Theories of Intimate Relationship : Part 1.

- ✓ **Instructor: Benjamin Karney**
- ✓ **Institution: Academic Earth**
- ✓ **Dictated by:** 최정훈, 박지영, 박상우, 신희경, 박고은

[0:00]

First of all, I have couple of announcements! Ah, last week, we didn't have our TA with us; she was at a professional conference, contributing to the growth of human knowledge.

But today she is back! I'd like to introduce her to you, she is Lisa Lu.

Lisa, I'd like you to stand up and wave to the class.

This is our TA.

You've got one, so if, let's say you need to discuss something about the course, how it's organized, or a question, or content in the course, and uh, I, I am indisposed, feel free to contact Lisa Lu.

Her office hours are printed in the syllabus, her e-mail's also there, so that's just another resource to help you navigate this course.

I'll tell you a, just a brief story, it has nothing to do with anything.

But I got a call from a journalist from San Diego, asking me if I had heard about a….intimate relationship course that was being offered in UCSD, and I said, "No, tell me about it."

She said, "In this course, the instructor has randomly paired up students in the class, and has them do exercises that will make them fall in love…that will make…he's doing exercise, he's having people do exercises that he believes according to research will inspire two people who do not know each other to fall in love with each other.

I said, and she wanted to know if I thought that was ethical, and I think it is probably not ethical, although you know, love is a good thing.

It's just messing with people's lives.

When we get to attraction, we'll talk about that research a little bit more.

But today we are not talking about that.

Today, we wanna pick up something…Leon, question? My mike is not on? (Tap Tap) Sounds not, but now it's on.

How about now? How about now? (Laughter) Alright, remember I said last week, that my optometrist came up to me and said, "Oh, I've got a theory about intimate relationships."

And pointed out that everybody has a theory about intimate relationships.

Well, you might ask yourself, why does everyone have a theory about intimate relationships?

What's the point, why would it be that an optometrist have a theory about intimate relationships?

Ah, it doesn't have a theory about necessarily, theory about every other social phenomenon, why theory of intimate relationships.

And the answer is that we can't operate without theories of the world.

As if intimate relationships are big part of our world we can't operate without theories of intimate relationships.

Now you might say, well that's not true, I approach my intimate relationships objectively like a scientist.

Which for I might turn around and say, oh but scientists need theories more than anyone.

[3:00]

And you might say, well shouldn't a theory be a product of your science?

You don't wanna start off with the theory and then do just prove your theory, you wanna do science objectively, collect the information.

And then, create a theory that, that sort of explains the data.

Well, that's surely not the way science works.

Science doesn't end with a theory.

It typically starts with a theory.

And it was mathematician who pointed this out very nicely where he said, "Science is, is indeed built up of facts as a house is built up of stones.

But, an accumulation of fact is no more a science than a hip of stones is a house.

In another words, understanding intimate relationships requires a lot more from us than gathering a bunch of facts and observations about intimate relationships.

What we need, are theories that help give shape to the fact that we collect.

And theories of intimate relationships are topic today.

We are gonna talk about a couple of big ones.

But first I want to say few more words, what is a theory?

What's a good theory supposed to do?

How are we supposed to judge what a theory of relationship is supposed to do?

Let's start with the idea of just what's a theory.

We will define a theory as an interconnected set of beliefs, knowledge and assumptions that relate to understanding a phenomenon.

Well, that's pretty broad.

I mean, by that definition, almost anything's a theory.

And exactly, that's exactly the point.

Any set of interconnected beliefs, knowledge, and assumptions represent a theory.

Well, you all have a set of beliefs, knowledge, and assumptions about intimate relationships.

That means each of you has theory right now about intimate relationship.

And so does my Optometrist, and so does my dad, and so do all of your Optometrist and all of your dads.

Everyone has a theory.

If you have any knowledge at all, then that means, that is your theory.

Now some theories are more articulate than others.

Some theories are more explicit than others.

Some people write down their theories and have a manifesto and that' says "this is what I believe!" Other people just have sort of vague notions and they couldn't even articulate them if you ask them to.

But they are all theories.

Because theories are sort of where we start.

And if theories are where we start, and a theory is also a map.

A theory is our current map of the world.

And if we are thinking about the part of the world that is intimate relationships, then our theory is, our current map of intimate relationships.

Then what does a map do? Map tells us what do expect, tells what the landmarks are, tells it's a guide, and that's what a theory is.

Our theory, our personal theory, your theory right now of intimate relationships, is your map of intimate relationships.

It's your guide to understanding what happens in intimate relationships.

[6:00]

Right now, you have a theory that if your partner buys you flowers, that means something.

Now you might not all have the same theory.

Some people might think when partner buys me flowers, that means my partner wants something from me and I should be suspicious.

Another people might have a theory their own, if my partner buys me flowers, that means that my partner appreciates me.

Those are big different theories of relationships.

But the point is that in both cases, your theory is your map that guides your behavior, that tells you what to do next.

And as you might imagine, some maps are better than others.

You can have a real detailed map with every single road, and it's just built in scale, or I might have a hastily scrolled map at the back of a napkin that leaves out details, and it's not in scale, that's distorted.

Theories are the same way.

Some theories might be really accurate depictions of the landscapes of relationships.

And some theories might be really poor or distorted descriptions of the landscape of

intimate relationships.

But they are all theories.

And they all do the same things.

Oh, let's be more explicit about what theories do.

What does a good theory do?

Well, one thing a theory does is it organizes its existing knowledge.

In other words, like said we don't just have accumulation of facts, but they are organized.

Some facts are more important than others.

How do we know? Our theory tells us so.

Our theories of intimate relationships let us know these are the important things to know about relationships.

For example, most theories about intimate relationships think that it is pretty important how people treat each other.

It's a theory that guides us to focus on some things and not the other things.

Some knowledge, are going to be important, and some is less important when is it organizes our knowledge, and than it draws attention to important processes.

Today, I am gonna talk about a handful of talk about two big theories of intimate relationships.

