

Studying the relationship of the competitor derogation tactics with gender, marital status and temporal context (short term / long term) and to assess the impact of the competitor derogation tactics on both sexes

¹Saba Ajdari, ²Ali Delavar, ³Mohammadali Mazaheri, ⁴Hassan Ahadi

1. Department of Psychology, Science and Research branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
2. Professor of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University
3. Associate professor of Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University
4. Professor of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University

Abstract: In the present study, the relationship of the competitor derogation tactics with gender, marital status and temporal context (short term / long term) and also the impact of the competitor derogation tactics on both sexes are studied. The study population consists of the students of Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Research Tehran Branch. A sample consisting of 420 subjects was selected using random sampling. Competitor derogation test was carried out in this sample and chi-square test was used to test the hypotheses. The results indicate that competitor derogation tactics that are used by both sexes are different: women most often use the tactics that include appearance derogation and the reproduction ability in the rival, and men often use resources derogation tactics, or ability to obtain resources in the rivals of the same sex. Using competitor derogation tactics has also differences based on marital status and type of relationship base on temporal context (short term / long term). Also it was shown that there is a significant difference between the sexes in terms of the influence of the competitor derogation tactics.

[Ajdari S, Delavar A, Mazaheri M, Ahadi H. **Studying the relationship of the competitor derogation tactics with gender, marital status and temporal context (short term / long term) and to assess the impact of the competitor derogation tactics on both sexes.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(6s):110-121] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 18

Keywords: competitor derogation, temporal context (short term / long term)

Introduction:

The importance of male-female relations is not hidden from anyone. Whether this relationship is long term or is short term. Ability to establish and maintain these relationships has various psychological and social effects on the life of individuals. Perhaps the person who is successful in the process of mate selection, and is able to maintain their relationship, experiences more relaxed, and socially is more acceptable in some communities. The first step in choosing a mate is to attract the mate. In order to attract individuals of the opposite sex as a mate, people are compelled to have intrasexual competition with their rivals of the same sex who are considered rivals. Basic component of competition in mating is to seem attractive to the opposite sex (Buss, 1988). This goal is achieved through two main ways: 1) self-promotion and 2) competitor derogation. In self-promotion approach, one tries to seem more attractive and more desirable to the intended mate, while in the second method, the competitor derogation, one tries to show rivals less attractive and less desirable (Buss, 1988).

Since, from an evolutionary perspective, the inability of a person to choose the right mate, and maintain their relationship is considered a failure to reproduce, clarifying the methods that both sexes use to overcome the problem of intrasexual competition,

to be selected as a mate, is very important. On the other hand, focusing on the differences between men and women in the use of these methods, according to the principles of evolutionary perspective provides a clear understanding of the differences between the sexes in this area. To better identify the competitor derogation tactics, it is also necessary to consider more details, such as marital status, and type of relationship (short term, long term).

Evolutionary perspective predicts gender differences in using self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics. For example, men more than women, boast about their social and financial resources, and in derogating rivals of same-sex render their resources as worthless. However, women exhibit more signs associated with value of reproduction, and compete with their rivals of the same sex to reach a mate with ideal appearance and in derogating rivals of same-sex blazon their appearance and reproduction capability as worthless in order to achieve ideal mate (Buss, 1987, 1988, 1989).

About self-promotion method, many studies have been carried out, but researchers have not paid enough attention to the competitor derogation method. As, mentioned earlier, gender differences are observed in the use of competitor derogation tactics. On the other hand, it should be noted that the type of

relationship (short term, long term) is also effective in the manner of applying these tactics. Researchers found that, mate selection preferences in men and women vary depending on the type of relationship in terms of temporal context. Similarly it is possible that self- promotion and competitor derogation tactics change in different temporal contexts (Kenrick et al, 1990 and 1993).

In this study, we tried to clarify the differences between the two sexes in the use of various tactics of competitor derogation, the effectiveness of tactics, and also the relationship of competitor derogation tactics with marital status and the effect of the temporal context of the relationship (short term, long term) on the use of competitor derogation tactics.

Method:

• Type of study

The method of this study is a combination of the quantitative (survey) and qualitative (baseline study) methods. Given the importance of localizing the reference standard measures, one phase of qualitative research was considered to find items appropriate to cultural and social conditions of the population in this study, in order to deepen the data more.

• Population, sample, the sampling method

The statistical population of this study consists of all of the students of Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Research Tehran Branch. Sampling method in this study was stratified sampling proportional to size. So that, the number of sample was divided proportional to the number of

students in each course. Since, typically, some of the questionnaires filled out by people cannot be used and the number of unanswered questions in them is too much, in this study, 420 questionnaires were distributed between the students that 399 questionnaires were usable and valid. From among this number of valid questionnaires, 247 questionnaires were filled by undergraduate students, 104 by graduate students and 48 were answered by PhD students.

• Research Tools

In this research, competitor derogation test was carried out which is made by researcher and has good reliability and validity. Cronbach's alpha calculated for the entire test was 0.958. This test contains 89 items that investigate 23 competitor derogation tactics. These tactics include: purposelessness, financial situation, foot looseness, Calling unpopular, appearance defects, mocking, ignoring, emotional instability, apathetic, ineptness, commitment, physical failure, selfishness, cleanliness, Calling silly, neglecting achievement, Calling weak, bad habits, being boring, loyalty, homosexuality, caring and exploiting.

