9-2017

Sexual conflict in mating strategies

Norman P. LI
Singapore Management University, normanli@smu.edu.sg

Jin Chuan YONG
Singapore Management University, jc.yong.2012@phdps.smu.edu.sg

Sexual Conflict in Mating Strategies

Norman P. Li, Jose C. Yong, Singapore Management University

Published in Encyclopedia of evolutionary psychological science, 2017, Springer.

DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6_1988-1

Synonyms

Error management theory; Rape; Sexual aggression; Sexual conflict; Sexual harassment; Strategic interference

Definition

Sexual conflict in mating strategies occur when men and women come into conflict as a result of pursuing different mating strategies with nonoverlapping or opposing objectives.

Introduction

Why do men and women come into conflict over mating and sex? This chapter examines the adaptive reasons, which trace back to key differences in minimum obligatory parental investment (Trivers 1972). Reflecting these differences, men tend to be relatively eager for casual sex, whereas women are relatively more cautious, requiring their sexual partners to be of higher quality or committed for a longer duration. As each side strives for its own reproductive interests, the other side's strategy is often interfered with, resulting in conflict.

Evolutionary Roots of Sexual Conflict in Mating Strategies

In most sexually reproducing species, females are physiologically obligated to make a larger minimum investment than males of time, energy, and resources to produce and develop offspring. In mammalian species, offspring develop inside the female and rely on the mother for nourishment and nurturance for the first few years of life. Although males often make significant parental investments, their minimum obligatory investment consists mainly of their sperm. Due to the large discrepancy in minimum required investment, females are more reproductively valuable and have evolved to be choosier about potential mates because mating mistakes are costlier to them. That is, females increase their overall reproductive success by ensuring that their sexual partners have sufficient genetic and material resources that they are willing to share (Buss and Schmitt 1993; Symons 1979). Human males, on the other hand, are much less biologically constrained and have evolved to compete for sexual access to females (Bjorklund and Shackelford 1999; Trivers 1972). Indeed, males are able to increase their overall reproductive success by increasing the number of partners that they inseminate – a generally undesirable strategy for human females, who are potentially bound to several years of maternal investment for any given sexual encounter. Therefore, whereas human males tend to benefit relatively more than females from pursuing a mating strategy of quickly amassing reproductive quantity, human females tend to benefit more relative to males from pursuing a strategy of slowly and carefully ensuring quality.

This asymmetry in reproductive costs and benefits shapes the variation in strategies preferred by men and women in their pursuit of sexual relationships with each other. As shown below, the resulting divergence in mating strategies is a source for much potential sexual conflict (Goetz and Shackelford 2009).

Sex Differences in Standards and Eagerness for Casual Sex

Stemming from differences in minimum required parental investment and the associated asymmetry in costs and benefits, men have evolved lower standards and greater eagerness for casual sex, whereas women have evolved to have higher standards and greater caution toward casual sex (Symons 1979). Men's lower standards have been demonstrated across numerous surveys (e.g., Buss and Schmitt 1993; Li et al. 2002). For instance, one study asked people to indicate the minimum acceptable percentile level for 24 different characteristics pertaining to a potential partner for a single date, sexual relations, steady dating, and marriage (Kenrick et al. 1990). Whereas women's minimum requirements started out relatively low for a date and rose steadily as the relationship became more sexual and significant, men's minimum requirements were significantly lower than women's for both dates and for sexual relations.

Take intelligence for instance. Both sexes required potential dates to be at the median level of intelligence, and both sexes required their steady dating and marriage partners to be clearly above the median. However, whereas women required their sexual partners to be above the median on intelligence, men were willing to accept a one-night stand whose intelligence was low (31st percentile; Kenrick et al. 1990). Other surveys have similarly indicated that compared to women, men desire and anticipate having more sexual partners (e.g., Simpson and Gangestad 1991), desire greater sexual variety, and have more sexual fantasies.