And on Friday, we are gonna talk about, if my wife hasn't had child yet, our child yet, we are going to talk about three more.

And each one of them draws attention to different important processes.

A theory should explain something, should answer a question.

A theory exists to answer questions for us.

And it should answer in a way that is elegant, is parsimonious.

The word, parsimonious, means to say a lot with a little.

To have a lot of meaning in a very small amount of words or symbols.

A theory does that for us.

Uh, do you know the comedian Steven Bright? He made a point about building a map that was a scale one to one.

Well, one-to-one map, where every inch of the map corresponds to the real inch in the world would be the real world.

[9:00]

The point of a map is that it's parsimonious.

It expresses the details of the real world in less detail than the real world.

Well, the theory does the same thing.

A theory reduces somehow.

It simplifies, every theory simplifies.

But that's its point.

A theory, a good theory will identify predictions and hypotheses.

A good theory explains what we know, and points to direction to what we don't know.

A good theory makes predictions.

A good theory says this is what will happen in the future.

And you will see that all the theories that I talk about this week do this.

Finally, if you're researcher, of course we all are, a theory guides measurement decisions.

A theory says here's what you should measure, here's what you should focus on as a scientist.

So some theories will say, focus on behavior, some theories will say, get at people's personality, that's what's gonna matter.

Some theories are gonna say talk about what people experience in their childhood.

Well, your different theory is gonna ask different questions and point you in different directions.

For what matters is, okay, if theory tells you what's important, that is going to tell you what to measure.

And finally, theory, a good theory is a living thing.

It improves on previous theory and can be itself improved upon.

Perhaps, you've heard people talk about a theory as non-falsifiable.

A non-falsifiable theory is a theory that cannot be changed by any observation.

No observation will change your mind.

So for example, here's a theory that is non-falsifiable.

Relationships work when they are destined to work, when they are fated to work.

That's my theory.

What makes a theory, what makes a relationship successful; you ask me, I'll tell you, fate and destiny?

If they are destined to work, they will.

If they are not destined to work, they won't.

That's a theory, it's a real theory.

But is it a good theory? Well, here's a problem.

What data would allow us to make a prediction of whether people were destined or not? Unfortunately only data such theory would require is whether they succeeded or failed.

If you know in advance, if you know afterward oh that relationship broke up, then they weren't destined.

And if they stayed together, that's destiny.

Well, that's not good enough, that's not a good theory.

Because there is no, you can't develop, and the theory cannot evolve.

Theory cannot be affected by the data.

As opposed to good theory, can be wrong.

In fact good theory will be wrong.

By definition, because it's a simplification.

It won't be perfect.

[12:00]

All it can do is closer and closer to describing the real world.

Alright, so that's a good theory generally.

But we don't want just any good theory, we want a good theory of intimate relationships.

And that has to go a little bit farther.

A good theory of intimate relationships has to do, I'm just gonna say, three things.

For one thing I want a good theory to do is, I want it to encompass the full range of possible predictors.

What do we mean by that? What do we mean by that is we have a sense that a lot of things affect relationships.

And I want a good theory to put it altogether for me.

So for example, I want a good theory to build me a house out of this specific stones of facts.

And I want every stone to be used.

So I think that people's relationships somehow are function of their biology.

I think that people's relationships are somehow are function of whether they are getting what they need.

I think intimate relationships are function of how people treat each other.

And their personalities.

And the world they live in.

And I want my theory to put that all together to leave nothing out, to encompass the full range of all the things we could have imagined, that affect relationships.

And tell me how it fits together.

But that's not all what I want theories to do.

I want theories to specify mechanisms of change.

As we have talked about the first day and as I 'm realizing we are going to be talking about everyday relationships change.

That's the phenomena.

It would be kind of interesting if some relationships are good, and stay good and some relationships are bad and stayed bad.

But what's really interesting is that good relationships sometimes stay good and frequently go bad, that's the mystery.

How does that happen? It's easy for a theory and there is many theories out there that….

Say, here's the difference between a good and a bad relationship.

Duh, that's not good enough.

I want a mechanism of change.

And I also want a theory that does more than say or relationships sometimes go bad, that's a description, not a theory.

I want to know how is it that some people who are in love, end up not in love anymore.

Mechanism of change, where does change come from? But that's not all I want a theory to do.

I also want this.

I want the theory to show why different people and different couples have different experiences.

That's a high bar to cross.

Because there's different kinds of variability.

There's variability between couples.

Some couples do better and worse than others.

That's sort of the easier kind of variability.

Sure, you imagine, you got two people who have a lot of problems in their lives, they're gonna have worse relationship than two people who, have a lot of advantages in their lives.

And I want to understand that.

But I also wanna understand variability within couples over time.

That's the mystery that keep hitting on.

[15:00]

I want to understand how does that couples have good days and bad days.

Or good months and bad months how does that same two people go through a bad patch and get better? Or start out terrific and get worse? Or back and forth.

Have you ever known a relationship that boy these people sometimes they are love-dovey or sometimes they are cats and dogs fighting with each other and the back again.

I've seen relationships like that.

A good theories are gonna explain all the phenomena including variability within the couple.

Those are pretty high standards.

But in the field of intimate relationships people have proposed some big ideas, some big theories.

And in our book and in this set of two lectures I'm gonna tell you about five of these theories.

Two today and three on Friday.

And each of these theories the people who write or read about these stories have said 1609 (imprint) in one way or another, my theory is all you need to know.

It's the theory.

It's the comprehensive theory.

I'll tell you in advance that's probably not true.

Probably each of these theories has a bit of the truth.

But they've all I choose to share them with you because they all asked the big questions.

They all tried to do these three things with varying degrees of success.

And they've all inspired a lot of the research that will be talking about in the subsequent 8 weeks of this course.

So this is sort of foundational week.

We are gonna talk about some of the biggest ideas in understanding intimate relationships.

And we are gonna be playing out (flashing out)1655 these ideas over the last 8 weeks of this course.

So you should be so happy that you are here paying attention today because this sort of sets the groundwork for what we are doing.