Findings:

The findings of this study have shown that there is a significant difference between men and women in the use of some competitor derogation tactics. Table 1 shows the statistical test and the percent of students' answers to the use of competitor derogation tactics in terms of the sex.

Table 1. The statistical test and the percent of students' responses to the use of competitor derogation tactics in terms of the sex

Significance level of χ^2 test	Statistical value of ϕ	The amount of using tactic			Sex	Tactic
		High	Average	Low		
0.475	0.061	35.3	33.8	30.9	Woman	Calling silly
		33.8	29.7	36.4	Man	
0.000	0.299	16.7	36.3	47.1	Woman	Mocking
		13.8	12.3	73.8	Man	
0.000	0.380	2.9	37.7	59.3	Woman	Financial situation
		29.7	19.5	50.8	Man	
0.000	0.195	32.8	21.6	45.6	Woman	Foot looseness
		38.5	7.7	53.8	Man	
0.030	0.132	20.6	46.6	32.8	Woman	Calling unpopular
		21.5	34.4	44.1	Man	
0.000	0.587	32.8	32.4	34.8	Woman	Appearance defects
		2.1	6.7	91.3	Man	
0.542	0.055	19.1	29.4	51.5	Woman	Neglecting achievement
		16.4	26.7	56.9	Man	
0.098	0.108	20.6	27.9	51.5	Woman	Calling weak
		28.2	20.5	51.3	Man	

0.224	0.309	2.5	28.9	68.6	Woman	Bad habits
		11.8	15.9	72.3	Man	
0.000	0.358	28.4	14.2	57.4	Woman	Cleanliness
		2.6	24.1	73.3	Man	
0.000	0.342	53.9	27.5	18.6	Woman	Exploiting
		24.6	28.2	47.2	Man	
0.281	0.08	15.2	53.9	30.9	Woman	Being boring
		13.3	48.2	38.5	Man	
0.000	0.285	16.2	43.6	40.2	Woman	Emotional instability
		38.5	22.1	39.5	Man	
0.75	0.144	31.4	31.4	37.3	Woman	Loyalty
		41.4	23.6	34.9	Man	
0.539	0.056	5.4	13.7	80.9	Woman	Homosexuality
		6.2	17.4	76.4	Man	
0.000	0.326	7.4	34.8	57.8	Woman	Apathetic
		29.7	15.4	54.9	Man	
0.165	0.95	20.6	33.3	46.1	Woman	Caring
		28.7	30.8	40.5	Man	
0.091	0.110	20.1	59.8	20.1	Woman	Ignoring
		14.9	56.4	28.7	Man	
0.010	0.152	28.9	16.7	54.4	Woman	Ineptness
		19	27.2	53.8	Man	
0.000	0.404	37.7	25	37.3	Woman	Commitment
		4.6	41	54.4	Man	
0.000	0.223	23	21.6	55.4	Woman	Physical failure
		29.2	6.2	64.6	Man	
0.000	0.381	36.3	41.24	22.5	Woman	Selfishness
		6.2	49.2	44.6	Man	
0.000	0.254	18.1	35.3	46.6	Woman	Purposelessness
		28.2	18.5	53.3	Man	

Examining the table it was found that women more use derogation tactics of appearance and reproduction ability to derogate the rivals of the same sex. According to the responses, tactics of blazoning rival as exploiter, blazoning rival as footloose, blazoning rival as committed, blazoning rival as silly, blazoning rival as selfish, questioning rivals appearance, blazoning rival as disloyal, respectively have allocated the most use response to themselves and are more used by women. As seen among these tactics, the tactics associated with appearance beauty are also seen.

On the other hand, the present study showed that men more use the tactics that include derogation of

resources or the ability to acquire resources, physical power and social status in order to derogate their rivals of the same sex. According to research data, respectively blazoning rival as disloyal, blazoning rival as instable, blazoning rival as footloose, blazoning rival as silly, blazoning rival as purposeless, are used more than other tactics by the men.

This study also sought to examine the intensity of influences of competitor derogation tactics. Table 2 shows the statistical test and the percent of students' responses to the intensity of the influences competitor derogation tactics in terms of sex.

Table 2 the statistical test and the percent of students' responses to the intensity of the influences competitor derogation tactics in terms of sex

Significance level of χ^2 test	Statistical value of ϕ	The amount of using tactic			Sex	Tactic
		High	Average	Low		
0.756	0.37	29.9	30.4	39.7	Woman	Calling silly
		30.3	27.2	42.6	Man	
0.000	0.261	14.7	34.3	51	Woman	Mocking