Behaviorally, men are the primary consumers of pornography and prostitution, and are also more likely to engage in extramarital affairs. In a set of classic field studies (Clark and Hatfield 1989), opposite-sex students were randomly approached on campus by experimenters and told, "I have been noticing you around campus. I find you to be very attractive." They were then either asked to "go out with me," "come over to my apartment," or "go to bed with me" that evening. For a simple date, men and women were similarly likely to accept the invitation – roughly half of each sex said yes. However, as the likelihood of immediate sexual intimacy increased, the sexes sharply diverged in their responses. While a meager 3% of the women agreed to go back to the man's apartment, nearly 70% of men consented to heading to the woman's apartment. For the more direct sexual request, not one woman agreed, and many were clearly upset at having been sexually solicited (e.g., "What is wrong with you? Leave me alone."). In stark contrast, more than 70% of men agreed to the sexual invitation, with some expressing greater urgency (e.g., "Why do we have to wait until tonight?"). Men who declined made sure to indicate mitigating circumstances ("I'm going with someone") or affirm their underlying interest (e.g., "I can't tonight but tomorrow would be fine.").

Conflict Concerning if and when Sex Occurs

Given that men and women diverge significantly in their focus on short-term quantity versus long-term quality and their attitudes toward casual sexual relations, it is not hard to imagine men's and women's mating strategies coming into conflict. Whereas women are more interested in having sexual relations with partners of sufficient quality who can invest, men prefer having many low-cost sexual relationships and to have them sooner versus later. The subsections below describe how these strategies come into conflict in the way that men and women infer sexual intent and how men, being more eager, may push for their interests while women, being more cautious, resist.

Error Management Theory

People often make judgments under conditions of uncertainty, whereby they do not know the exact states of factors relevant to their decisions. According to error management theory (Haselton and Buss 2000), such decisions effectively pit a Type I error (falsely inferring the existence of a particular state) against a Type II error (falsely denying the existence of that state). For recurrent situations of reproductive significance, humans likely evolved a systematic bias to make related decisions that favor committing the less costly error.

One such situation involves inferring sexual intent in opposite-sex others. For men, additional sexual partners can contribute directly to reproductive success. However, because women tend to be cautious about casual sex, most men do not have access to many casual sexual partners (Symons 1979). Thus, a Type II error – incorrectly inferring a lack of sexual interest when it is actually present – means losing valuable reproductive resources. In comparison, a Type I error – incorrectly inferring sexual interest when it is absent – results in a comparatively smaller cost of wasted time and effort (Haselton and Buss 2000). Given this cost asymmetry, men may have evolved to overinfer sexual interest in women.

For women, casual sex does not offer the same gains in reproductive success, and potential casual sexual partners are not scarce. Thus, missing a sexual opportunity from falsely inferring a lack of sexual interest is not particularly costly for women. However, women would incur a potentially expensive error if they were to have sexual relations after falsely inferring commitment from their potential mates (Haselton and Buss 2000). Such a mistake could lead to tying up years of reproductive resources without the support of paternal resources. In comparison, incorrectly inferring that male commitment is insufficient is not as costly, as such an interpretation may also encourage additional or greater displays of quality, investment, and commitment from potential partners. Thus, due to asymmetries in the costliness of errors associated with assessing male relationship commitment, women have likely evolved a commitment skepticism bias (Haselton and Buss 2000).

Directly investigating sexual intent, a classic study randomly placed people into male–female pairs and assigned them to be actors chatting for 5 minutes, or observers instructed to watch the conversation through a one-way mirror (Abbey 1982). Both male observers and actors perceived females having conversations to be more promiscuous and more platonically, romantically, and sexually interested than female observers and actors did. Male actors and observers also reported greater sexual attraction toward the female actor than female actors and observers reported toward the male actor.

Although various explanations have been proposed for these findings, Haselton and Buss (2000) empirically demonstrated that sex differences in the perception of sexual intent reflect error management theory. Specifically, they showed that people are not simply projecting their own views onto their perceptions of sexual intent in opposite-sex others, and that men's perceptions of women's sexual intent differ for a potential mate versus their sister. The latter finding indicates that men are not simply ascribing greater sexual intent to all women but, rather, just to those who constitute potential mates.

Sexual Aggressiveness

Behavioral conflicts may also be induced by sex differences in perceptions of sexual intent as well as the underlying sex differences in desired sexual urgency. This section covers two broad categories of sexually aggressive behavior: sexual harassment and rape. Whereas sexual harassment involves unwanted or unsolicited sexual attention in general, rape more specifically focuses on the use of coercive physical force to achieve sexual intercourse.

