

Gendernomics: Expectancy, Equity theory and sex.

Black Label Logic | 6 March, 2016 | by Black Label Logic

✖ Two of the classics in motivational theory for business are equity and expectancy theory. The two state different but complimentary perspectives on what motivates an employee and how to get an employee to perform.

About equity theory

Equity theory is a model used that is based on the supposition that people seek to maintain equity of inputs and outputs within a relationship, when compared to the perceived inputs and outputs of others. When applied to a business relationship, it tends to refer to the employees inputs (hours work, results) and the employees outputs (pay). When compared to the perceived inputs of co-workers and the remuneration of co-workers.

The theory states that if the employee perceive themselves as being in a non-equitable relationship, meaning one where costs are greater than benefits, they will strive to restore equity, for instance by working less, or producing less results.

This model is made for business, but it holds true in interpersonal relationships as well, if a person is overly investing in another person (onetis) that is done with the expectation of equity being restored at one point. This becomes very clear in the reasoning underlying many a man's orbiting of an attractive female, where he has selected a strategy of showing evidence of being the perfect man according to what the woman says without any guarantee of payout but with an implicit expectation of equity being restored at some point.

About expectancy theory

Expectancy theory works very well with equity theory, because where equity theory is about cost vs rewards, expectancy theory is about behavior motivated by rewards. Basic expectancy theory states that a person will elect certain behavior over other possible behaviors based on the expected outcomes.

So an employee seeking to get a promotion, will select showing up on time over being late, or will take on ambitious projects because they expect that this will get them a promotion.

The problem arises when expected behavior does not lead to the expected benefits. For instance if the employee sees that the person who got the promotion spent more time engaging in political plays and less time in work, the up until now, model employee may decide to engage in more politics and less direct work. This is negative for the company, as the employee was one of the guys in the company that made sure results happened, but he is now dedicating 30% of his working time to playing politics in order to secure his goal.

Causality

Propositions of cause and effect underlie much of human thinking. In both of the examples used for equity- and expectancy theory, the core was a supposition by the actor. *"If I do this better, I should get more"* and *"If I do this, I should get that"*

A lot of feminists/women are very quick to engage in the female solipsism of *"Just because you're nice to me/buy me stuff, doesn't mean I owe you shit"* and this is correct. Every woman as a being with agency is free to choose what is required to enter into her holiest of holies. However, we are dealing with two opposite expectations.

One is expecting resources to be spent on her with no idea of reciprocity being permitted.

The other is expecting that reciprocity applies as a moral principle.

Expectancy theory:

Man: *“If I’m nice, buy her shit, and demonstrate what a good boyfriend I can be, she will eventually see that we should be together.”*

Woman: *“I can expect men to be nice to me, buy things for me, and do things for me without offering anything in return.”*

In the case of the man there is an expectation of causality, “If X, then Y”, which is also a reciprocal expectation. In the case of the woman there is an expectation of “If X, then maybe Y”.

A meaningful analogy would be that the man’s expectation is like a bond. He pays a principle (the effort to get the woman) and then he gets paid interest for a period of time afterwards (the coupon). In reality, what he is buying is an option, it may or may not vest, and the woman is free to sell options to other men as well.

This is highly beneficial for the woman, as she can have 5, 10, 20 men are buying things for her, doing things for her and so on, without actually having to make an equitable investment. Evolutionary speaking, this means that the woman is net positive, whereas the men are net negative. They are expending resources that she gets, but are getting nothing in return. This raises 2 major questions that are beyond me to answer:

- A) Are women inherently narcissistic and thus expect to be given free stuff.
- B) Are women oblivious to reciprocity and thus naively believe that the orbiters hang around and expend resources on them with no expectation.

I’m not one for moral arguments, but misrepresenting the potential outcome to extract resources in many cases will be considered fraud.

The longer term effects

The effect of this over time is very predictable and is stated in the first 2 parts of this essay:

- A) The man not getting what he expects, starts to engage in different behavior.
- B) The man being taken advantage of refuses to provide equity any longer.

From a perspective of a negotiation, the outcomes are as follows:

- A) If the female is in enough demand, she can easily replace him.
- B) If the female is in high enough demand, she can replace him with another man who does provide equity.