		11.3	13.8	74.9	Man	
0.000	0.341	2.9	33.3	63.7	Woman	Financial situation
		26.7	21	52.3	Man	
0.064	0.117	30.4	21.1	48.5	Woman	Foot looseness
		33.8	12.3	53.8	Man	
0.017	0.143	20.6	43.1	36.3	Woman	Calling unpopular
		17.4	32.3	50.3	Man	
0.000	0.504	33.8	28.9	37.3	Woman	Appearance defects
		7.2	14.9	77.9	Man	
0.767	0.036	20.6	29.9	49.5	Woman	Neglecting achievement
		21	26.7	52.3	Man	
0.001	0.189	16.2	28.4	55.4	Woman	Calling weak
		30.3	24.1	45.6	Man	
0.000	0.229	2	27	71.1	Woman	Bad habits
		10.8	13.8	75.4	Man	
0.000	0.344	26	13.2	60.8	Woman	Cleanliness
		2.1	21	76.9	Man	
0.000	0.336	50.5	28.4	21.1	Woman	Exploiting
		23.1	26.2	50.8	Man	
0.477	0.061	12.7	50	37.3	Woman	Being boring
		10.8	46.2	43.1	Man	
0.000	0.197	15.7	37.3	47.1	Woman	Emotional instability
		30.8	24.1	45.1	Man	
0.039	0.127	28.4	37.3	34.3	Woman	Loyalty
		39.5	27.7	32.8	Man	
0.769	0.036	5.9	23.2	70.9	Woman	Homosexuality
		6.2	26.2	67.7	Man	
0.000	0.199	6.9	29.9	63.2	Woman	Apathetic
		19	19.5	61.5	Man	
0.067	0.117	17.2	27.5	55.4	Woman	Caring
		26.2	27.7	46.2	Man	
0.135	0.10	18.1	55.9	26	Woman	Ignoring
		12.8	53.3	33.8	Man	
0.012	0.149	28.4	16.7	54.9	Woman	Ineptness
		19	27.2	53.8	Man	
0.000	0.388	37.7	28.4	33.8	Woman	Commitment
		5.6	45.6	48.7	Man	
0.005	0.164	23	21.1	55.9	Woman	Physical failure
		34.9	11.3	53.8	Man	
0.000	0.343	35.3	37.3	27.5	Woman	Selfishness
		7.2	47.7	45.1	Man	
0.000	0.216	16.7	33.3	50	Woman	Purposelessness
		30.3	16.9	52.8	Man	

Another objective of the present study was to investigate the relationship between marital status and the ratio of using competitor derogation tactics. Table 3 shows the relationship between marital status of respondents and their use of competitor derogation tactics.

Table 3 the statistical test and the percent of students' responses to the ratio of using competitor derogation tactics in terms of marital status

Significance level of χ^2 test	Statistical value of ϕ	The amount of using tactic			Marital status	Tactic
		High	Average	Low		
0.110	0.105	33.2	30	36.7	Single	Calling silly
		37.9	36.2	25.9	Married	
0.000	0.363	19.1	19.1	61.8	Single	Mocking
		6.9	55.2	37.9	Married	
0.137	0.1	14.1	31.1	54.8	Single	Financial situation
		2.7	23.3	56	Married	
0.011	0.150	32.2	13.4	54.4	Single	Foot looseness
		44	18.1	37.9	Married	
0.000	0.244	15.5	39.9	44.5	Single	Calling unpopular
		34.5	42.2	23.3	Married	
0.000	0.412	15.9	9.9	74.2	Single	Appearance defects
		27.6	39.7	32.8	Married	
0.008	0.156	16.6	24.4	59	Single	Neglecting achievement
		20.7	37.1	42.2	Married	
0.002	0.179	27.9	17.7	54.4	Single	Calling weak
		30.2	31.9	37.9	Married	
0.000	0.222	6	24.4	69.6	Single	Bad habits
		18.1	11.2	70.7	Married	
0.000	0.299	13.8	16.6	69.6	Single	Cleanliness
		23.3	38.8	37.9	Married	
0.000	0.264	37.8	22.3	39.9	Single	Exploiting
		44	41.4	14.7	Married	
0.000	0.253	28	49.1	41	Single	Being boring
		25	56	19	Married	
0.009	0.154	24	31.4	44.5	Single	Emotional instability
		34.5	37.1	28.4	Married	
0.001	0.193	36	23	41	Single	Loyalty
		34.5	40.5	25	Married	
0.000	0.223	6.7	25.1	68.2	Single	Homosexuality
		20.7	13.8	65.5	Married	
0.000	0.270	11.7	26.5	61.8	Single	Apathetic
		34.5	22.4	43.1	Married	
0.000	0.274	18.7	35.5	45.9	Single	Caring
		44	17.2	38.8	Married	
0.000	0.217	155.5	56.2	28.3	Single	Ignoring
		23.3	68.1	8.6	Married	
0.013	0.147	20.8	20.5	58.7	Single	Ineptness
		31.9	25	43.1	Married	
0.000	0.402	13.1	33.6	53.4	Single	Commitment
		47.4	33.6	19	Married	
0.002	0.175	9.2	24.7	66.1	Single	Physical failure
		20.7	28.4	50.9	Married	
0.000	0.382	14.5	44.5	41	Single	Selfishness
		41.4	51.7	6.9	Married	
0.000	0.223	17.3	28.6	54.1	Single	Purposelessness
		48.3	13.8	37.9	Married	

Also, in this study, we evaluated the ratio of using competitor derogation tactics in terms of temporal context of relationship (short term/ long term). Table 4 examines the relationship between the use of competitor derogation tactics and temporal context of relationship (short term / long term).