Sexual harassment: Mating conflict in the workplace. In the modern workplace, men and women spend a significant amount of time coming into close contact and getting acquainted with each other. Such an evolutionarily novel environment may be especially conducive to the development of conflicts in mating strategies, as opposite-sex co-workers who can potentially be attracted to each other are expected to interact nonsexually. Indeed, in some work environments, up to 90% of women have reported being sexually harassed in some form.

In the United States, sexual harassment laws grant legal recourse to individuals who receive "unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature." Such conducts cover an extensive range of behaviors, including staring in a sexually suggestive manner; making remarks considered offensive about looks, clothing, or body parts; touching (e.g., patting, pinching, or intentional brushing against another's body); telling sexual jokes or displaying sexually suggestive posters; making sexual gestures; and sending, forwarding, or soliciting sexually suggestive letters, notes, e-mails, or images. Since the mid-1990s, over 10,000 sexual harassment charges have been filed each year. Consistent with sex differences in reproductive strategies, the large majority of filers are female.

A well-publicized sexual harassment case occurred when Paula Jones filed charges against President Bill Clinton in 1994. According to Jones' testimony, while Clinton was governor of Arkansas, he exposed his penis to Jones, who was then an employee of the state of Arkansas, and asked her for oral sex in a hotel room. Over the next few years, the president's sexual history was investigated and made public, but the eventual ruling was that there was insufficient evidence that Jones had suffered any emotional damage. Nevertheless, Clinton settled out of court for $850,000 (with no apologies).

Another interesting case involves the supermarket chain Safeway, which, in the late 1990s, reinstated a "superior customer service" policy requiring employees to smile, make eye contact with, and warmly greet customers by their name. In the duration of the Safeway program, various female employees were asked about their marital status, propositioned for dates, touched, grabbed, and followed after work to their cars by male customers. Five female employees filed formal charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, alleging that the Safeway program encourages sexual harassment by creating a hostile work environment.

Both the Clinton and Safeway cases reflect mating-related strategic interference (Buss 1989) – violations of one's preferred mating strategy – in the workplace. That is, much of the sexual harassment that occurs ultimately stems from fundamental sex differences in preferred mating strategies, whereby men are more eager for sexual relations and women are more cautious. In this view, laws governing sexual harassment specifically target the violation of a slow mating strategy by discouraging men (and some women) from pursuing or showing signs of a relatively eager sexual strategy and acting upon potential overperceptions of sexual interest (as well as strategically feigned displays of interest).

Studies focusing on the characteristics of alleged targets of sexual harassment lend further support to a strategic interference perspective. For example, younger women tend to be more frequently harassed than older women, reflecting men's preference for younger, and implicitly more fertile, mates (Buss and Schmitt 1993). In fact, people are less likely to believe that a woman who claims sexual harassment was actually harassed if she is physically unattractive – and thus, less sexually desirable – than if she is attractive (Seiter and Dunn 2001). Similarly, women are more likely to be upset by persistent unwanted advances from low-status men such as garbage collectors and janitors than by high-status men such as graduate students and rock stars (Buss 2003). Such findings indicate that sexual harassment is not random conflict, but rather, it

stems from one sex pursuing their evolved mating preferences without the full consent of the other sex, who has their own preferences and standards.

Although men are typically blamed for their unwanted sexual advances, some findings suggest that women's behaviors may play a role in triggering men's overperception of sexual interest. For instance, women, significantly more than men, report smiling and flirting to elicit special treatment from the opposite sex, despite having no sexual interest toward such individuals (Buss 2003). In such cases, men's evolved sexual eagerness is being exploited which may, at times, contribute to sexual harassment.

In summary, the modern-day workplace presents an evolutionarily novel context in which men and women work, interact, and come into close contact with each other. As such, it constitutes a potential mating market as well as a stage for sexual conflict. Various studies are consistent with the possibility that sexual harassment typically occurs as a result of sexual conflict over mating strategies. Although co-workers or customers and service staff are not expected to get sexually involved, they might get attracted to desirable members of the opposite sex in these contexts. Regardless of their social or work roles, men who are relatively more eager for sex may be suggestively indicating their interests toward women, who are strategically more hesitant and who may falsely suggest sexual interest in order to coax other forms of investment from the men. Importantly, and consistent with an evolutionary perspective, sexual advances are more likely to be unwanted, and thus, viewed as harassment, if they involve less socially desirable male perpetrators and younger and more physically attractive female targets.

