOM USE: IS THERE A SEXUAL DOUBLE STANDARD?

Tonychris Nnaka, NURS

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2015

Faculty Mentor: Michael Young

The purposes of this study are: (1) to identify college student judgments toward others based on description of a model's heavy drinking, hooking-up and condom use behaviors, (2) to determine whether a double standard exists in the context of alcohol consumption, hooking-up, and level of condom use (i.e., are male and female models who are participating in the same drinking, sexual, and condom use behaviors evaluated differently relative to selected character traits?). We hypothesized that male study participants would show evidence of a sexual double standard, but female participants would not.

Participants (N=242) were UTA students, single/under 25, who completed a questionnaires that include one of eight randomly assigned vignettes (four vignette types,

male or female model). Data were analyzed using SPSS, with separate analyses conducted for male and female participants.

Analyses of female participant data showed significant main effects for vignette type for both positive character and likability. Among male participants there was a significant main effect for vignette type for positive character. Models in the two basic vignettes received most positive judgment from both male and female participants. No significant model x vignette interaction effects were observed for any of the three outcome variables for either male or female participants.

Neither male nor female participants evaluated the male model differently from the female model; thus there was no evidence of a sexual double-standard. Drinking and hooking-up vignettes were evaluated less favorably than the basic vignette, indicating that the normative standards of the study participants were not supportive of these behaviors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
Chapter	
1. CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose.....	2
1.3 Research Question.....	3
2. CHAPTER TWO	4
2.1 Double Standard.....	5
3. CHAPTER THREE	9
3.1 Participants.....	9
3.2 Testing Instrument	9
3.3 Design	14
3.4 Procedures	15
3.5 Results	15
3.5.1 Frequency Counts	15
3.5.2 Factor Analysis	15
3.5.3 Results for Female Participants	16
3.5.4 Results for Male Participants	16

4. CHAPTER FOUR	17
4.1 Limitations	18
5. CHAPTER FIVE	20
Appendix	
A. FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS ON CHARACTER TRIATS.....	21
B. RESULTS OF TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FEMALE	23
C. RESULTS OF TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MALE.....	25
D. MEAN SCALE SCORES BY VIGNETTE FOR FEMALE.....	27
E. MEAN SCALE SCORES BY VIGNETTE FOR MALE.....	29
REFERENCES	31
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	34

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Alcohol consumption and involvement in high-risk sexual behaviors, such as unprotected oral, vaginal, and anal sex in the context of hook-up are very common behaviors among college students. Studies have identified that many college students are engaging in sexual behavior in the context of what is known as “hooking-up” (Glenn & Marquardt, 2001). The exact definition of “hooking-up” has been operationally defined in many ways by different scholars. For the purpose of this study, “hooking up” is defined as a sexual encounter in which the participants are strangers, or brief acquaintances, who participate in sexual activity with little or no expectation of future relationship beyond the current encounter. It has been observed by several scholars that a significant number of college students have engaged in hooking-up encounters and that many of these encounters have involved sexual intercourse (Marks, 2008; Penhollow, Young, & Bailey, 2007 & 2010)

A correlation between alcohol consumption and hooking-up has been identified by several researchers (Aicken, Nardone, and Mercer, 2011; Hutton, Mccaul, Chander, Jenckes, Nollen, et al., 2013). According to Klein, Geaghan, & MacDonal, (2007), alcohol usage is among the number one factor that promotes risky sexual behavior, including sexual contact with a stranger. The tendency for alcohol consumption to increase the chances of hooking-up and participation in unsafe sexual behaviors is

attributed to its suppressive effect on the central nervous system; thus decreasing individuals' judgment abilities.

Because a hook-up occurs between people who are strangers or only brief acquaintances, with no commitment or attachment to each other, it is a situation that poses a substantial risk, including risk for the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). Consistent use of condoms is an important factor in decreasing the risk of acquiring HIV/AIDS and other STDs (Holmes, Levine, & Weaver, 2004; Sivaram, Srikrishnana, Latkin, Iriundo-Perez, Solomon, et al., 2008). Encouraging the use of condoms and overcoming societal barriers to condom use (e.g., a sexual double standard) is paramount.