Table 4. The statistical test and the percent of students' responses to the ratio of using competitor derogation tactics in terms of the relationship type

Significance level of χ^2 test	Statistical value of ϕ	The amount of using tactic			Type of relationship	Tactic
		High	Average	Low		
0.237	0.085	30.3	35.8	33.9	Short term	Calling silly
		37.9	29.2	33	Long term	
0.000	0.284	21.2	14.5	64.2	Short term	Mocking
		11.6	40.3	48.1	Long term	
0.000	0.329	14.5	46.1	39.4	Short term	Financial situation
		17.2	16.3	66.5	Long term	
0.002	0.177	45.5	10.9	43.6	Short term	Foot looseness
		28.8	17.6	53.6	Long term	
0.000	0.234	10.3	29.7	40	Short term	Calling unpopular
		28.8	33.9	37.3	Long term	
0.059	0.119	13.9	18.2	67.9	Short term	Appearance defects
		23.2	18.5	58.4	Long term	
0.004	0.166	10.3	31.5	58.2	Short term	Neglecting achievement
		23.2	25.8	51.1	Long term	
0.000	0.234	31.5	31.5	37	Short term	Calling weak
		26.6	15	58.4	Long term	
0.003	0.171	10.3	28.5	61.2	Short term	Bad habits
		9	15	76	Long term	
0.000	0.216	10.3	17	72.7	Short term	Cleanliness
		21	27.5	51.5	Long term	
0.578	0.052	41.2	24.8	33.9	Short term	Exploiting
		38.6	29.6	31.8	Long term	
0.001	0.193	10.3	62.4	27.3	Short term	Being boring
		17.2	42.9	39.9	Long term	
0.000	0.201	24.8	38.2	37	Short term	Emotional instability
		28.8	29.6	41.6	Long term	
0.000	0.222	45.5	17	37.6	Short term	Loyalty
		28.8	35.6	35.6	Long term	
0.000	0.327	0	31.5	68.5	Short term	Homosexuality
		18.5	15	66.5	Long term	
0.000	0.195	10.3	32.1	57.6	Short term	Apathetic
		24	20.6	55.4	Long term	
0.000	0.296	11.5	40.6	47.9	Short term	Caring
		36.5	22.3	41.2	Long term	
0.000	0.254	10.3	55.8	33.9	Short term	Ignoring
		23.2	62.2	14.6	Long term	
0.033	0.131	17.6	24.8	57.6	Short term	Ineptness
		28.8	19.7	51.5	Long term	
0.000	0.217	17.6	45.5	37	Short term	Commitment
		27	24.9	48.1	Long term	
0.496	0.059	10.9	24.2	64.8	Short term	Physical failure
		13.7	27	59.2	Long term	
0.000	0.238	18.2	37.6	44.2	Short term	Selfishness
		25.3	52.8	21.9	Long term	
0.011	0.150	21.2	31.5	47.3	Short term	Purposelessness
		30	19.3	50.6	Long term	

Discussion:

Findings of the study indicate that there was a significant difference between the sexes in terms of using competitor derogation tactics. According to the results, among the studied tactics, pattern of using some tactics was not related to the gender of respondent students, and is used similarly between men and women that these tactics include, calling silly, neglecting achievement, calling weak, bad habits, being boring, loyalty, homosexuality, caring, ignoring. Using other competitor derogation tactics is different between the two sexes and some are used more by women and some by men. Based on the research findings, mocking, foot looseness, facial defects, cleanliness, exploiting, emotional instability, apathetic, calling inept, commitment, selfishness, purposelessness, tactics are used more by women. On the other hand, the tactics of the financial position, calling unpopular, physical failure, are used more by men.

These findings are consistent with those of previous studies. In researches carried out on intrasexual competitor tactics (self-promotion and competitor derogation), Schmitt and Buss (1996, Buss, 1988; Buss & Deden, 1990) concluded that both sexes when making a relationship with opposite sex actively derogate potential competitors and self-promote. Buss and Deden (1990), studied the gender differences in competitor derogation. Their studies demonstrated differences between the sexes. Blask-Richak and Buss (2006) carried out a study on 68 male mates and 99 women mates who were friends. In this study, it was found that men looking for short-term mating often use tactics that indicates their dominance or undermines the dominance of the rival. This finding was not found in women. It was also found that both sexes for the long-term mating tend to use self-promotion tactics concerning the sexual monopoly. In competitor derogation tactics, about the foot looseness of the rival similar results were not found. It is also an evidence of differences among the tactics chosen.

Also, Fisher, Cox and Gordon (2009) in a study that investigated the impact of gender and romantic relationship status on intersexual competition strategy selection, concluded that, in general, self-promotional strategy is used more than competitor derogation strategy. They also found that women more than men use self-promotional strategy and men more than women use competitor derogation strategy. Buss (1988), in a study on 113 students (57 women and 56 men) identified the tactics to attract mates. Because, mate attraction tactics and intersexual competition methods are directly correlated with mate selection preferences in both sexes, these two areas are also

related. Then the questionnaire of mate attraction tactics (28 tactics) was conducted out on 108 participants, so that, each subject answered the questions about his/her friend of the same sex. The results indicate that men more than women used methods of showing resources to attract mates. Also, it was found that in order to attract mates, women more than men use the tactics of changing appearance, using makeup, using stylish clothes, and being clean. But no evidence was found about the women using the tactics of using sexy clothing, seductive behavior and behaving with modesty. Men often use exaggeration methods about the achievements, the possibility of having a higher income in the future, showing assets and exaggerating about the physical and athletic ability, whereas women often use tactics about difficulty in gaining her, improving appearance with makeup and jewelry, and also showing empathy.