Rape. A more direct and serious conflict involves forced sexual intercourse or rape – an act that is not limited to humans. Take scorpionflies for instance. When male scorpionflies have access to viable food sources (e.g., arthropods), they typically present food gifts to females, who accept such gifts while offering sexual access in return. However, when food gifts are unobtainable, males will sometimes use their anatomical clamps, or "genital claspers," to hold the wings of female scorpionflies in place in order to force copulation. Males that are smaller and less capable of securing food are typically the ones who use their clamps to secure matings (Thornhill and Palmer 2000).

An example closer to humans involves orangutans (Wrangham and Peterson 1996), for which there are two male forms: adult and subadult types. Whereas adults are physically larger, more dominant, and more adept at obtaining consensual matings with females, subadults are generally smaller and less dominant and have difficulty finding interested and willing sexual partners. Consistent with this distinction, subadult males have been observed to be more likely to force copulation onto females than adult males. As with the scorpionfly, the forced matings pursued by subadult orangutans are more the exception than the norm and seem to reflect conditional mating strategies. That is, when such males fail in intrasexual competition or are otherwise unable to provide females with the necessary resources to facilitate consensual sexual relations, the males adopt sexual coercion as a last resort to gain sexual access.

Rape in humans is a widely studied topic. As with sexual harassment, the victim is usually female. In one survey, 54% of American women reported some form of sexual victimization, while 27% reported experiencing rape or attempted rape (Koss et al. 1987). Perpetrators might be strangers, but more than 80% of sexual victimization cases deal with acquaintances, boyfriends, or husbands.

Drawing from an evolutionary perspective, some theorists have proposed that male rape might be an adaptive, conditional mating strategy, such as the ones employed by male scorpionflies and orangutans. Specifically, Thornhill and Thornhill (1983) argued that men may have evolved to rape (or be more likely to rape) when they are unable to obtain a mate through intrasexual competition. This view has been termed as the "mate-deprivation hypothesis" (Lalumiere et al. 1996). Shields and Shields (1983) proposed a similar hypothesis with an additional integration of sociocultural theories of male hostility and power. Both sets of

researchers argued for greater attention to be paid to an evolutionary perspective and advocated the use of a reproductive cost–benefit approach to understanding rape.

More recently, Thornhill and Palmer (2000) presented and evaluated two evolutionary conceptions of rape. On the one hand, rape may be a by-product of other evolved mating mechanisms, such as the male desire for low-cost (minimal courtship) mating and sexual variety. On the other hand, rape could represent a specialized adaptation that activates under certain circumstances. As part of the adaptation, men are hypothesized to have various psychological mechanisms that promote this strategy, including the ability to assess the vulnerability of potential rape targets, a rape mindset that activates when sexual access to consenting partners is blocked, preferences for young and fertile females, and sexual arousal in response to female resistance to men's sexual advances (Thornhill and Palmer 2000).

There is a fair amount of evidence for rape as an evolved mating strategy (see Camilleri and Stiver 2014). For instance, an important prediction made by the rape-as-adaptation hypothesis is that male rapists should have a preference, if not requirement, for fertile females. The potential costs of rape in ancestral times were relatively large and included retaliation from the female, her kin, and her long-term romantic partners. Given such costs, an evolved strategy for male rape should be designed by selection to be particularly attuned to targeting females most likely to bear children. Indeed, similar to those claiming sexual harassment, rape victims appear to be disproportionately in their early 20s (Shackelford 2002) when fertility is highest, with almost 80% of rape victims in the age range of 16–34. It might be argued that this finding is a by-product of women in this age group being more likely to associate with young men, who are themselves the age group most likely to engage in criminal activities in general. However, a comparison between the age distributions of rape and murder victims contradicts this explanation (Thornhill and Thornhill 1983) – murder victims tend to be older than rape victims and are not concentrated among individuals in their 20s.