1.2 Purpose

The purposes of this study are: (1) to identify college students' judgments toward others based on description of a model's heavy drinking, hooking-up and condom use behaviors; and (2) to determine whether a double standard exists in the context of alcohol consumption, hooking-up, and level of condom use (i.e., are male and female models who are participating in the same drinking, sexual, and condom use behaviors evaluated differently relative to selected character traits?). We hypothesized that: (1) male study participants would judge a female model more favorably if they were not provided information about her drinking, sexual, or condom use behaviors; (2) male participants would most likely judge a male model favorably even when provided information indicating regularly heavy alcohol consumption and frequent engagement in sexual behaviors within the context of hooking-up after heavy drinking; (3) female study participants would judge models more favorably if they were not provided information

about their drinking, sexual, or condom use behaviors, but not differentially by the gender of the model. In other words, we projected that male study participants would show evidence of a sexual double standard, but female participants would not.

1.3. Research Question

This study will seek to answer the questions: Is there a sexual double standard regarding hooking-up/casual sex, alcohol consumption, and condom use? Are men and women who are participating in the same risky sexual behaviors and condom use behaviors evaluated differently relative to selected character traits?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participation in sexual intercourse under the influence of alcohol is considered an extremely high-risk sexual behavior, especially when the action is done within the context of drinking to the point of impaired decision-making and hooking-up. Individuals who engage in such behaviors, substantially predispose themselves to several health consequences which include the contraction of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS. Paul and colleagues (2000) found that 48% of the college students in their sample had experienced at least one hook-up. The study, however, did not clearly stipulate what type of sexual activity was involved. Another 30% of the sample, however, reported they had experienced intercourse in the context of a hook-up. Another study conducted by Young, Penhollow, and Bailey (2007), examined the sexual behavior of “sexually experienced” college students within the context of hooking-up situation. These researchers classified study participants as “experienced” if they indicated any participation in any sort of sexual activity including; giving or receiving oral sex, anal intercourse, manual stimulation of partner’s genitals, or having a partner manually stimulate their genitals. The result found that among these “experienced” participants, 71% indicated they had participated in sexual intercourse and 35% indicated they had done so in a hooking-up situation. Drinking, and hooking-up within the context of heavy drinking is problematic for a number of reasons, including a lower incidence of condom

use, and exposure of participants to potentially serious risks. Consistent condom use is important, but especially in hooking-up situations.

2.1 Double Standard

It is widely believed that the sexual double standard is a persistent phenomenon in our contemporary society. The “double standard” simply means that individuals evaluate men and women differently for engaging in identical and similar levels of sexual activities. Jonason and Marks (2009), in their study of the double standard, affirmed this widely believed notion. In our society, men have more freedom relative to sexual behaviors than women. For example, men who engage in various sexual behaviors are evaluated with more acceptance and tolerance than women who engage in the same behaviors.

Several scholars have utilized a variety of evaluation tools to accurately identify and evaluate whether one gender is judged differently from the other when considering the same sexual behavior. Some researchers have directly asked study participants questions relative to sexual double standard (e.g., “Women who have had many sexual partners are judged more harshly than men who have had many sexual partners”). Other studies have asked participants to evaluate a male or female model based on the number of sexual partners the model reported, whether the model is in a monogamous relationship or currently has multiple sexual partners (Marks, 2008; Marks, & Fraley, 2005).

However, according Marks and Fraley (2005) indicated that in addressing the sexual double-standard, researchers have not specifically distinguished between attitudes and values. These researchers only evaluated the differences between men and women

who engage in the same sexual behavior, rather than general belief about social norm. The evaluation produced minimal to no evidence of sexual double-standard. In addition, Marks' (2008) double-standard study participants rated men and women equally, under normal conditions. However, under the condition of divided attention, participants evaluated men described as having a high number of sexual partners much more positively than they evaluated women also described as having a high number of sexual partners.

Though several studies have attempted to confirm the existence of a sexual double standard, there has been little consistency across studies relative to research design and evaluation measures. Thus, the results produced from one study to the next are not readily comparable, are unclear, and tend to vary depending on the different approaches researchers have taken.