And in a way, the five theories can be organized on a continuum based on how far back in human history they searched for the causes of human behavior.

It's visibly behavior in intimate relationships.

So let's start with the first theory that goes the farthest back and this progress to the theories will get closer and closer in time.

So the theory that really starts at the earliest part is evolutionary theory.

Well you know about evolutionary theory of course?

You know about Charles Darwin the voyage of the beagle and the Galapagos Islands turtles and our Charles Darwin in his theory of natural selection said not just humanity but all animal species, all living species evolved through natural selection.

[18:00]

And what's natural selection?

The idea that there is a variability within each generation and some of those variations make people more likely to pass on their genes to the next generation and so those variation should be passed on and gradually species changed and developed.

Well evolutionary theory has been adapted to study psychological issues.

And in particular has been applied to the studyof intimate relationships and one of the people who has done is the fellow named David Buss.

David Buss is a professor at the University of Texas.

I've met him exactly once and this is how the meeting went.

I had a private I've been given 30 minutes alone with David Buss and I had recently published my own work on intimate relationships I was still a graduate student at that time and I tried to be comprehensive I tried to specify, make some changes I tried to put it altogether.

So this is it, the big picture of the intimate relationships.

And he came into the room sat himself down and he said I've taken look at your work and I wanna know this.

How do you account for the fact that women get less attractive as they get older? I said "what do you mean?" He said “well they do” I said "maybe they do so? And he said "well, isn't that it? I mean men are attracted to women when they are young and then of course relationships go back because women get less attractive when they get older, and over time men are not gonna be satisfied with them.

Said David Buss who has been married more than once.

Well I said to him "That maybe true on average but some people stay together and some people break up long time and some people break up after short time.

It's that variability that I'm interested in.

But it was what he was interested in.

Because his theory told him what he was interested in.

And that wasn't it.

And his theory says this.

This is the premise.

Briefly I’m gonna flash this out but the premise if you want to summarize to one word or one sentence this is it.

Humans seek particular mates to solve specific adaptive problems that their ancestors confronted during the course of human evolution.

Human make preferences and make decisions or hypothesize to be strategic products of selection pressures operating during ancestral conditions.

What does that mean? What does he talking about there? Because this is it.

This is the premise of the evolutionary perspective on intimate relations.

And what is he talking about.

Here is what he is talking about.

[21:00]

What he is saying is that just as certain traits are passed down across generations because they help us survive.

They are more likely to survive, we have this traits, that's natural selection.

There are other traits that get passed down because they make us more likely to have sex and therefore reproduce.

So we think of natural selection we think of survival of the fittest whatever makes you more likely to survive is like to get passed down to the next generation.

That's true.

But there's lots of things that get passed down on animal species that don't seem to contribute to survival and yet they still get passed down case in point.

Have you ever seen a male peacock? Sure you have.

Male peacock has this beautiful plumage.

This big wide beautiful tails, feathers with the eyes.

Gorgeous, well how does that help a peacock survive? The answer is it doesn't help peacock survive.

In fact it impedes survival because it's big and makes it slows the peacocks down.

There is a tiger chasing at peacock that ones of the biggest tail feathers will not escape the tiger.

And yet it's still above.

How does something so impractical something so unwieldy would have evolved? The sexual selection is somethings evolve because even if they make us, even if they don't improve survival rates they do improve reproduction rates.

And of course in the peacocks, male peacocks attract female pea hens, that's right, female peacock is a pea hen.

Did you know that? Maybe you didn’t know that.

Anyway the more the bigger the fluffier the gorgeous, the tail feathers the more likely you attract a pea hen therefore you reproduce therefore the ones of the biggest tail feathers passed their trait of big tail feathers onto the next generation.

Well so in animals, so in peacocks says evolutionary perspectives on intimate relationships so in human beings.

Sexual selection should absolutely operated in human beings as well.

Such that, whatever traits preferences, tendencies, contributed to successful

reproduction that result in surviving offspring, whatever those preferences are the contribute to successful reproduction.

Those should be passed down.

And therefore us human beings should be the products of generation upon generation of sexual selection.

Therefore our preferences, when it comes to sex, when it comes to mate selection, they are not just random.

[24:00]

But rather they are strategic.

There are things that we as human species evolved to solve reproductive problems that we faced when the human species was evolving.

Now biological types, have looked at this and said well you maybe that explains a lot of things about human beings about human physiology about the way that we respond actually.

But the evolutionary psychologists focus specifically on the evolution of what's called psychological mechanisms.

A psychological mechanism is a dependency to think and respond a certain way in the presence of certain stimuli.

The word mechanism makes this sound very robotic.

The idea we don't like the idea that Oh I'm not a mechanism I have free will, I respond flexibly to things.

Well the evolutionary psychologists don't really mean that this is the deterministic mechanisms but they ask you a question, evolutionary psychologists ask you a question which is this.

Why do we find youth attractive? why? why are people who are sort of young and have good clean skin why is that attractive? They might say obviously it's attractive.

I will get to you in a second.

It's more attractive to have, for example evolutionary psychologists asked this question.

Why is clean skin sexier than losing festering sores? Well you are laughing obviously no one wants big pussy, oozing sore for partner? But why, exactly why.

I mean it's not maybe it's obvious.

Why? Well the evolutionary psychologist says back in evolutionary times let's say there were two cave men.

One of them really loved pussy oozing festering sores and the other one really loved clean fresh skin and when happens people clean personal skin tend to be healthier.

They're more likely to reproduce successfully so that preference for clean fresh skin was more likely lead to successful reproduction where the guy was only reproducing with the people with oozing festering sores, well those kids survived very long.

So we evolved of preference for youth for health for fresh clean skin.

Do you have a question? What's your name? Absolutely so the idea being that well let's say there's two cavemen and one of them really likes people who are sort of old and wizened and the other one likes people who are young and just closely to reproductive age.

[27:00]

Well that person who is attracted to young people of reproductive age is going to reproduce more often and more successfully.