The most direct evidence of rape's potential reproductive gains for men comes from pregnancy rates of rape victims. Whereas consensual-pregnancy rates are around 3%, rape-pregnancy rates are significantly higher, near 8% (Gottschall and Gottschall 2003). The majority of rape pregnancies were also concentrated in the 15–24 victim age range. However, rapists' targeting of reproductively aged women may be interpretable from other mating mechanisms. When choosing partners, men are found to have a preference for young women, especially those in the most fertile age range (Buss and Schmitt 1993; Symons 1979). Thus, rapists' choice of fertile targets might reflect an expression of typical male mate preferences. Greater pregnancy rates in rape victims might be due to male sensitivity to female ovulatory cues, coupled with the fact that the rapist is, unlike nonrapists, unconstrained by female choice.

On the other hand, the mate deprivation hypothesis has not received much support for its prediction that men who are unable to obtain mates will tend toward rape (e.g., Lalumiere et al. 1996). In fact, men who reported being physically and nonphysically sexually coercive also reported having higher mating success and more sexual experience. Although this appears to contradict the adaptation hypothesis, it is possible that this survey tapped into a more modern form of "date rape" committed by males who are capable of getting dates but use aggression to speed up or increase the likelihood of copulation, rather than deprivation-motivated (or "loser male") rape, which could involve strangers and is likely rare among college students. Indeed, a more nuanced evolutionary conception of rape has been proposed by others (McKibbin, Shackelford, Goetz, and Starratt 2008; but c.f. Camilleri 2012). Taking a domain-specific approach, they proposed that five distinctly different types of rapists may have evolved for specific functions: disadvantaged men, specialized rapists, opportunistic rapists, high-mating-effort men, and partner rapists. Perhaps it is useful to conceive of mate-deprivation motivated rape not as a single adaptation but as an initial filter through which other rape adaptations have evolved (Camilleri 2012, p. 180).

While further support for general or specific male rape adaptations is still needed, rape nevertheless constitutes a violation of females' mate choice and preferred mating strategy. Regardless of its ultimate cause, rape, to the extent that it recurrently occurred in the ancestral past, would have exerted selection pressures for female adaptations to prevent rape.

Evidence for Female Antirape Adaptations

One candidate for a female antirape adaptation is psychological pain from rape. Physical pain draws attention to a part of one's physiology that needs tending to, whereas mental pain draws attention to the social circumstances leading to the pain and motivates avoidance of future similar situations. For example, people become upset in response to having been sexually deceived, which prevents similar mistakes in the future (Haselton et al. 2005). A series of studies reported by Thornhill and Palmer (2000) found that rape victims who were reproductively aged experienced more psychological trauma from rape, as compared with pre- and post-reproductively aged women. Furthermore, vaginal intercourse during rape led to greater psychological trauma – but only in reproductively aged victims. This highlights the sensitivity of psychological pain to the magnitude of the reproductive costs involved, whereby reproductively aged women are the most likely to be impregnated by an undesirable mate as a result of rape.

Trauma experienced by rape potentially serves a corrective purpose, driving the victim to be acutely aware of relevant dangers and to avoid them at all costs. But without previous experience, women also seem instinctively avoidant of risky behaviors, especially when the cost of rape is highest. One such situation is when women are in their ovulatory phase – the one-or-two-day window each month when the chance of conception is highest. For instance, one study asked female participants to evaluate a set of activities on how likely these activities would place someone in a position that is "vulnerable to sexual assault" (Chavanne and Gallup 1998, p. 29). A separate group of females indicated which activities, among the set, they had carried out in the past 24 hours. As predicted, using a composite score across all activities, participants indicated taking the least amount of risks during their ovulatory phase. Criticizing their use of a composite risk-taking score, others performed a follow-up variant of the study and found that ovulating women specifically increased their nonrisky activities, such as reading at home, while avoiding risky activities, such as getting drunk or walking alone in a park. Another intriguing study found that female handgrip strength significantly increased after women read a hypothetical sexual assault scenario and that this effect was specific to women in their ovulatory phase (Petralia and Gallup 2002). The researchers interpreted the findings as tentative evidence for a female adaptation to resist rape when pregnancy risk is highest.

Female rape avoidance behaviors have also been found to increase with other individual factors, such as greater physical attractiveness, already having a mate, and not being sociosexually oriented towards short-term, casual sex (McKibbin et al. 2010). In general, women's rape avoidance behaviors may serve the functions of avoiding: strange men, being viewed as sexually receptive or being alone, and having a heightened awareness of one's surroundings in the interest of defensive preparedness.

