

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2013

Interpreting Ambiguity in Sexual Dating Encounters: Social Information Processing Differences in Men and Women

Carrie Ambrose

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ambrose, Carrie, "Interpreting Ambiguity in Sexual Dating Encounters: Social Information Processing Differences in Men and Women" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 34.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/34>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Interpreting Ambiguity in Sexual Dating Encounters: Social Information Processing Differences
in Men and Women

A Dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Psychology
The University of Mississippi

by

CARRIE AMBROSE

December 2012

Copyright Carrie Ambrose 2012

ALL RIGHTS RESERVE

ABSTRACT

Research has shown date/acquaintance rape to be the most prevalent type of rape. Dating and social interactions provide a context influenced by social factors (e.g., relationship with perpetrator, relationship expectation, peer influences) and personal factors (e.g., social perceptions, goals, learning history), many of which have been suggested to complicate decision making in reference to communicating sexual boundaries.

Social Information Processing Theory (SIP) suggests individuals follow successive cognitive stages in determining how to respond to social stimuli. These stages are influenced by biological predisposition, environment, and learning history. The SIP model involves 6 stages: encoding of cues, interpretation of cues, goal clarification, response construction, response decision, and response implementation. Crick and Dodge (1994) proposed individual memory, social knowledge, and social schema affect each stage of social information processing resulting in a process that is unique to each individual.

In order to examine male and female differences in decision making processes during a date rape situation undergraduate college men and women listened to an audio tape of a male and female couple on a date engaged in the early stages of sexual negotiations (e.g. kissing). The woman expressed resistance to the man's attempts to have additional sexual contact (e.g., touching breasts and buttocks). The male acknowledges her resistance, but continues making sexual advances. Participants imagined themselves as the same sex vignette actor and responded to an SIP measure designed to assess five SIP cognitive processing stages related to the sexual

situation: interpretation of cues (causal and intent interpretation), goal clarification, response decision, response evaluation, and response efficacy. Additionally, emotional reactions to the situation were assessed. Participants were also administered a measure to assess past sexual perpetration and victimization. A series of Chi-square tests were conducted and results indicated males and females significantly differed in all SIP stages: causal and intent interpretation, goal clarification, and response decision. To evaluate the predictive ability of prior SIP stage responses on response decision making, a multinomial logistic regression analyses was performed and emotional reaction was found to be a significant predictor of responses decision highlighting the importance of emotion processing integration into social information processing research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Alan M. Gross, for his support not only with this project, but throughout my graduate training. I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, Drs. John Young, Todd Smitherman, and Marc Showalter for their help and support with this project. Finally, I would like to thank my mother for her never ending support, love, and understanding throughout my graduate career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	26
RESULTS.....	30
DISCUSSION	35
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	42
LIST OF APPENDICES	50
APPEDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	51
APPENIDX B: SOCIAL INFORMATION PROCESSING MEASURE.....	54
APPENDIX C: SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY	58
APPENDIX D: TABLES.....	71
VITA.....	79

INTRODUCTION

Rape affects many women in the United States. According to a national study conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice, 1 in 6 women will be a victim of an attempted or completed rape. Women between the ages of 20-34 have the highest incidence of sexual victimization (54.6%) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003) resulting in many studies focusing on college samples. Research conducted with college age women has found high prevalence of sexual assault. Gross et al. (2006) reported that 27% of college women they sampled had experienced some form of unwanted sexual contact, with 37% reporting more than one experience of sexual aggression. In a community sample, Testa and colleagues found that 18.8% of women reported experiencing sexual coercion, 11.9% reported attempted rape, and 17.2% completed rape (Testa et al., 2004).

Research has shown acquaintance rape is the most common form of rape. Acquaintance rape is defined as rape in which the victim and perpetrator have some level of social contact prior to the assault. Date rape is a type of acquaintance rape in which the victim and perpetrator have a dating relationship. According to the 2006 National Crime Victimization Study, 54% of reported rapes are perpetrated by a known assailant, with 27.4% of those assailants being a well known acquaintance and 26.6% a casual acquaintance (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). In a sample of college women, Koss and colleagues (1988) found 15.4% of women reported experiencing unwanted sexual intercourse by physical force or being given drugs and or alcohol.