So the preference will get passed down.

Now a psychological mechanism gets pat the idea of a psychological mechanism gets passed down across generations.

In the same way that brown hair gets passed down on across generations or tallness or straight teeth now we can probably, we are closer to identify the gene for straight teeth than we are to identify the gene for preferring a particular mate over another mate and that's ok.

The evolutionary psychologist says I'm not sure what the gene is.

For a particular psychological mechanism all I can tell you is there is psychological mechanism, in this case it would be a preference for a certain mate over another kind and gets passed down or got passed down and now that's what we're left with.

What they are is preferences, tendencies in the human species what they are not is deterministic or mechanistic.

Here's another thing that they're not necessarily.

Psychological mechanisms are not necessarily conscious.

Well maybe they are conscious and that is I think none of you is quite conscious that I prefer no festering sores please.

Most people prefer straight teeth over crooked teeth.

Most people prefer signs of health than signs of sickness.

Well that's conscious.

And the evolutionary psychologist says that's psychological mechanism.

That preference is psychological mechanism and it serves adaptive function.

It means that we are going to seek out mates that are maximally likely to help us reproduce successful.

Here is the interesting thing.

Evolution takes a long time to work itself out, A long time.

Changes evolve in a species, let's say human species slowly mighty slowly.

And the implication of that fact is that in terms of evolutionary history it's been an eye blink since we were all wearing skins living in caves with a lot more hair on our bodies and thick ridges over our eyebrows.

From an evolutionary perspective it was just yesterday that we are all in the end of thought.

And if that is true says the evolutionary psychologists.

[30:00]

And if we in fact, have evolved psychological mechanisms then these evolve psychological mechanisms did not evolve to adopt us to today's environment because in evolutionary terms today's environment barely started to exist.

We have evolved not to adapt to this environment of UCLA but rather, to adapt to the environment of evolutionary adaptedness, in other words, we've adapted our mechanisms to fit the environment where we all evolved from, in caves wearing saber tooth tiger skins.

I'm exaggerating a little bit, but you get the flavor of it.

So the evolutionary psychologists are making a very interesting point.

Which is that with respect to our psychological mechanisms we are all cave people.

Therefore, if you want to understand our current days psychological mechanisms, if you want to understand how the human species evolved, what preferences the human species has, then you don't want to look at today.

You want to look at history.

You want to look at the environment of evolutionary adaptedness.

And ask yourself, what preferences would have evolved in that environment?

What was adaptive back then? And that's how evolutionary psychology proceeds.

Evolutionary psychology proceeds basically by conducting, at first, thought experiments.

Saying okay, let's think about it.

What was the environment like?

What were the adaptive challenges that the human species had to respond to? And what would have been the strategic clever way to pass on your genes?

It's likely that we would have evolved psychological mechanisms that are responsive to those challenges.

And since no time has passed at all since then, we're gonna still have those psychological mechanisms.

Mechanisms that are adapted to that environment.

Environment of 30, 40 thousand years ago.

With me so far? Let's think about it.

What were the challenges? What were the challenges that human beings faced with respect to reproduction and mate selection in that environment? Well, there's actually a sub-theory of evolutionary theory that addresses this exact question.

And that theory is called the theory of parental investment.

The theory of parental investment does what I just described.

It thinks back.

It says, okay, there we are all living in caves.

What's the challenge, what's the issue? And the theory of parental investment says, a lot of the challenges around human reproduction and mate selection arise from this fact.

The fact that by virtue of biology, men and women invest in the next generation in different ways.

[33:00]

And I can tell you I'm experiencing this right now in my house.

The theory of parental investment says, let's take a look at the situation and adaptive challenges that women face.

A woman, unlike a female dog or some female fish, can only gestate, most of the time, one child at a time.

Fish can have plenty of eggs at the same time, a female dog has a litter of puppies.

Human beings, except for that crazy lady that lives nearby, most of the time, one, maybe two, most of the time, one baby at a time.

And how long does it take to nurture that baby? Nine months! During that nine months, that woman is increasingly immobile and cannot have, cannot gestate other children.

She can take care of existing children but she cannot gestate other children.

So for nine months, your reproductive capacity is tied up into one single child.

Now from an evolutionary standing point, the goal of the mother of that child is, support this child.

And how are you gonna do it? Well you're gonna try to find a mate that will A.

Be healthy and fit so that this child is likely to be healthy and fit, B.

You want a mate that can protect your child from predators, and C, you want a mate who's going to help you with this child even after the child comes out.

So if you have two cave women with different preferences, the one who reproduces the most successfully is the one who has the preferences that attract her towards mates that solve those problems.

So what would you expect? You would expect over the course of generations, for females of the species to evolve psychological mechanisms that alert them to the presence of men who are healthy, men who are strong, men who have the capacity to protect the mother and the child.

What about male at the same environment of evolutionary adaptiveness? What are men's challenges? Men's challenges are quite different because their investment in parenthood is different.

A man's investment in creating an offspring is sperm.

And men have plenty of sperm.

[36:00]

Moreover, whereas a woman can only be impregnated once for nine months at a time, a man can impregnate many, many people simultaneously with very little effort, in fact even by accident.

So man, what are man looking for? Well, for men the challenges is to get access to as many as possible, because the more people I have access to, the more genes I'll have passed out.

So we have two cave men and one of them says, you know, I'm really not that interested in sex.

And one of them says yes I'm extremely interested in sex and I want to have sex with as many people as possible.

Which one is going to have more offspring and pass down their preferences? The one who's deeply interested in sex.

So evolutionary psychology says men should have evolved over countless generations, psychological mechanisms that alert them to sexual availability in partners, they should have alert them to mechanisms that make them highly desirous of sex, and they should alert them to fertility if possible or at least availability in their partners.

So for example if all the people I could have sex with, I mean sex doesn't take a lot of time but it takes some time, if I have a choice of people to have sex with, from an evolutionary standing point, what I want to make sure is, I'm having sex with a person who is likely to get pregnant and have my child.