To the extent that rape is a sexual conflict, its enactment (versus prevention) confers reproductive benefits onto one sex while exacting costs on the other. Rape is not only costly to females by circumventing their mate and reproductive timing choices, but can also cause physical injury and might lead to abandonment by the female's current mate (Thornhill and Thornhill 1983).

Conflicts of Deception

Conflict can also occur when individuals misrepresent themselves or their intentions to further their own mating strategy but are later found out. Although some deception is not specific to a particular sex, an

evolutionary perspective would also predict that much deception would be patterned around the different mating strategies and mate-selection criteria used by men and women (Buss 1989; Haselton et al. 2005). The prevalence of mating-related deception has been documented in many studies. For instance, people lie to others in more than 25% of their daily social interactions. In mating contexts, both sexes use a diverse set of deceptive acts, both intra- and intersexually (Haselton et al. 2005).

One major type of sexual deception involves misrepresenting one's sexual intentions. As described earlier, men around the world consistently desire a greater number of sexual partners than women do (Buss and Schmitt 1993). Given that men are more eager for sexual relations than women are, it comes as no surprise that men, more than women, are deceptive in service of obtaining sex. In one study 71% of college men admitted to having exaggerated their love and commitment to their potential mates in order to have sex (Buss 2003).

Women, more than men, report having used sexual teasing – intentionally offering some form of sexual contact and withdrawing that offer (Meston and O'Sullivan 2007). As described above, many women admit to flirting with men with whom they have no intention of having sex in order to extract favors from these men (Buss 2003). Correspondingly, more men than women report having been sexually "led on" and being emotionally upset in response to being deceived about sexual access (Haselton et al. 2005). Newlywed women are more likely than newlywed men to report having acted coy and having played hard to get as tactics in attracting their spouse. Thus, while sexual teasing might be an effective female strategy to extract favors and resources from men who are trying to employ a short-term mating strategy, it may also have the effect of allowing women to more effectively fulfill a long-term mating strategy.

On the other hand, men, more often than women, misrepresent their commitment and interest in long-term relations in order to obtain sexual access. This strategy is especially favored by men who are narcissistic, Machiavellian, and psychopathic – "Dark Triad" traits associated with being more sociosexually unrestricted, having more lifetime sexual partners, and more actively seeking out short-term sexual partners (Jonason et al. 2009). Taken together, these patterns suggest that, regarding sexual access, each sex may be misrepresenting compliance with the other sex's preferred mating strategy in order to promote their personal interests and mating goals.

Conclusion

Sexual conflicts in mating often involve differences in how sexual intent and sexual deception are perceived by men and women. These differences originate from asymmetries in parental investment and can result in sexual harassment and rape. Although men often invest heavily in their children, only women are physiologically obligated to make a substantial initial parental investment (Trivers 1972). This key difference selects for different optimal mating strategies for men and women. Whereas men have evolved to seek greater numbers of fertile mates, women have evolved to be more careful about ensuring that potential sexual partners are of high quality and are willing and able to invest in them and their offspring (Buss and Schmitt 1993; Symons 1979). Therefore, as many studies show, the sexes' preferred mating strategies will often come into conflict. Compared with women, men's eagerness for sex tends to induce overperceptions of sexual intent and greater sexual aggressiveness, which may result in sexual harassment and even coerced sex. Furthermore, members of each sex often deceive the opposite sex (potential mating partners) to induce them to comply with their own preferred sexual strategies. This is done by creating the false impression in the opposite sex that they (the opposite sex individuals) are successfully enacting their own preferred sexual strategies.

Although research has covered a lot of conceptual and empirical ground, there are still various important dimensions related to this topic that have yet to be investigated or considered. For instance, female harassers have been found to be disproportionately younger, single, and more attractive than the average working woman (e.g., Studd and Gattiker 1991). From an evolutionary perspective on mating conflict, such female harassment might be interpreted as attempts by unmated women to solicit potential partners. However, why especially desirable women would need to harass their potential mates is baffling and requires further explanation. Readers are advised to keep posted for future developments on this topic.

References

Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830–838.

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

Buss, D. M. (1989). Conflict between the sexes: Strategic interference and the evocation of anger and upset. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 735–747.