The majority of the participants reported being acquainted with, or being in a romantic relationship with the perpetrator at the time of the sexual assault (Koss et al., 1988).

Researchers have suggested that male and female differences in communication during sexual encounters leads to miscommunication and inaccurate interpretations concerning sexual interest and boundaries. In particular, women may use subtle or indirect resistance they feel is clear while men do not identify these behaviors as clear resistance. Additionally, miscommunication occurs when men over interpret women's sexual interest or misinterpret women's refusals as "token" or not a true refusal. These misinterpretations may lead to sexual assault. Some research has found support for miscommunication and misinterpretation while other research indicates that men and women are able to identify refusals to unwanted sexual pressures (Gross, Weed, & Lawson, 1998), but this ability to recognize these refusals does not prevent the occurrence of rape. It has also been suggested that male motivations to gain sex, personal beliefs about rape victims, and attention to contextual cues may influence sexual aggression and victimization (Bondurant & Donat, 1999; McCaw and Senn, 1998).

There are several factors identified as contributing to sexual victimization. Studies have shown early detection of threat risk cues is an important factor in rape avoidance. Women with victimization histories have been found to take significantly longer to identify threat-related risk cues in date rape scenarios (Wilson, Calhoun, & Bernat, 1999; Messman-Moore and Brown, 2006). Risk perception is important to rape avoidance as delays in risk recognition have been shown to reduce the use of effective resistance to unwanted sexual pressures (Messman-Moore & Brown, 2006). Certain resistance strategies have been shown to be more effective than others in rape protection. Direct physical resistance is more likely to result in rape avoidance compared to nonforceful verbal or passive resistance (Clay-Warner, 2005). The research shows that risk

perception and resistance are crucial to women's self protection to rape, but there are contextual factors that influence women's abilities to perform these tasks. Unique to acquaintance and date rape, the relationship with the perpetrator, relationship expectancies, and self consciousness of the woman have all been shown to influence how women perceive and respond to unwanted sexual pressures (Livingston & Testa, 2000; Nurius et al., 2000; Macy et al, 2006).

The purpose of this study is to examine male and female differences in decision making processes during a date rape situation. Following a brief review of the epidemiology of rape, misperception of sexual interest and gender differences in interpretations of sexual situations will be discussed. Factors shown to influence the occurrence of completed rape such as resistance to unwanted sexual pressures and risk appraisal will be examined. Finally, the Social Information Processing theory will be discussed.

Epidemiology

Sexual assault studies have consistently found prevalence rates of female rape to be approximately 20% (Koss et al., 1987; 1994). According to the National Crime Victimization Survey of 2007, 248,280 women were victims of sexual assault, attempted rape, or rape. It is estimated that as many as 60% of rapes are unreported (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010). Acquaintance rape accounted for 44% of reported rapes (28.9% assailant well-known and 15.5 casual acquaintance), followed by 31% by a stranger, and 8% by a spouse (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010). Additionally, the 2007 National Crime Victimization Survey found that compared to other age groups, girls between the ages of 16-19 and 20-24 are up to four times more likely to experience sexual assault, attempted rape, and rape (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010).

Epidemiological studies reveal that acquaintance and date rape are significantly more prevalent than stranger rape. Similar to national surveys, Ullman and colleagues (2007) observed 45% of victimized women were victimized by an acquaintance and 22.4% by romantic partners or husbands compared to 20% victimized by strangers. VanZile-Tamsen et al. (2005) found 98% of women who reported victimization experienced their most recent victimization by an acquaintance. Himelein (1995) found 52% of college women reported sexual victimization in a dating relationship in their lifetime.

Studies suggest acquaintance and date rape are particularly problematic for college women. Brener and colleagues (1999) analyzed the National College Health Risk Behavior Survey and found 20% of women reported experiencing rape, with the majority of these experiences occurring during their late teen years. In a college sample of women, Winslett and Gross (2008) administered the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) and found 59.3% of female participants reported experiencing at least one sexually aggressive act; 30.2% reported experiencing sexual coercion, 20.9% reported attempted rape, and 15.1% reported completed rape.