So anything associated with fertility in a partner, I should prefer.

Well what kind of things are associated with fertility? It turns out, clear skin, youth, health.

So if the challenge's to get access for men since they don't have to invest much more than that, men should have evolved psychological mechanisms that help them to solve that problem help them to get access to fertile females.

If the challenge for women is to get protection while they're gestating this precious single child, they should have evolved psychological mechanisms that help them solve their problem, that alert them to the presence of men who are capable of protecting them, and investing in their child.

Well, according to evolutionary psychology, that's what happened.

And that's what happened 30 or 40 thousand years ago, and the product was us.

And the result is, according to evolutionary psychologists, they say, we're right.

Then these mechanisms should characterize the human species.

And men and women should differ in these ways, anywhere that you measure.

And this is not a noncontroversial idea.

[39:00]

And if some of you're finding this controversial, that's okay.

And we'll get to that in a moment.

But that's a lot of thinking.

So far, that's all thinking, talking, and thought experiments.

So what kind of a research would you do? Is there a way to test this theory? There is.

And a lot of the research starts and some of it ends by predicting and explaining gender differences.

Follows directly from the theory of parental investment.

The theory of parental investment says, since many women are so differentially invested in the production of offspring, then men and women should evolve very different psychological mechanisms and especially different preferences for mates and different responses to relationship behavior.

And this should be true in the human species.

Because this should have evolved before there was Chinese and American.

Before there was people in Australia and people in Alaska.

They should have evolved when we're all just one close living together species so it should still be true since in evolutionary terms, no time has passed.

So let's see if it's true.

And people like David Bus have done a lot of research saying I think that I can explain male and female gender differences in attraction and in mate selection and other sort of intimate relationship processes like for example, jealousy.

One of David Bus's most famous studies asks people a simple question.

He started in college students.

And the other day, he says, “I’m gonna ask you this question you're not gonna announce the answer just think about it.

Here's the question.

Which of these is worse for you? Which of these situations would you find most intolerable? One, your mate is emotionally committed to you but sexually unfaithful.

They have sex with someone else, doesn't mean anything though, emotionally you're it.

Or, there's other situation, which is your mate is sexually faithful to you but has an emotional connection with someone else.

A crush a passionate communication by e-mail or whatever.

You see the issue.

Which is worse, sexual infidelity or emotional infidelity? Play with that.

Think about it.

Roll it around your head a little bit.

One, a partner's having sex with someone else but they still love me, verses a partner still having sex just with me but sort of has this thing going on with someone else.

[41:00]

They're not having sex but this thing, this connection.

They're like sharing intimacies over coffee.

Which is worse for you? Well, raise your hand if you do have an answer, if you really do have a strong preference for one over the other.

Not that many hands up.

So some people can't decide.

Well, what Bus did was he forced the question.

He said, make a choice damn it.

And what he found in college students was very clear.

Big difference between genders.

Predict the effects.

Which gender found the emotional infidelity worse? Students: Women.

Correct.

And which found the sexual infidelity worse, men.

And he says, that's perfectly explained by evolutionary theory, because, think about it.

If you're a woman and you need your male protector to protect you especially while you're immobile, in the longest late stages of pregnancy.

So if you discover that your man had sex with somebody else but is still back with you, taking care of you, giving you all the saber tooth tiger meat when he comes back from the hunt, you're not thrilled by sexual infidelity don't get me wrong, but at least you're getting a lot of other things that you need.

It could be worse.

But on the other hand, if your man is in love with someone else, well, he might then give the saber tooth tiger meat to another person he likes better than you.

That's gonna be worse.

He might not take care of your kids, that's gonna be worse.

So yeah, the emotional infidelity is more threatening.

What if you're a man living in the same cave.

For you, the big problem is, if I'm giving you and this child my saber tooth tiger meat it had better be my child.

Because evolutionarily speaking, the worst thing for me would be to give you all my resources for someone else's kid.

That would be terrible but how can I know whether it's my kid or not? Well, it looks kind of like me but it looks a little bit like George over there too.

Well, if I'm a cave guy, here's what I ought to do.

I'm gonna evolve I'm gonna have psychological mechanisms alerting me to fidelity.

To making sure that you are sexually faithful because if you are sexually unfaithful, then you might be having someone else's kid and that will trick me and that would be very bad for me.

So men should say, sexual infidelity? “No, No, No.”

Go ahead have all the crushes you want but no sexual infidelity and that's what the college students found.

Kinda neat? But here's where David Boz went further.

[45:00]

He asked me the same question, in 36 countries across the world, in industrialized nations, in modernly industrialized nations, in non-industrialized nations, in Amazonian tree people tribes, in aborigine tribes, in every other kind of situation.

And he always got the same effect.

No matter what, he always found that women were more threatened by emotional infidelity, and men were more threatened by sexual infidelity.

And said, “look.”

And it is what David Bozward says, and talks, he says, “have I proven that this is evolved? No.

But, you do a better job.

Go ahead, you explain.

Better than I have.

Why men and women all over the planet earth have this difference? And I don’t think you can do it, says David Boz.

I don’t think you can do it.

But I have a theory that explains not just, don’t just say men and women are different, he says, but here’s how they are different, and why.

Now, the only thing is mate preferences.

So, for example, let me just ask you.

Take a guess, pop quiz.

Don’t plan any paper, we are just doing this orally.

Which gender is more likely to be attracted to a partner that’s older than themselves?

(Audiences: women.)

Good guess.

Which gender is more likely to, uh, wait.

You just said women, right?

Which gender is more likely to be attracted to a mate that's shorter than themselves?

Men.

He says, now, that's obvious, right? You didn't have to guess, but why is it true? It's one thing to say, "yeah, men and women are different."

But, why? Why is it true? Explain to me why that should be true.

David Boz says, evolutionary theory doesn't just describe it, it explains, says "Yes, there's a reason."

There's a reason why human beings evolved this way.

Because that preference is true all over the planet earth.

You can look at tribal peoples, you can look at industrial peoples.