Buss (1988), in his study, implemented the scale of mate attraction tactics on 107 newly married couples, so that, they were asked to specify which tactics they used so more to attract their current couples in the past. Results indicated that men most often use tactics of showing material resources, physical and athletic strength, and women often make use of tactics of using make up, being clean, changing the appearance, using jewelry, using sexy dresses and gentlemanly and modesty behavior.

Also, the present study showed that among competitor derogation tactics, tactics related to the derogation of the facial beauty are seen, that is consistent with the results obtained from previous studies. For example, from an evolutionary perspective, gossiping is considered as one of the strategies used in intrasexual competition specifically by women (Massar, Buunk & Rempt, 2012). Since, the intrasexual competition tactics of women are less aggressive than men, evolutionary perspective about the gossiping assumes that this tactic is used more by women. Moreover, according to this view, individuals will tend to communicate with people of the same sex, because these environments are the center for gossiping and destroying the reputation of a woman's sexuality and physical appearance that are important for a woman's mating value. In fact, recent studies have proved both of these hypotheses, (Masar, Bonk and Rmt, 2012).

For example, McAndrew & Milenkovic (2002), found that participants who more than anything are interested in the information about the people of the same sex, are more likely to divulge information about their competitors. Interestingly, although there was no gender differences in the tendency to gossip about the reputation of potential competitors(De

Backer, Nelissen and Fisher, 2007), research has shown that there is a difference in recalling gossiping about sexual rivals: women more than men recall information about mating skills of potential competitors. Also, according to McAndrew, Bell & Garcia (2007) Women, when speaking to their beloved, gossip three times more than men people of the same sex, i.e. competitors.

About the content of gossip, researches (e.g., Buss and Deden, 1990; Owens, Shute & Slee, 2000) have shown that, derogating comments about other women's appearance and little about their sexual reputation have high rank among gossip subjects. Moreover, it seems that negative comments about the attractiveness of other women has the desired effect on men, meaning that makes potential mate (derogator's rival) less desirable for men. A research by Fisher and Cox (2009) indicated that men assess the rivals less attractive when negative comments are proposed about the appearance of a rival. In addition, men are even more impressed when these comments are proposed by an attractive woman. However, in another study (Fisher, Shaw, Worth, Smith and Reeve, 2010), it was shown that gossiping decreases the individual's desirability as a mate. The evaluation of men from friendship, kindness, reliability and overall desirability of derogator person significantly reduces. Studies have shown that gossiping is an effective method for women through which derogate the people of the same sex in front of the opposite sex (Masar, Bonk and Rmt, 2012).

Also, Fisher (2012) conducted a study that investigated the influence of estrogen on the female's estimate of facial attractiveness of other women. The results showed that, during periods of increased estrogen, competition and thus derogation increases. In contrast, estrogen levels did not have any impact on men's facial attractiveness.

Fisher (2004) examined changes in women's ratings of female faces during ovulation (i.e., maximum fertility) as compared to menstruation (i.e., minimal fertility). She found ovulating women provided lower evaluations of female facial attractiveness compared to menstruating women, which she considered to be due to increased intrasexual competition during a time when it is most critical for reproduction. Also the study of Buss and Deden (1990) about gender differences of men and women in competitor derogation in showed that the more use of appearance derogation tactics is constant among women. Also the women undermine the loyalty and reproductive value of their rivals.

The findings of this research can be explained based on previous research. In cases that males invest, females search for mates that are more able to

provide these resources. (Trayvrs, 1972). Since, based on the theory of evolution, mate selection preferences in a sex can affect the features members of the opposite sex compete for (bass, a1988), men in intrasexual competition should try to increase their financial resources, and derogate potential resources of other men. It is predicted that males more than females derogate competitor resources. They also derogate the traits of their rival that are conducive to acquire these resources too. These characteristics include social status and rank, achievements, ambitions, being diligent, courage and physical strength (Barton, 1966; Darwin, 1871, Vylrmn, 1979). Courage and Delaware are associated with the ability to hunt, defend territory and resources efficiently and protect the couple and children (Darwin, 1871). It predicts that, probably males derogate another's courage. (Trayvrs, 1972, Williams, 1975).

The study of Buss and Deden (1990), researchers sought to determine the similarities of the two sexes in terms of competitor derogation. 120 undergraduate students, 60 female and 60 male were asked to say what tactics they use or think what tactics they use to derogate the competitor. Finally, it was found that men more use tactics of derogating economic resources, achievements and goals of rival. It also became clear that, derogating the physical strength of the rival is also among the competitor derogation methods. Also, the study showed that men more use tactics including derogation of resources, or the ability to acquire resources, physical power and social status to derogate the people of the same sex.