In the present study I followed the example of Young, Penhollow and Bailey's (2010) double-standard study, and used vignettes to determine whether a double standard existed. In the Young, Penhollow, and Bailey (2010) study, participants were assigned to one of six forms of a questionnaire. The researchers used six different vignettes. Each vignette depicted either a male or female model in one of three situations: (1) a "basic" vignette which included a positive description of the model but did not mention sexual behavior; (2) a "hooking-up" vignette which included the same information as the basic vignette, with the additional information that last weekend the model had met someone "at a party and before the night was over they had sex,"; and (3) a "condom provision" vignette, which included the same information as the hooking-up vignette but added the model "provided the condom."

After reading the vignette to which they had been assigned, students responded to 12 statements about the model, indicating their degree of agreement/disagreement with each statement. The statements were evaluated according to three scales: positive character, likability, and negative character behavior. Results indicated that male participants exhibited a double standard, i.e., the participants who received the vignette about the male model in the hooking-up or condom provision situation evaluated the model more favorably than participants evaluated the male model in the basic situation; but participants who received the vignette about the female model in the hooking-up or condom provision situation evaluated the model less favorably than participants evaluated the female model in the basic situation. Female participants did not exhibit a double standard.

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether a double standard exists for sexual behavior in the context of heavy drinking, hooking-up and condom use frequency (e.g., are men and women who are participating in the same sexual and condom behaviors under the influence of alcohol evaluated differently relative to selected character traits?). The assessment of this factor is exceptionally vital because individuals who initiate condom use in hooking-up/casual sex situations are evaluated less favorably than others; this may prove to be a substantial barrier to their use of condoms in such situations. This consequently creates an increased risk of contracting HIV/AIDS and/or other sexually transmitted disease/infections.

The operational hypotheses for the study are listed as follows: (1) male study participants will evaluate a female model more favorably when they are not provided information regarding the model participation in heavy drinking or condom use

frequency during hooking-up sex following heavy drinking; (2) male study participants will evaluate a male model more favorably when they are provided information indicating that the model had participated in heavy drinking, and hooking-up sex following heavy drinking that also indicated frequency of condom use; and (3) female study participants will not evaluate models for whom they are provided information regarding participation in hooking-up sex and condom provision differently by gender of the model. In other words, it is believed that male participants will show evidence of a sexual double-standard, but female participants will not.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

The participants consisted of a sample of currently enrolled undergraduate students at the University of Texas at Arlington. Because the sample for the study was taken from only one institution, some demographic information concerning the general university population may be relevant. The university is a public four-year university, with a total enrollment of approximately 48,000 undergraduates comprising 74% of the total enrollment. Slightly more females (55%) than males (45%) are enrolled. Caucasian students comprise the highest percentage (46.5%) of the enrollment, followed by Hispanic (16.5%), African American (14.5%), Asian American (10.2%), International students (10.0%), not reported (1.8%), and Native American (0.5%).

The study restricted data analysis to undergraduate students who indicated they were single and under age 25. The result from the analysis showed a greater percentage of female participants (76.5%) and Caucasian students, and a lesser number of male participants (23.5%).

3.2 Testing Instrument

The testing instrument used in this study was a self-report questionnaire. Each questionnaire included a vignette describing a college student – either a female model, “Linda,” or a male model, “David.” There were eight different versions of the vignette, four that featured a female model and four that featured a male model.

Models were described as follows:

D-1: David is a 19-year old college student. He works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider him attractive. He is a good student, works hard at his studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. He gets along well with his parents and has lots of friends at school. He thinks getting a college degree is important to his future and will help him do well for himself and also do good for others.

D-2: David is a 19-year old college student. He works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider him attractive. He is a good student, works hard at his studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. He gets along well with his parents and has lots of friends at school. He thinks getting a college degree is important to his future and will help him do well for himself and also do good for others. At least once per week, sometimes two or three times per week, David and his buddies go out drinking. More often than not, David will drink too much, greatly impairing his ability to make good decisions.

D-3: David is a 19-year old college student. He works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider him attractive. He is a good student, works hard at his studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. He gets along well with his parents and has lots of friends at school. He thinks getting a college degree is important to his future and will help him do well for himself and also do good for others. At least once per week, sometimes two or three times per week, David and his buddies go out drinking. More often than not, David will drink too much, greatly impairing his ability to make good decisions. On these occasions it is not unusual for him to leave with a young woman he just met and wake up the next morning next to her, in her bed, both of them naked.