Men are vastly more likely to be partner with thirty younger than themselves, and shorter than themselves.

And women are vastly more likely to be partner with man through older than themselves, and taller than themselves.

Because men are looking for youth and fertility and women are looking for resources and protection.

So, we've got to know that they found the differences they found in everywhere.

Now, here's what I need to make a point, because people can easily misunderstand this.

Okay.

Now, maybe you're thinking, well, that's fine for industrialized nations, or whatever, 36 countries.

But I am a student in UCLA and I assure you that when I am look for a mate, I am not thinking about that person as reproductive things.

Question.

Casey.

Yeah, well.

Just same sex couples? Oh, great question.

Ah, here's how.

Same sex couples are, by definition, they both are of the, same sex.

[48:00]

So, now you should have, you should have.

Two people who have comparable preferences, and so sometimes some of the stuff would fall out not be relevant in same-sexual relationships, but some of the stuff will still be quite relevant.

What we should be talking about this, I think it's next week, in more detail.

But for now, let me say that, uh, for example, evolutionary psychologists say that men should be much more interested in having sex with multiple partners than women.

We just said that a moment ago.

Well, if that's true, then even in same-sex relationships, same sex relationship with men, should be much more open, or accepting of extra relational sexual activity than same sex relations between women.

And study of evolutionary study has shown that's true.

On the other hand, what's interesting about same sex relationships was that it allow us to tease a part, affects us preferences of associated with sexual orientation, and associated with gender.

And a lot of researched has already tried to do that in really interesting and provocative way, we'll talk about it next week.

But what I thought you were asking, when I first heard your question, was, how does it count for safe sex? About the same sex, like one of people who, you know, wear condoms, or wear no protection at all, 'cause I know, here's the last thing I want; reproduction.

Well, that's irrelevant.

Because, the point of the theory is not that these are totally that you're consciously saying I want resources, or I want fertility.

No.

What's conscious is, a preference for something.

It still happens, but that something you know, our ancestral past was a cue to resources, protection, or fertility.

Today, it might not be.

But that doesn't matter.

The preference hasn't changed.

Let me say that again, because that's like crucial, to avoid a deep misunderstanding that many people have about this theory.

If I am out and about, and I see the potential partner, I am not saying, hey, fertile.

All I am saying is, "Hey, clean skins, straight teeth, curvy body, young, that's attractive."

Now, why is it attractive? Why isn't big round unattractive? You know, why is it attractive? It's attractive, because according to the evolutional theory, in our ancestral past, people think those things were more fertile.

Nowadays, it may not be associated with fertility.

It may be less fertile, maybe.

But, the preference hasn't changed yet.

Hasn't caught up.

You understand.

We didn't evolve the preference for fertility, no.

[51:00]

We evolved the preference for cues that when our ancestral path signaled fertility.

Even if those cues don't signal fertility anymore, even if we are not thinking about fertility, the preference for the cues remains.

And it does.

Even if we are not thinking about fertility, women frequently say, "I'm not thinking about fertility.

I'm just saying just I am just telling what I like, just happens to be big and broad.

Which gender is more likely to say, "I like my partners to be broad in the shoulder,

and big bulky and burly.”?

Well, men are unlikely to say that.

Because there’s been never a time those things were cues to something men wanted in our ancestral past.

But, there were, there was a time when a cues to something you’d want if you were living in a cave, it’s very adaptive to have a partner who’s big and burly.

It may not be adaptive now, now might be adaptive to have a partner who’s sensitive and wears a tie.

Unfortunately, for us, the preference remains.

Is there any question in the back? Is there any question? Yes? Spencer?

(A student asks a question)

No! Spencer asked a good question.

Does this mean there’s no similarities between male and female preferences?

Not at all.

There are many similarities.

Whatever would be preference be adapted for both genders?

Would be a preference that everyone would’ve evolved?

Like the preference for health.

Men, neither men nor women attracted to festering sores.

Uh, question? Uh, so, is it Daisha? Britney.

So, Britney asks what about, what’s going on now, with attraction to really skinny woman, you know, where does that come from? From.

I don’t wanna get too deeply into it.

But the pure evolutional psychologists would say that to the extent of that is become associated with youth, and uh, then we’ve learned that’s associated with youth and we find it attractive because we are, we are attracted to anything associated with youth.

That’s why, it’s like, people wearing schoolgirl outfits are supposed to be attractive, because it’s attracted to youth.

That's not the point.

The point is, I don't wanna get to deep because we still have another theory to talk about in next 20 minutes.

One more question.

What's your name? Micah.

(Question)

Hahaha.

I'll tell you why.

There is an answer.

Okay? There's an answer, Micah, thankfully, for us.

The answer is, well, how does, how is that sensitive guys who wears ties even evolved? Like, how do we ever have reproductive success, given this theory? And the answer is, because there is an evolutionary advantage to having a mate who treats you nicely, and will treat your kid nicely, and who's unlikely to stray.

[54:00]

Who's unlikely to be sexually unfaithful, and even emotionally unfaithful.

There's an advantage.

So, under some circumstances, the best situation, for a woman, would be to get genes from someone who's big and burly, but have a sensitive guy in home who's likely to take care of your kid.

So, to be mates with a sensitive guy who be treating you nicely, your kid nicely, but also have affairs with a big burly guys.

Which, by the way, is what happens.

Not all the time, but occasionally.

Awesome.

So, here's the point.

One more thing.

Is this all too obvious?

Sometimes people criticize these theories saying, “Well, come on! I knew that men and women were different, big deal!”

And then you guess, the stinky t-shirt studies.

And I assure you, if you predicted all the results of all this, you won’t predict this.

Oh, no.

Let me tell you about the stinky t-shirt study.

Probably one of my favorite researches happen in evolutionary psychology.

The idea is this; women are looking for genetically fit partners, right? But women, it doesn’t matter all the time, because women can have sex any time of the month, but they only ovulate in certain period of month.

And at least when they are ovulating.

What’s happening? What’s this all about? Oh, let’s leave it out for now.