Buss, D. M. (2003). The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating (Revised Ed.). New York: Free Press.Google Scholar

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

Camilleri, J. A. (2012). Evolutionary psychological perspectives on sexual offending: From etiology to intervention. In T. K. Shackelford & V. A. Weekes-Shackelford (Eds.), Oxford handbook of evolutionary perspectives on violence, homicide, and war (pp. 173–196). New York: Oxford University Press.Google Scholar

Camilleri, J. A., & Stiver, K. A. (2014). Adaptation and sexual offending. In T. K. Shackelford & V. A. Weekes-Shackelford (Eds.), Evolutionary perspectives on human sexual psychology and behavior (pp. 43–67). New York: Springer.

Chavanne, T. J., & Gallup, G. G. (1998). Variation in risk taking behavior among female college students as a function of the menstrual cycle. Evolution and Human Behavior, 19, 27–32.

Clark, R. D., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2, 39–55.

Goetz, A. T., & Shackelford, T. K. (2009). Sexual conflict in humans: Evolutionary consequences of asymmetric parental investment and paternity uncertainty. Animal Biology, 59, 449–456.

Gottschall, J., & Gottschall, T. (2003). Are per-incident rape-pregnancy rates higher than per-incident consensual pregnancy rates? Human Nature, 14, 1–20.

Haselton, M. G., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Error management theory: A new perspective on biases in cross-sex mind reading. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 81–91.

Haselton, M. G., Buss, D. M., Oubaid, V., & Angleitner, A. (2005). Sex, lies, and strategic interference: The psychology of deception between the sexes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 3–23.

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. W., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). The Dark Triad: Facilitating short-term mating in men. European Journal of Personality, 23, 5–18.

Kenrick, D. T., Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G., & Trost, M. R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of human courtship: Qualifying the parental investment model. Journal of Psychology, 82, 947–955.Google Scholar

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting, 55, 162–170.

Lalumiere, M. L., Chalmers, L. J., Quinsey, V. L., & Seto, M. C. (1996). A test of the mate deprivation hypothesis of sexual coercion. Ethology and Sociobiology, 17, 299–318.

Li, N. P., Bailey, J. M., Kenrick, D. T., & Linsenmeier, J. A. W. (2002). The necessities and luxuries of mate preferences: Testing the tradeoffs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82, 947–955.

McKibbin, W. F., Bates, V. M., Shackelford, T. K., LaMunyon, C. W., & Hafen, C. A. (2010). Risk of sperm competition moderates the relationship between men's satisfaction with their partner and men's interest in their partner's copulatory orgasm. Personality and Individual Differences, 49, 961–966.

McKibbin, W. F., Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Starratt, V. G. (2008). Why do men rape? An evolutionary psychological perspective. Review of General Psychology, 12, 86–97.

Meston, C. M., & O'Sullivan, L. F. (2007). Such a tease: Intentional sexual provocation within heterosexual interactions. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36, 531–542.

Petralia, S. M., & Gallup, G. G. (2002). Effects of a sexual assault scenario on handgrip strength across the menstrual cycle. Evolution and Human Behavior, 23, 3–10.

Seiter, J. S., & Dunn, D. (2001). Beauty and believability in sexual harassment cases: Does physical attractiveness affect perceptions of veracity and the likelihood of being harassed? Communication Research Reports, 17(2), 203–209.

Shackelford, T. K. (2002). Are young women the special targets of rape-murder? Aggressive Behavior, 28, 224–232.

Shields, W. M., & Shields, L. M. (1983). Forcible rape: An evolutionary perspective. Ethology and Sociobiology, 4, 115–136.

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 870–883.

Studd, M. V., & Gattiker, U. E. (1991). The evolutionary psychology of sexual harassment in organizations. Ethology & Sociobiology, 12, 249–290.

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

Thornhill, R., & Palmer, C. T. (2000). A natural history of rape: Biological bases of sexual coercion. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Thornhill, R., & Thornhill, N. W. (1983). Human rape: An evolutionary analysis. Ethology and Sociobiology, 4, 137–173.

Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), Sexual selection and the descent of man 1871–1971 (pp. 136–179). Chicago: Aldine.

Wrangham, R., & Peterson, D. (1996). Demonic males. New York: Houghton Mifflin.