The findings of this research can be explained based on previous research. In cases that males invest, females search for mates that are more able to provide these resources. (Trayvrs, 1972). Since, based on the theory of evolution, mate selection preferences in a sex can affect the features members of the opposite sex compete for (bass, a1988), men in intrasexual competition should try to increase their financial resources, and derogate potential resources of other men. It is predicted that males more than females derogate competitor resources. They also derogate the traits of their rival that are conducive to acquire these resources too. These characteristics include social status and rank, achievements, ambitions, being diligent, courage and physical strength (Barton, 1966; Darwin, 1871, Vylrmn, 1979). Courage and Delaware are associated with the ability to hunt, defend territory and resources efficiently and protect the couple and children (Darwin, 1871). It predicts that, probably males derogate another's courage. (Trayvrs, 1972, Williams, 1975).

The study of Buss and Deden (1990), researchers sought to determine the similarities of the

two sexes in terms of competitor derogation. 120 undergraduate students, 60 female and 60 male were asked to say what tactics they use or think what tactics they use to derogate the competitor. Finally, it was found that men more use tactics of derogating economic resources, achievements and goals of rival. It also became clear that, derogating the physical strength of the rival is also among the competitor derogation methods.

In this study, also the effectiveness of various tactics in two sexes was investigated. The findings of the present study suggest that there was no statistically significant difference between men and women in the effectiveness of tactics of calling silly, derogating achievement, homosexuality, caring, ignoring. However, financial status, calling weak, emotional instability, loyalty, apathetic, commitment, and physical failure tactics were considered as more effective than other tactics for men. While women considered mocking, calling unpopular, physical faults, bad habits, cleanliness, exploiting, being boring, calling inept, selfishness, purposelessness, the most effective tactics.

These findings are consistent with previous studies in this area. For example, in the study by Buss and Deden (1990), researchers attempted to show the effectiveness of these tactics in each sex. For this purpose, a sample of 101 undergraduate students (50 men and 51 women) was selected. They were asked to rate the effectiveness of each competitor derogation tactic in both sexes. The results showed that, using derogation tactics of economic resources, power, and purpose is more effective for men; however, both sexes believed that derogation tactics of women's appearance and loyalty were more effective in women.

It is worth mentioning that contradictory results were obtained in the case of women's foot looseness. These results can be explained by the temporal context of mating (long term/ short term). It seems, in short-term mating, the woman's foot looseness is not bad. Thus, using this tactic is not effective for women in short-term mating, whereas, in the long-term mating that the woman's loyalty increases man's confidence of being father, using this tactic of competitor derogation by other women would be effective.

Schmitt and Buss (1996), conducted a research to investigate the gender and temporal context of the relationship (long term/ short term). In this study, 86 students (44 males and 42 females) were asked to rate the effectiveness of competitor derogation tactics about the short-term and long-term mating in the two sexes.

Results suggests that, while, competitor derogation tactics about the sexual availability are effective for women in short-term mating, sexual monopolistic tactics and questioning the rival's loyalty are effective for women in long-term mating. Meanwhile, for men, tactics of having resources, dominance, or derogating rival's dominance are effective in short-term mating, and the ability to acquire resources are effective in long-term mating.

Competitor derogation tactics about commitment and kindness are effective for both sexes in long-term mating. Competitor derogation tactics about rival's appearance are effective in both sexes in short-term mating and in general, these tactics are more effective when used by women.

In a study Blask-Richak and Buss (2006) it made clear that, both sexes consider sexual availability tactics effective in short-term mating. Whereas, for men, in short-term mating tactics of appearance are effective. Also in short-term mating, domination tactics are more effective for men. In this study it was found that sexual monopoly for women is most effective in long-term mating. Eventually it became clear that there is a high correlation between the personal reports and friend's reports on the effectiveness of perceived self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics.

In a study by Buss (1988) the results showed that using the method of showing resources is more effective for men to attract mates while, the use of tactics of sexy dressing, seductive behavior, using make up, stylish clothes, and changing the appearance are more effective to attract mates when used by females. However, the tactics of foot looseness and touching men are more effective when use by women, and tactic of kind behavior is more effective while men use it to attract mates. In this study, the results showed that, whatever the extent of the effect of one tactic is estimated to be more for one sex it will be more likely to be used by that sex.

It was also shown that there is a relationship between marital status and competitor derogation tactics. The results showed that, there was no significant difference between single and married people, in terms of using financial condition tactics. Singles used mocking tactic more than married people. Married people use various competitor derogation tactics more than singles such as: calling silly, foot looseness, calling unpopular, facial defects, derogating achievements, calling weak, bad habits, cleanliness, exploiting, being boring, emotional instability, loyalty, homosexuality, caring, ignoring, calling inept, commitment, physical failures, selfishness, purposelessness, more than single people are using.

The results of the current study in some part of the field are in conflict with previous research. For example, Buss and Deden (1990) in their study of 100 subjects, who were recently married, asked them to answer competitor derogation questionnaires about themselves and then answer the same questionnaire about their spouse. The results of this study partially confirmed previous studies and showed that, married people were not in conditions of intrasexual competition. Consequently, they may less use competitor derogation tactics or do not be sensitive to them and recognizing them as before.