Though their decision-making is generally impaired, he and his partners do somehow manage to make sure they use condoms almost all of the time.

D-4: David is a 19-year old college student. He works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider him attractive. He is a good student, works hard at his studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. He gets along well with his parents and has lots of friends at school. He thinks getting a college degree is important to his future and will help him do well for himself and also do good for others. At least once per week, sometimes two or three times per week, David and his buddies go out drinking. More often than not, David will drink too much, greatly impairing his ability to make good decisions. On these occasions it is not unusual for him to leave with a young woman he just met and wake up the next morning next to her, in her bed, both of them naked. Because their decision-making is generally impaired, he and his partners rarely use condoms.

L-1: Linda is a 19-year old college student. She works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider her attractive. She is a good student, works hard at her studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. She gets along well with her parents and has lots of friends at school. She thinks getting a college degree is important to her future and will help her do well for herself and also do good for others.

L-2: Linda is a 19-year old college student. She works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider her attractive. She is a good student, works hard at her studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. She gets along well with her parents and has lots of friends at school. She thinks getting a college degree is important to her future and will help her do well for herself and also do good for others. At least once per week,

sometimes two or three times per week, Linda and her girlfriends go out drinking. More often than not, Linda will drink too much, greatly impairing her ability to make good decisions.

L-3: Linda is a 19-year old college student. She works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider her attractive. She is a good student, works hard at her studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. She gets along well with her parents and has lots of friends at school. She thinks getting a college degree is important to her future and will help her do well for herself and also do good for others. At least once per week, sometimes two or three times per week, Linda and her girlfriends go out drinking. More often than not, Linda will drink too much, greatly impairing her ability to make good decisions. On these occasions it is not unusual for her to leave with a young man she just met and wake up the next morning next to him, in his bed, both of them naked. Though their decision-making is generally impaired, she and her partners do somehow manage to make sure they use condoms almost all of the time.

L-4: Linda is a 19-year old college student. She works out most days and is above average in fitness. Most people would consider her attractive. She is a good student, works hard at her studies, and has a 3.5 GPA. She gets along well with her parents and has lots of friends at school. She thinks getting a college degree is important to her future and will help her do well for herself and also do good for others. At least once per week, sometimes two or three times per week, Linda and her girlfriends go out drinking. More often than not, Linda will drink too much, greatly impairing her ability to make good decisions. On these occasions it is not unusual for her to leave with a young man she just

met and wake up the next morning next to him, in his bed, both of them naked. Because their decision-making is generally impaired, she and her partners rarely use condoms.

After reading the version of the vignette on questionnaire to which they were assigned, participants were asked to use a four-point like-type scale (1= “strongly agree” to 4 = “strongly disagree”) to rate the model (Linda or David) based on fifteen statements describing personality and character characteristics. The statements consist of three scales: a likeability scale, a positive character trait scale, and a negative character behavior scale.

The items in the likeability scale were: Linda/David is a likeable person, a person with a good sense of humor, a happy person, and the type of person I would want for my friend. Possible scores on the scale ranged from 4 to 16, with lower scores indicating greater perceived likeability. The items in the positive character trait scale were: Linda/David is a responsible person, a dependable person, a trustworthy person, a person with high moral and ethical standards, an honest person, and a person who makes good decisions. Possible scores on the scale ranged from 6 to 24, with lower scores indicating a more favorable evaluation regarding perceived character traits. The items in the negative behavior scale were: Linda/David is the type of person who will probably cheat on his/her spouse, is the type of person who will probably embezzle money from his/her employer, would probably cheat on an exam if he/she thought he/she would get a better grade, would probably rob his/her best friend blind if he/she thought he/she could get away with it. Possible scores on the scale ranged from 4 to 16, with lower scores indicating more negative evaluation regarding negative character behaviors.

These scales were used by Young, Kittleson, and Cardenas (2015) and were adapted from the work by Young, Penhollow, and Bailey (2010). Grouping these items in the form of scales, demonstrating that each scale measures a single construct, and using multi-item scales to measure constructs, makes a stronger case for the validity of the instrument than using single items in the analysis.