Prevalence rates of self-reported male perpetration of sexual assault are consistently lower than female reports of sexual assault victimization. Several large studies involving community and college samples have revealed approximately 4% of males reporting rape and 3% reporting attempted rape (Koss et al., 1987; Senn, Desmarais, Verberg, and Wood, 2000). Girard and Senn (2008) found 13% of their sample of college males reported engaging in sexual coercion and 3% reported committing a sexual assault. Winslett and Gross (2008) found 16.3% of males in their sample reported engaging in sexually aggressive acts; 10% in sexual coercion, and 2.5% in completed rape. They also found that men scoring high on a measure of social

desirability reported lower degrees of sexually aggressive behaviors (Winslett & Gross, 2008). Koss and colleagues (1987) have suggested reported differences in male perpetration in female victimization rates may be due to biased male reporting.

Resistance

In an effort to understand sexual victimization, researchers have examined numerous variables associated with sexual assault. This focus of research does not imply victims are to blame, but rather strives to identify factors that can be targeted in rape prevention/training programs to protect women. Studies have shown that regardless of whether it is an acquaintance, date, or stranger rape attack, resistance strategies in response to unwanted sexual pressures are related to rape outcomes. After reviewing National Crime Victimization Survey data, Clay-Warner (2005) found physical resistance (pushing, hitting, etc.) to be most effective in rape avoidance, while forceful verbal resistance was not effective, and nonforceful verbal resistance was related to rape completion (Clay-Warner, 2005).

Zoucha-Jensen and Coyne (1993) examined a sample police reports of stranger and acquaintance sexual assaults to determine types of resistance strategies used and rape completion. Reports were coded based on type of resistance used (e.g. no resistance, forceful and nonforceful verbal resistance, physical resistance) and rape completion (no rape versus rape). Consistent with Clay-Warner (2005), results revealed forceful verbal resistance, fleeing, and physical resistance were associated with rape avoidance. Rape completion was associated with no resistance and non forceful verbal resistance.

In order to examine the relationships between offender violence, resistance strategies, and rape outcomes, Ullman and Knight (1991) reviewed detailed rape and attempted rape survivor

reports from records of convicted rapists enrolled in a treatment program. Correlational analyses revealed forceful fighting and screaming were related to lower levels sexual abuse outcomes. Pleading, begging, and/or trying to reason with the offender were related to greater sexual abuse outcomes. Additionally, physical attacks from the offender were related to physical resistance from the victim, and physical resistance was not related to physical injury. The authors suggested fighting and screaming are effective resistance strategies that do not increase the likelihood of the victim incurring physical injury (Ullman & Knight, 1991).

Research also suggests that when women do not employ forceful physical resistance to unwanted sexual pressures it is not necessarily due to a lack of understanding of the potential effectiveness of these resistance behaviors. In a study conducted on focus groups of college women, it was found that women were able to identify risk factors and articulate what resistance strategies should be used in response to unwanted sexual pressures (Norris, Nurius, & Dimeff, 1996). Alarming, when later assessed on measures of resistance to unwanted sexual pressures from an acquaintance these same women reported using lesser forms of resistance such as gentle refusals and verbal resistance to try and stop the man's advances. Qualitative analyses suggested that participants' fears of embarrassment and rejection were related to use of indirect resistance.

Turchik and colleagues (2007) conducted a prospective study investigating the relationship between women's intended use of resistance strategies and the actual use of those strategies. A sample of college women were administered a series of questionnaires at Time 1 and again 8 weeks later. At Time 1 participants completed measures of childhood and adult sexual victimization, perceived vulnerability to sexual assault, intended behavioral responses to sexual aggression, and wrote a hypothetical narrative of an unwanted sexual experience. The narrative was intended to facilitate responses to the behavioral responses to sexual aggression

measure. At Time 2 participants completed the sexual experiences survey to assess victimization since Time 1. Women who reported victimization at Time 2 then completed measures of primary threat appraisal, self blame and offender blame, emotional and behavioral responses, and psychological barriers. Of the women who returned for Time 2, 28.8% reported being victimized since Time 1. Regression analysis revealed reports of intending to use physical resistance did not predict the subsequent use of physical resistance. Other factors such as knowing the assailant and desire to preserve the relationship were negatively correlated with physical resistance, while confidence was positively correlated with physical resistance. Similar findings have been reported by Nurius and colleagues (2000).