Unless… I have an idea.

Here we go.

OK.

So, unless women are ovulating, they, it doesn’t matter if they have sex, they won’t reproduce.

So, evolutionary theory says, check this out; that women should be more sensitive to cues of her potential partner when they are ovulating, than they are not ovulating.

Now, a lot of women will say, well, I know that, you know, I feel different in different times of a month, but a lot of it in western culture, a lot focus is on period of menstruation.

Like, when I menstrual, then I feel differently, but the rest of the month, I am fine.

But this theory says, the period of ovulation, which is much less noticeable, should be crucial for changing your preferences of women.

Because there’s no reason for you to care that much when you are not ovulating and the stakes are very high when you are ovulating.

So, women should have evolved different sensitivity to reproductive fitness of their partner only when they are ovulating.

Well, here’s a sign of reproductive fitness; physical symmetry.

It turns out that people who have good genes or healthy are more symmetric down the two sides of their body.

[57:00]

They have their ears same sized, eyes same height, cheekbones are same, nostrils are the same size, and if those things are not symmetric, that's the sign of genetic dissimilarity, of not being quite as healthy.

But, you know what? Symmetries are very hard thing to judge.

Scientists start with the "calipers."

Things, things like that.

So, how, how might we get a quick way of sensing people's symmetric, or people's genetic fitness?

Well, a set of, a group of researchers thought that maybe scent, which we can easily discern in the person.

Maybe scent is the cue to genetic fitness.

The core rates of physical similitude between nose and genetic fitness.

So, here's what they did; they got men, college men, to come to the lab and measured their symmetry, the length of their arms, the size of their eyes, the length of their ears, the height of their cheekbones, and they got the men reigned.

Some guys were very symmetric, some guys were not.

And the other stage men, they gave each man a clean, white unscented t-shirt with a bar of soap.

And they told these men, for the next three nights, before you go to sleep, shower with this unscented soap, and then go to bed wearing this t-shirt.

And wear the same t-shirt three nights in a row.

And then when you are done, seal it in the plastic bag and bring it back to us.

So now they've got a stack of stinky t-shirts, of t-shirts that has been worn by these men, some of whom were highly genetically fit, and some of whom were not.

Then they brought women to the lab.

And they asked those women, to stick their nose to these plastic bags and sniff those t-shirts.

And after each sniff, they were asked to rate the t-shirt on its pleasantness and appealingness and sexiness.

Now, what they found absolutely proved a support of their hypothesis; what they found is that women who are not ovulating could not sniff the difference between a symmetric man and an unsymmetric man.

But women who are ovulating preferred the scent of a symmetric man over the scent of an unsymmetric man.

And that, my friends, is something not you would have guessed.

Uh, Micah!It was one study and it was women who had their new, some of these were ovulating right now, and some of them were not ovulating right now.

(Student asking question) Except here is the thing is that um….

[60:00]

Presumably, the timing this is actually a quasi experiment MikeBecause each woman were basically, randomly given all these different t- shirts.

And the timing of ovulation is essentially random.

So in fact, for the purpose of this experiment women were randomly assigned to either be ovulating on the random date of the study was going on or not be ovulating on the random day.

So there is no reason to expect on average any differences between the women happen to be ovulating on that day or the women who weren't.

But there were.

Let me move on because there is a whole other theory that I need to talk about in next ten minutes.

Evolutionary perspectives link a wide range of variables.

Suddenly the way we behave in intimate relationships is being connected to the way we have evolved this biological creatures.

Well that is phenomenal.

But it does focus more on gender differences than variability within gender.

Because obviously you might get the mistaken impression from discussion of evolutionary theory that all women want the same thing and all men want the same different thing.

Well that is obviously not true.

There is a lot of variability within each gender “a lot”.

Evolutionary theory does not talk about that so much.

Therefore focuses on something very interesting.

The extent to which each gender is different but in focusing on that tends to overlook about differences between men or between women.

How do you explain that? Evolutionary theory does not talk about that much.

Evolutionary theory focuses on a lot on mate selection in really interesting ways.

But on what happens to relationships once they form? Well it doesn’t get so far.

It tends to say well some relationships should be better than others.

Because these relationships they are meeting adaptive needs, but what about relationship that starts good and goes bad? It doesn’t have quite much to say, it is not silent but doesn’t sound much too say.

Let me move on to another theory equally interesting and I’m gonna spend a lot less time on it.

I’m sorry about that.

“Attachment theory.”

Attachment theory also goes back in time, also says the source of our current adult intimate relationships wise in the past.

Let’s look into the past but whereas the evolutionary theory says let’s look into our ancestral evolutionary past .

Attachment theory says let’s look into our personal history, let’s look into the relationships that we all had as infants.

And the premise of attachment theory is the nature of the bonds that we form with our primary caregivers in infancy, shapes the relationships that we have throughout our lives.

Look, I have said this first, it was a fellow name John Bowlby .

And John Bowlby said look.

Yes John Bowlby was an evolutionary theorist totally.

[63:00]

He believed in evolution, he believed that we all evolved.

But when he looked back at, he was looking at monkeys and our primate ancestors and you know what we have in common with our primate ancestors is that we will not survive if we don't have a relationship with our parents.

If you are a fish you are born, you don't have to say hi to your mom and dad.

You are just off.

But human beings are helpless when they emerge from the womb.

When my son finally emerges he will be totally helpless, he will be dependent on us.

So it makes sense that human beings would have evolved mechanisms to make sure that parents will stick around and take care of that kid.

So he said we will have, we have evolved a system, an attachment system, a system for developing an attachment for infants and their parents.

Which answers the question "Why are babies so cute?" by babies are evolved to be cute so that it will stick around and watch them even though it is two in the morning.

Why do babies? Babies don't have to learn how to cry? They are born learning how to, knowing how to cry.

Why is that useful? It is useful because that cry gets attention from the people who are attached to them so that they will get care.

Attachment is necessary for the survival of the species.

It does a couple things for the babies.