It is worth mentioning that contradictory results were obtained in the case of women's foot looseness. These results can be explained by the temporal context of mating (long term/ short term). It seems, in short-term mating, the woman's foot looseness is not bad. Thus, using this tactic is not effective for women in short-term mating, whereas, in the long-term mating that the woman's loyalty increases man's confidence of being father, using this tactic of competitor derogation by other women would be effective.

Also, Fisher, Cox and Gordon (2009) in a study that investigated the impact of gender and romantic relationship status on intersexual competition strategy selection, concluded that, in general, self-promotional strategy is used more than competitor derogation strategy. They also found that women more than men use self-promotional strategy and men more than women use competitor derogation strategy. In their study, the people who did not have a romantic relationship or did not have a friendship relationship, use self-promotion and competitor derogation more than married people.

However, these results can be explained in light of the findings of some studies. Researches have shown that people often try to grasp and preserve their current relationship from more attractive options (Ritter, Karmans & Schi, 2010). Competitor derogation may be used to maintain a relationship (Johnston and Rasbalt, 1989). For example, people who are involved in a romantic relationship, pay less attention to attractive people of the opposite sex (Miller, 1997) and when interacting with attractive people of the opposite sex, indicate less behavioral symptoms of attention (Karmanz and Vrvyjmn, 2008).

People, who are committed to their relationship, derogate their possible rivals on the internal personality characteristics, such as intelligence and loyalty. Simpson et al (1990) studied the valuation of the attractiveness of the opposite sex among those, who were involved in an emotional relationship and those who were not. They found that people, who are

involved in an emotional relationship and are committed to it, consider the members of the opposite sex less attractive. They stated that, people derogate the attractiveness of the opposite sex in order to maintain their current relationship. These findings were largely repeated by Lidun and colleagues (1999) (Fisher et al, 2008). It seems that, among married people there is a tendency toward derogation of competitor and potential rivals that the main function of which is to maintain the current relationship.

Research data showed that among intrasexual competition tactics, there is no a direct and significant relationship between the four tactics of calling silly, facial defects, exploiting, physical failure, and temporal context of the relationship (short term / long term). Tactics of mocking, financial condition, foot looseness, derogating achievements, loyalty, overtaking in sports and pregnancy, were used more by the people in a short term relationship than those in a long term relationship.

People who were in a long term relationship used the following tactics more than those who were in the short term relationship: calling unpopular, calling weak, bad habits, cleanliness, being boring, emotional instability, homosexuality, apathetic, caring, ignoring, calling inept, commitment, selfishness, purposelessness.

In researches carried out on intrasexual competitor tactics (self-promotion and competitor derogation), Schmitt and Buss (1996, Buss, 1988; Buss & Deden, 1990) concluded that both sexes when making a relationship with opposite sex actively derogate potential competitors and self-promote. However, the length of the relationship affects the use of these strategies. Women who are looking for short term relationship, focus on their sexual attractions and abilities whereas, women looking for a long term relationship are emphasizing more loyalty and toughness in sexual relations. In contrast, the men, who are looking for short term relationship, emphasize current and tangible resources, while the men, who are looking for a long term relationship, emphasize their ability to access to resources in the future. Thus competitor derogation tactics are affected by the length of the relationship. For example, women, who are looking for short term relationship, call their competitors 'ugly', 'intolerant' or 'dirty', whereas, in the competition for a long-term relationship call them "footloose".

Competitor derogation also may be used to preserve and maintain a relationship (Johnson and Rasbalt, 1989). People, who are committed to their relationship, derogate their possible rivals on the internal personality characteristics, such as intelligence and loyalty. Simpson et al (1990) studied

the valuation of the attractiveness of the opposite sex among those, who were involved in an emotional relationship and those who were not. They found that people, who are involved in an emotional relationship and are committed to it, consider the members of the opposite sex less attractive. They stated that, people derogate the attractiveness of the opposite sex in order to maintain their current relationship. These findings were largely repeated by Lidun and colleagues (1999) (Fisher et al, 2008). It seems that, among married people there is a tendency toward derogation of competitor and potential rivals that the main function of which is to maintain the current relationship.

Schmitt and Buss (1996), conducted a research to investigate the gender and temporal context of the relationship (long term/ short term).

Initially, 40 students (18 males and 22 females) were asked to write five practices to attract opposite sex for short term mating and five practices for long term mating and about themselves and two other persons one of which is of opposite sex. Finally, 31 self-promotion and 28 competitor derogation tactics were obtained. Then 108 undergraduate students (58 men and 50 women) were asked to rate the impact of self-promotion tactics in short term and long term mating for both sexes and other 86 students (44 males and 42 females) were asked to rate the impact of competitor derogation tactics on short term and long term mating for both sexes.

The results indicate the following: 1. self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics are effective about sexual availability for women in short-term mating. 2. Tactics about sexual monopoly and questioning rival's loyalty are effective for women in long term mating. 3. For men tactics of having resources are effective in short term mating and the ability to acquire resources tactics are effective in long term mating. 4. Tactics of having dominance or undermining the dominance of the rival are effective for men in short term mating. 5. Self-promotion tactics of commitment or competitor derogation tactics about commitment are effective for both sexes in long term mating. 6. Self-promotion tactics of kindness or competitor derogation tactics of kindness are effective for both sexes in long term mating. 7. Self-promotion tactics about appearance or competitor derogation tactics of rival's appearance are effective for both sexes in short term mating and in general, these tactics are more effective when used by women.