For a much more detailed perspective of negotiation, please visit Illimitableman’s breakdown [here](#). As Rollo Tomassi outlines in several pieces on the sexual marketplace [1] women hold the negotiating power until they hit “The wall”, I explored this in my essay on the [SMV](#). At this point, the power-dynamic in the negotiation changes. A woman’s ability to attract and maintain a network of positive equity, starts to rapidly decline until she is no longer able to keep it up. This is when the lamentations of *“Where are all the good men who are supposed to marry a 35 – 40 year old woman, who has only focused on herself for most of her life?”*

The problem for her comes in the following:

- A) Men who are younger than her, prefer to go for women their own age or younger.
- B) Men who are at her own age, have now experienced a massive rise in sexual market value (provided they have done the work) and are now highly attractive to both women their own age, and women who are younger.

C) Men her own age, and men older than her, are either married or have experienced a divorce and thus are less likely to go for attempt number 2.

As I outlined in my essay on supply and demand, a woman is in extremely high demand until she hits 30, at which point she suffers a drastic decline in demand. She, like many investment banks failed to realize that a crash was coming, and thus needed a bailout. Now, she may get a bailout from one of the long term orbiters, who marries her and takes care of her. He of course is just happy that after 10 – 15 years of banging every bad boy, artist, and whatever other type of man, she finally sees that he is the one.

The option for men

The wake-up call is usually harsher than it needs to be for men. It can come after the perfect soul-mate turns out to be a harpy. It can come in the form of anger after watching his perfect angel going after men other than him for years. It can come after one too many nights of listening to her cry into his shoulder about how she always picks the wrong men. Or perhaps, the classics “*Lets just be friends*” or “*You are such a perfect guy, how come you aren’t taken?*”

The man starts to look around the net for advice on how to get her to finally see him, and he ends up in the manosphere. I hope in some of the better sections, and he learns that all the behavior he has observed in his own life has also been observed by many members of the manosphere, that I call [“The Manosphere Grounded Theory project: What the fuck is up with women?”](#).

He learns about hypergamy and understands the woman’s behavior with the string of “jerks”. He learns about how to be a man from one of the many surrogate fathers of the manosphere. He starts to work out, maximizing his career, and invests all the resources he used to invest in her, in himself in preparation for the SMP flip. This is in essence the man realigning his expectancy theory and equity theory in the following manner:

Expectancy: I expect that if I apply the principles of the manosphere, I can get more women than ever before.

Equity: I refuse to invest a women who do not invest in me first.

Alternatively he rejects women all together, and decides to go MGTOW, in varying degrees. Either he rejects women all together, or just long term relationships, or just marriage or some form of this. This is a change in expectancy and equity as follows:

Expectancy: I expect that if I invest all my resources in myself and my life, I will have a better life.

Equity: I refuse to invest resources in anything except myself, as I expect them to bear no fruit.

These positions in terms that are simple to understanding is:

A) Flipping the script and the position of negotiation in effect assuming the most powerful role in the power dynamic.

B) Refusing to play the game at all.

These are not mutually exclusive roles except for in their extreme states, one can be a MGTOW and still engage in short term relationships and one night stands. However, they are both reactions to failure of expectancy and equity, combined with an extremely negative market for most of his life.

As illustrated by the following table:

Age range	F.S	F.D
20 - 24	-442 353	442 353
25 - 29	-169 333	169 333
30 - 34	-30 901	30 901
35 - 39	95 598	-95 598
40 - 44	970 874	-970 874
45 - 49	290 421	-290 421

Men experience a case where from ages 20 – 29, and to a lesser extent 30 – 34, the supply of women that men are most attracted to, is lower than the demand for them. Thus increasing the price of females. At the same time, men are in over-supply, resulting in a decrease in the price of males. As this flips when a woman hits 35, and goes into the extremes when the woman goes past 40, the demand and supply curves of the genders become inverted. With men in undersupply and high demand.

A man lives in supply-side economics, where supply creates its own demand. An Alpha male is always in high demand because he is a differentiated and rare product.

Women live in demand-side economics, where demand creates supply. An attractive women is not always an attractive women, due to aging and declining beauty.

A note:

I recently launched a [Patreon page](#) where I will be posting additional content every month for those who support me and I will do a Google Hangout for the highest tier Patrons (limited to 10 people).

I've also had some requests for consults, which I've declined up until now, but due to demand I've chosen to open up for doing some consults on request. For details please check out my [Consulting and Patreon Page](#)

[As always you can buy my book Gendernomics at Amazon.com as both paperback and Kindle](#)

Sources:

[1]<http://therationalmale.com/2012/06/04/final-exam-navigating-the-smp/>

Archived from theredarchive.com