3.3 Design

The study employed a two (model gender) by four (vignette type) factorial design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions: (1) female model (Linda), basic description of the model, no mention of sexual behavior and alcohol consumption; (2) male model (David), basic description of the model, no mention of sexual behavior and alcohol consumption; (3) female model (Linda), description of the model including alcohol consumption to the level of impairing her ability to make good decisions; (4) male model (David) description of the model including alcohol consumption to the level of impairing her ability to make good decisions; (5) female model (Linda) description of model includes her participation in hooking-up/casual sex situations, under the influence of alcohol but managing the use of condoms; (6) male model (David) description of model includes his participation in a hooking-up/casual sex situations, under the influence of alcohol but managing the use of condoms; (7) female model (Linda) description of model includes her participation in a hooking-up/casual sex situations, under the influence of alcohol, but rarely using condoms; and (8) male model (David) description of model includes his participation in a hooking-up/casual sex situations, under the influence of alcohol, but rarely using condoms.

3.4 Procedures

Approval for the study was obtained from the University of Texas at Arlington Institutional Review Board. Following approval, undergraduate students at the University of Texas at Arlington were recruited to participate in the study. The student sample was selected from the university directory. The eight forms of the questionnaire were randomly distributed to undergraduate students at the University of Texas at Arlington using Qualtrics survey software. Students voluntarily completed the questionnaire within a specific time frame. Two incentives (One \$150 Gift Card and one \$50 Gift Card given away in a drawing) were utilized to encourage participation. After the initial distribution of the questionnaire, two follow-up emails were sent within a two week interval only to non-respondents to the initial invitation.

Data were analyzed using the SPSS program. Statistical procedures included frequency counts, factor analysis, and 2 x 4 (model x vignette) analysis of variance. Analysis of variance was conducted separately for male and female participants for all three scales – likeability, positive character trait, and negative character behavior.

3.5 Results

3.5.1 Frequency Counts

Data were collected from 339 participants. After the elimination of participants who did not meet the criteria for participation, 234 valid data (single, under age 25) were left. Females comprised 76.5% of the sample.

3.5.2 Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analyses confirmed the existence of three factors: likability, positive character traits, and negative character behavior (see Table 1). Items that

comprised the positive character scale all loaded heavily (.739) or above. Items that comprised the likability scale also loaded heavily on that factor (.757) or above. Relative to negative behavior, the four items comprising that scale also loaded heavily at (.737) or above (see Table 1).

3.5.3 Results for Female Participants

Analyses of female participant data showed significant main effects for vignette type for positive character and likability, but not negative behaviors, with the basic vignette receiving the most positive judgment. The positive character score for Vignette 1, the basic vignette (22.93) was scored significantly higher than each of the other three vignettes. Vignette 2 (the heavy drinking vignette), 18.17 and vignette 3 (the hooking-up-used condoms vignette), 17.66 were scored higher than Vignette 4 (hooking-up-rarely used condoms vignette), 16.01.

There were no significant main effects for models or significant model x vignette interaction effects for any of the three scales (see Table 2).

3.5.4 Results for Male Participants

Analysis of male participant data showed significant main effects for vignette type for positive character, but not for likability or negative behavior, with the basic vignette receiving the most positive judgement. The positive character score for Vignette 1 (the basic vignette), 22.71, was scored significantly higher than Vignette 2 (the heavy drinking vignette), 18.03 and Vignette 4 (the hooking-up-rarely used condoms vignette), 17.45.

There were no significant main effects for model or significant model x vignette interaction effects for any of the three scales (see Table 3).

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to determine whether a “double standard” exists regarding hooking-up/casual sexual behavior, alcohol consumption, and condom provision in such conditions; i.e., are men and women who are participating in the same sexual, alcohol use and condom provision behaviors evaluated differently relative to selected character traits?

Analysis of female participant data showed significant main effects for vignette type for positive character and likeability, with the basic vignette receiving the most positive judgment. Analysis of male participant data showed significant main effects for vignette type for positive character, with the basic vignette receiving the most positive judgment. There were no significant models x vignette interaction effects for either male or female participants. This indicated neither the male nor female participants evaluated the female model differently from the male model for engaging in the same behaviors, thus there was no evidence of sexual double standard. The drinking and hooking-up vignettes were evaluated less favorably than the basic vignette by female participants, and drinking and the hooking-up with rare condom use vignettes were evaluated less favorably than the basic vignette by male participants. This indicates normative standards of the study participants were not supportive of these behaviors.