Blask-Richak and Buss (2006) carried out a study on 68 male mates and 99 women mates who were friends. They found that in short term mating both sexes more use self-promotion tactics of sexual

availability and competitor derogation tactic of rival's lack of sexual availability. Also in short term mating both sexes use self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics related to appearance. In this study, it was found that men looking for short-term mating often use tactics that indicates their dominance or undermines the dominance of the rival. This finding was not found in women. It was also found that both sexes for the long-term mating tend to use self-promotion tactics concerning the sexual monopoly. In competitor derogation tactics about the foot looseness of the rival similar results were not found. Researchers found that there is a high correlation between the personal reports and reports of the same sex friend.

Blask-Richak and Buss (2006) carried out another study on 68 male mates and 99 women mates who were friends. They were searching for the effectiveness of perceived self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics in attracting mates. Researchers found that, both sexes consider sexual availability tactics effective in short-term mating. Whereas, for men, in short-term mating tactics of appearance are effective. Also in short-term mating, domination tactics are more effective for men. In this study it was found that sexual monopoly for women is most effective in long-term mating. Eventually it became clear that there is a high correlation between the personal reports and friend's reports on the effectiveness of perceived self-promotion and competitor derogation tactics.

References

1. Barton, F. (1966) Creativity and psychology of rumor. New York: Von Nostrand.
2. Bleske-Rechek, A. & Buss, D.M. (2006). Sexual strategies pursued and mate attraction tactics deployed. *Personality and individual differences*, 40, 1299-1311.
3. Buss, D.M. (1998). Psychological sex differences: Origins through sexual selection. In B. Clinchy, & J. Norem (Eds.). *The Gender and Psychological Reader* (pp. 228-235). New York: New York University Press.
4. Buss, D.M. (1987). Sex differences in human mate selection criteria: An evolutionary perspective. In C. Crawford, M. Smith, & D. Krebs (Eds.), *Sociobiology and psychology: Issues, goals, and findings* (pp.335-354). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
5. Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-14.

6. Buss, D.M. & Dedden, L.A. (1990). Derogation of competitors. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 395-422.
7. Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man and selection in relation of sex*. London: John Murray.
8. De Backer, C. J. S., Nelissen, M., & Fisher, M. L. (2007). Let's talk about sex: A study on the recall of gossip about potential mates and sexual rivals. *Sex Roles*, 56, 781-791.
9. Fisher, M., Cox, A., & Gordon, F. (2009). Self-promotion versus competitor derogation: the influence of sex and romantic relationship status on intrasexual competition strategy selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 7, 4, 287-308.
10. Fisher, M., Shaw, S., Worth, K., Smith, L., & Reeve, C. (2010). How we view those who derogate: Perceptions of female competitor derogators. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, 4, 265-276.
11. Fisher, M. L. (2012). Female intrasexual competition decreases female facial attractiveness. *The Royal Society of Proceedings of Biological Sciences*. Downloaded from rsob.royalsocietypublishing.org. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2004.0160
12. Karremans, J. C., & Verwijmeren, T. (2008). Mimicking attractive opposite-sex others: The role of romantic relationship status. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 939-950.
13. 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 [Special issues: Biological foundations of personality: Evolution, behavioral genetics, and psychophysiology]. *Journal of Personality*, 58, 97-116.
14. Kenrick, D.T., Groth, G., Trost, M. & Sadalla, E. (1993). Integrating evolutionary and social exchange perspectives on relationships: Effects of gender, self-appraisal, and involvement level on mate selection criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 951-969.
15. Johnston, D., & Rusbult, C. (1989). Resisting temptation: Devaluation of alternative partners as means of maintaining commitment in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 967-980.
16. Massar, K., Buunk, A. P., & Rempt, S. (2012). Age differences in women's tendency to gossip are mediated by their mate value. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 106-109.
17. McAndrew, F. T., & Milenkovic, M. A. (2002). Of tabloids and family secrets: The evolutionary psychology of gossip. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 1064-1082.
18. McAndrew, F. T., Bell, E. K., & Garcia, C. M. (2007). Who do we tell and whom do we tell on? Gossip as a strategy for status enhancement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1562-1577.
19. Miller, R. S. (1997). Inattentive and contented: Relationship commitment and attention to alternatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 758-766.
20. Ritter, S. M., Karremans, J. C., Schie, H. T. (2010). The role of self-regulation in derogating attractive alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 631-637.
21. Schmitt, D.P., & Buss, D.M. (1996). Strategic self-promotion and competitor derogation: Sex and content effects on the perceived effectiveness of mate attraction tactics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1185-1204.
22. Simpson, J.A., Gangestad, S. & Lerman, M. (1990). Perception of physical attractiveness: Mechanisms involved in the maintenance of romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1192-1201.
23. 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.
24. Williams, G.C. (1975) *Sex and Evolution*. Princeton, NJ: University Press.
25. Willerman, L. (1979). *The psychology of individual and group differences*. Freeman.

2013/15/1