One is it provides a secure base.

If babies are attached to their parents then it's safe to explore because you know your parents are going to grab you before you go off the cliff.

In fact one of the classic studies of the secure base is um…They grab babies to a room which had a floor and then a pit.

A deep pit covered with the layer of glass.

So when the babies are crawling along they get to the edge "looks like a pit" what should they do down there? Now in fact it's covered with the glass they could cross over and basically walk out over the pit.

But it does look a little odd.

So what they had and happens is, babies were securely attached and used their parent as a source of information and what happens is babies who like their moms look back and look at mom and the moms are been instructed to some of them smile and when the mom smiled the babies walked right out of the pit.

That's okay there were glass over the pit.

But when moms are going… then the babies shied away.

I learned something from mom.

Don't go over pits.

Well imagine that's how things function, that's how babies learn it's adoptive that we should have evolved the system that connects babies to their caregivers so that they can explore the world, and learn about the world.

What Bowlby said is from those interactions we developed what he called mental models.

[66:00]

Mental ideas about relationships in the world.

We develop an expectation for care.

We learn "are people going to take care of me? Or I grow up on my own here?" That first relationship teaches us the answer to that question.

Well a woman named Mary Ainsworth said "How many, I would like to know what kind of mental models there are".

So she developed a research paradigm called the strange situation and the strange situation where situation where she got babies in their primary care givers.

In this case were all moms.

To come to lab, play in her room and what she had, the strange situation was simply that after the mom and kid were playing in the room for a while the kid was like you know 18 months old, a stranger would come in, a researching system start talking the baby and then the mom would slip out.

And through the one way mirror the researchers would have observed what were the babies doing when discovered the mom is gone and then the mom would come right back in and the question is, what does the baby do when the mom comes back in.

That's the strange situation and what they found was three different styles of responses to the situation.

Half of the kids demonstrated paranoid behaviors they call "Secure attachment".

In secure attachment what happen is, the kids were exploring the room they knew, mom was there, they didn't have to stare at mom.

But when mom stepped down, they discovered, they started to cry "Where is mom?" The mom came back they hug mom, "Oh mom", "Thanks you are back" and then they were fine.

Securely attached kids wanted mom around and were assured when she returned but the other two about 25% each found in two other categories.

There was this avoidant group.

The avoidant group ignored mom, didn't notice when she left, didn't care when she returned.

In contrast, anxious and ambivalent group kind of my favorite group 'cause they are so poignant.

The anxious and ambivalent group when they discovered mom was gone they didn't want to leave mom.

They were reluctant to explore the room in the first place.

When mom find themselves out they freak out and when mom comes back they are mad at mom for leaving, so Mary Ainsworth and her student said maybe there are different styles, different mental models that people develop intimacy they worked her to call different attachment style secure, avoid, and anxious.

And these are responsive to different kinds of parenting.

If your parent is dependable you know your parents are going to be there, you develop a secure attachment style.

[69:00]

If you know your parents not there, you develop an avoid attachment style.

If your parent is unreliable you develop an anxious ambivalent attachment style.

Well people do this research and kid is very interesting and then two researchers of adults said "well, wait a minute" they went back and read Bowlby.

And Bowlby said "Hey these mental models last your whole life.

You use these mental models when you develop new intimate relationships in adulthood.

Two researchers named “Phil Shaver, and Cyndi Hazern said, “Well, wait a minute, then we should see commonalities between infant parent attachment and adult attachment.

And they start asking me some questions, let me ask you same questions.

In what kind of relationships is it okay to talk baby talk? Parents and children.

People in love.

Right? If you hear me talking “yeah, oh yeah,” “Sweet baby” Who am I talking to? My wife or my kid? Maybe both.

What kind of relationship do you find people gazing into each others’ eyes.

Lovers and parents and kids.

Who is it comfortable to cuddle with? Your lover and your kid.

Sometimes at the same time.

So the idea is there is a common, maybe it is the same mechanism; maybe it’s the same evolved system that governs our attachments in infancy and our attachment in adulthood.

And if that is true, then these are the sole influence attachment, they should be the same styles in adult attachment.

So to study that, they put a quiz in the newspaper, and it looked like this.

They put three paragraphs in the newspaper and they asked people circle the one that describes you.

Let’s read them real quickly.

First one I found it relatively easy to get close to others and comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me.

I don’t often worry about being abandoned.

Who is that?

Secure.

How many of you is that? Don’t reach your hand.

But good for you.

How about this one? I am uncomfortable close to others, I find it difficult to trust them allow myself to depend on them, I am nervous when people get too close.

Which one is that? Avoid.

We are talking about adults here.

How about this one.

I find others are reluctant to get close as I would like I worry my partner doesn't really love me or won't to stay with me, I want to merge completely with someone and this desire scares people away.

Anxious-ambivalent, of course.

By the way, I just love anxious and ambivalent.

Because anxious ambivalent is saying "I 'm so mad at you for not being perfect", "I'm so mad at you for not loving me enough."

"I wish you love me more and I hate you for that."

So here is the point.

The point is, what they found was 50%, 25, 25.

[72:00]

The same proportions.

Kind of interesting.

I'm going to skip this slide.

It is all on the text.

I'm going right to this.

What does the attachment theory explain? What does the attachment theory explain? Well, attachment theory has been used to explain some very interesting and important things.

Hey where do our standards for intimacy come from? Why do some people want to be really close? Why are some people perfectly comfortable, kind of being more solitary and more distant, and like, some people will say you know the problem with this person is that I can't really breathe, you don't have any independence.

Other people say “You know the problem is, this person doesn’t want to be close enough”.

What’s the difference? This says these differences arise in childhood in infancy when we develop our models of what attachment, what intimacy’s all about.

Why do some people, don’t you know people have some relationships over and over again.

Every time is the same problem.

Why? Well what Bowlby says is we have these mental models and attachment styles, and we bring them with us.

And we end up making the same mistake over and over again.

Let’s see if we can do better on Friday.

For now you are dismissed.

Thank you.