Results from previous studies are varied relative to the sexual double-standard. Mark's (2008) study demonstrated that under the conditions of divided attention,

participants evaluated men with high number of sexual partners more favorably than they evaluated women with the same number of sexual partner. Milhausen and Herold (2001) found a significant gender difference among college student participants, with more men than women endorsing a sexual double standard. In the present study, the existence of sexual double standard was found be absent among participants. However, it was interesting to discover that the rating male participants gave the models who hooked-up after drinking but used condoms almost all the time was not significantly different from the rating given to models in the basic vignettes (who did not drink or hooked-up). It must be kept in mind that this study had a few male participants (n=55), with the numbers receiving the different vignettes ranging from only 5 to 11. If there had been a larger number of male participants the results may have been different.

4.1 Limitations

Interpretation of these results should take the limitations of the study into account. Participants consisted of a sample of undergraduate college students enrolled at university, however, analysis of the demographics of the larger university suggest the sample is relatively not representative. The study involved the evaluation of a hypothetical model in a vignette, which may differ from participants' actual evaluation of a real person. The use of vignettes, however, has been common in research, including research concerning the sexual double standard. Information about the participants' personal sexual behavior was not included in the analysis. Participants who had participated in sex in the context of hooking-up and had provided a condom, or had a partner provide a condom in a hooking-up situation may have evaluated models

differently from participants who had not had these experiences. The insufficient data from male participants may have also had an impact on the study results.

Future studies should consider the limitations stipulated in this study. For example, researchers should consider varying the racial and ethnic groups of the models, and making sure there are substantial male participants to conduct a robust analysis. Researchers may also consider addressing whether participants' evaluations of models varies by the participants' own sexual experiences. Lastly, researchers may wish to examine how the model's views of condom use might influence participants' evaluations (e.g., were the models glad they used a condom, concerned that they did not use a condom, or glad they did not use a condom?).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrated no evidence of sexual double-standard among males or females. The study result also identified an important unintentional finding, which is evidence that heavy drinking, and hooking-up following heavy drinking, might not be normative. This finding may be useful for those designing campus health promotion campaigns that are designed to change perception of social norms. Furthermore, results from this study might have a significant effect on reducing high risk sexual behaviors and the incidence of sexual transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS, and unintended pregnancy.

Risks for STDs and unintended pregnancies are not uniformly spread among the entire human population; college-age adults have the highest risk compared to others (Klein, Geaghan, and MacDonald, 2007). Consequently, it is important to target this population with awareness messages and preventative educational interventions. Thus, the results of this study should be considered by health educators in designing interventions to reduce high risk behaviors and promote responsible drinking, responsible sexual decision making, and safer sex.

APPENDIX A

FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS ON CHARACTER TRAITS

Table 1

Positive Character Item	Factor Loading	Cronbach's alpha
David/Linda is an honest person	.739	.889
David/Linda is a trustworthy person	.812	
David/Linda is a dependable person	.846	
David/Linda is a responsible person	.837	
David/Linda is a person with high moral and ethical standards	.849	
David/Linda is a person who makes good decisions	.771	
 Likability Item	 Factor Loading	 Cronbach's alpha
David/Linda is a likeable person	.845	.676
David/Linda is the type of person I would want for my friend	.757	
David is a happy person	.793	
 Negative Behavior Item	 Factor Loading	 Cronbach's alpha
David/Linda is the type of person who will probably embezzle money from his/her employer	.892	.854
David/Linda would probably rob his best friend if he thought he could get away with it	.900	
David/Linda would probably cheat on an exam if he/she thought he/she would get a better grade	.784	
David/Linda is the type of person who will probably cheat on his/her spouse.	.737	

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FEMALE
PARTICIPANTS – DIFFERENCE BY VIGNETTE TYPE; NO DIFFERENCE BY
MODEL; NO SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION EFFECTS

Table 2

Female Participants	Overall	Main Effects		Interaction
		Model	Vignette	Model Gender x Vignette
<hr/>				
Likability				
F Value	8.88	.112	19.30	1.89
Probability	<.001	.738	<.001	0.133
<hr/>				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up	Hook-Up
			Condoms-Almost Always	Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.77 ^a	10.32 ^b	10.15 ^b	9.341 ^c
Means with the same letter are not significantly different				
<hr/>				
Positive Character				
F Value	20.68	.451	47.78	1.14
Probability	<.001	.503	<.001	.333
<hr/>				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up	Hook-Up
			Condoms-Almost Always	Condoms-Rarely
Mean	22.93 ^a	18.17 ^b	17.66 ^b	16.01 ^c
Means with the same letter are not significantly different				
<hr/>				
Negative Behavior				
F Value	1.61	2.34	1.42	1.70
Probability	.136	.128	.239	.170
<hr/>				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up	Hook-Up
			Condoms-Almost Always	Condoms-Rarely
Mean	9.62 ^a	10.47 ^a	9.60 ^a	10.37 ^a
Means with the same letter are not significantly different				

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MALE PARTICIPANTS

– DIFFERENCE BY VIGNETTE TYPE; NO DIFFERENCE BY MODEL; NO

SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION EFFECTS

Table 3

Male Participants	Overall	Main Effects Model		Interaction Model Gender x Vignette
		Vignette		
Likability				
F Value	1.19	.825	.016	2.41
Probability	.325	.368	.997	.079
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.17 ^a	11.33 ^a	11.18 ^a	11.16 ^a
Means with the same letter are not significantly different.				
Positive Character				
F Value	2.01	.122	3.231	1.18
Probability	.074	.728	.031	.326
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	22.71a	18.03b	19.31ab	17.45b
Means with the same letter are not significantly different.				
Negative Behavior				
F Value	.995	2.60	.218	1.24
Probability	.447	.114	.884	.306
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	9.42 ^a	9.93 ^a	10.00 ^a	9.49 ^a
Means with the same letter are not significantly different.				

APPENDIX D

MEAN SCALE SCORES BY VIGNETTE FOR FEMALE PARTICIPANTS

Table 4

Likability – Male Model (David)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.45	10.24	10.61	9.45
SD	1.11	1.22	1.30	1.99
n	30	22	20	24
Likability – Female Model (Linda)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	12.09	10.41	9.69	9.23
SD	1.74	1.56	2.13	1.68
n	22	22	23	24
Positive Character – Male Model (David)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	22.19	18.21	18.03	15.74
SD	2.50	2.02	2.99	3.31
n	30	22	20	20
Positive Character – Female Model (Linda)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	23.67	18.14	17.28	16.28
SD	3.35	2.73	3.93	3.08
n	22	22	23	24
Negative Behavior – Male Model (David)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	10.43	11.13	9.35	10.37
SD	1.11	1.22	1.30	1.99
n	30	22	20	24
Negative Behavior – Female Model (Linda)				
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	8.82	9.82	9.86	10.37
SD	2.42	2.82	3.66	2.49
N	22	22	23	24

APPENDIX E

MEAN SCALE SCORES BY VIGNETTE FOR MALE PARTICIPANTS

Table 5

Likability – Male Model (David)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.26	11.00	12.93		10.80
SD	2.08	1.41	1.77		1.95
n	6	5	6		7
Likability – Female Model (Linda)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.07	11.65	9.42		11.52
SD	1.89	2.40	3.87		1.40
n	8	11	7		5
Positive Character – Male Model (David)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	23.32	17.80	20.33		15.13
SD	4.00	4.44	7.50		3.16
n	6	5	6		7
Positive Character – Female Model (Linda)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	22.11	18.25	18.28		19.78
SD	2.71	3.94	7.32		3.20
n	8	11	7		5
Negative Behavior – Male Model (David)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	7.16	9.60	9.66		9.42
SD	2.71	2.19	3.50		3.60
n	6	5	6		7
Negative Behavior – Female Model (Linda)					
Vignette Type	Basic	Drinking	Hook-Up Condoms-Almost	Always	Hook-Up Condoms-Rarely
Mean	11.12	10.08	10.28		9.59
SD	2.30	2.02	4.39		1.81
n	8	11	7		5

REFERENCES

- Aicken, C. H., Nardone, A., & Mercer, C. H. (2011). Alcohol misuse, sexual risk behaviour and adverse sexual health outcomes: evidence from Britain's national probability sexual behaviour surveys. *Journal of Public Health, 33*(2), 262-271.
- Bloomfield, K., Wicki, M., Wilsnack, S., Hughes, T., & Gmel, G. (2011). International Differences in Alcohol Use According to Sexual Orientation. *Substance Abuse, 32*(4), 210-219.
- Cooper, L. Alcohol Use and Risky Sexual Behavior among College Students and Youth: Evaluating the Evidence*. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol / Supplement, 14*, 101-115.
- Glenn, N., & Marquardt, E. (2001). *Hooking Up, Hanging Out and Hoping for Mr. Right: College Women on Dating and Mating Today*. Report to the Independent Women's Forum, Institute for American Values.
- Holmes, K. K., Levine, R., & Weaver, M. (2004). Effectiveness of condoms in preventing sexually transmitted infections. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 84*-454-461.
- Hutton, H., Mccauley, M., Chander, G., Jenckes, M., Nollen, C., Sharp, V., & Erbelding, E. (2013). Alcohol Use, Anal Sex, and Other Risky Sexual Behaviors Among HIV-Infected Women and Men. *AIDS & Behavior, 17*(5), 1694-1704.
- Jonason, P.K., & Marls, M.J. (2009). Common vs. uncommon sexual acts: Evidence for the double standard. *Sex Roles, 60*, 357-365.

- Klein, W., Geaghan, T., & MacDonald, T. (2007). Unplanned Sexual Activity as a Consequence of Alcohol Use: A Prospective Study of Risk Perceptions and Alcohol Use Among College Freshmen. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(3), 317-323.
- Maisto, S., Palfai, T., Vanable, P., Heath, J., & Woolf-King, S. (2012). The effects of alcohol and sexual arousal on determinants of sexual risk in men who have sex with men. *Archives Of Sexual Behavior*, 41(4), 971-986.
- Marks, M. (2008). Evaluation of sexually active men and women under divided attention: A social cognitive approach to the sexual double standard. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 84-91.
- Milhausen, R.R., & Herold, E. S. (2001). Reconceptualizing the sexual double standard. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*. 13, 63-83.
- Penhollow, T. M., Young, M., & Bailey, W. (2007). Relationship between religiosity and “hooking-up” behavior. *American Journal of Health Education*, 38, 338-345.
- Scott-Sheldon, L., Carey, M., & Carey, K. (2010). Alcohol and risky sexual behavior among heavy drinking college students [corrected] [published erratum appears in AIDS BEHAV 2011 Feb;15(1):252]. *AIDS & Behavior*, 14(4), 845-853.
- Sivaram, S., Srikrishnan, A., Latkin, C., Iriundo-Perez, J., Go, V., Solomon, S., & Celentano, D. (2008). Male alcohol use and unprotected sex with non-regular partners: evidence from wine shops in Chennai, India. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence*, 94(1-3), 133-141.
- Stueve, A., & O'Donnell, L. (2005). Early alcohol initiation and subsequent sexual and alcohol risk behaviors among urban youths. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(5), 887-893.

Young, M., Kittleson, M., & Cardenas, S. (2015). Waiting until marriage or not: Do adolescents believe in a sexual double standard? (unpublished manuscript).

Young, M., Penhollow, T., & Bailey, W. (2010). Hooking-up and condom provision: is there a double standard. *American Journal of Health Studies*: 25(3) 2010, 25(3), 156-164.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Tonychris Nnaka is an Honors student at the University of Texas Arlington in the College of Nursing and Health Innovation. While pursuing his undergraduate degree, he developed a passion for research; ever since, he has relentlessly striven to achieve expertise in his research skills as an undergraduate. Tonychris is mentored by Dr. Michael Young (UT Arlington College of Nursing and Health Innovation). His research interests are in behavioral sciences and issues affecting the healthcare system. Tonychris hopes to attend the University of North Texas Health Science Center to pursue his dream of earning a public health doctor of philosophy degree, with emphasis on health administration and health policy.