The above studies suggest that in social/dating situations women may experience social pressures to behave according to traditional gender roles of being socially engaging and attractive to males, but also alert to potential sexual risks from dates/acquaintances. These conflicting goals can lead to difficulty acting quickly or efficiently to protect oneself in response to unwanted sexual pressures from a date or acquaintance (Norris, Nurius, & Dimeff, 1996).

Gender Differences in Communication and Perception

Gender differences in communication during a dating context have been examined as a factor in date rape. It has been argued that men frequently misinterpret women's behavior as indicative of sexual interest (Muehlenhard, 1988). Lindgren and colleagues (2008) defined sexual interest as "one's subjective interest in pursuing some type of sexual activity", and suggested that sexual interest/intention is not fixed but rather fluid in that it changes as individuals encode and interpret new information (Lindgren et al., 2008).

Abbey (1982) examined male and female differences in perception of sexual interest in a sample of college students. Participants were placed in groups of two male/female pairs. One pair, “actors”, was instructed to have a 5 minute conversation while the other pair, “observers”, was instructed to watch the conversation through a one-way mirror. Once the conversation was completed both pairs completed measures assessing the couple’s interaction, as well as their interaction with their partner. Results revealed that in comparison to women’s ratings, males rated female actors as more promiscuous and seductive. Male actors reported being more sexually attracted to their partners than did female actors. Relative to female observers, male observers were more sexually attracted to opposite sex actors, and believed female actors were more sexually interested in male actors. Additionally, males rated male actors as more flirtatious and seductive than did female participants. The authors suggested the findings supported the idea that men are biased to interpret female friendly behavior as more sexual than it is intended. Since relative to females, male actors and observers rated men and women’s behavior as showing more sexual interest, this information processing bias may be global and not limited to interpretations of female behavior (Abbey).

Kowalski (1993) examined college men and women’s perceptions of sexual interest in behaviors of both genders, as well as assessed participants’ personal attitudes towards women and their role in society. Participants were given a list of target behaviors and told they were performed by either a male or female. Participants were instructed to imagine a man and woman on a date, and depending on condition rate each man’s (or woman’s) target behaviors based on the actors perceived level of sexual interest. Factor analysis revealed three factors; mundane (e.g. she/he smiles at him/her, she/he compliments him/her), romantic (e.g. she/he invites him/her to her/his apartment), and sexual (e.g. she/he undresses him/her). When attitudes towards women

were examined, men with more traditional views of women perceived more sexual interest in mundane behaviors and romantic behaviors compared to men with low and nontraditional views of women. Interestingly, perceived women's sexual interest was not significantly different between men and women with traditional attitudes towards women, except in the condition of mundane behaviors in which men reported higher levels of perceived sexual interest. Men and women with average or nontraditional views of women did not differ in perceived sexual interest of mundane male behaviors. Similar results were found in perceptions of male romantic target behaviors. The authors suggested ambiguous behaviors such as smiling and eye contact are more likely to be misperceived as sexual interest by males, but that more direct cues are interpreted similarly between genders. It was suggested that attitudes towards women moderate perceptions of sexual interest, but this gender difference in perception frequently puts women in the difficult position of trying to be social while not implying sexual interest (Kowalski, 1993).

Bondurant and Donat (1999) asked males to complete measures assessing sexual assault perpetration, perceptions of sexual interest in varied behaviors (mundane, romantic, and sexual), and attitudes towards rape victims and rape. The attitudes towards rape victims measure assessed both cognitive components (veritable facts) and affective components (value-loaded opinions). Comparing men identified as sexually aggressive with non-aggressive males revealed aggressive men perceived the woman's target behavior as significantly more sexual. Affective component attitudes towards rape victims were related to men perceiving more sexual interest in friendly and romantic women's behavior. Surprisingly, sexual aggression was not related to affective attitudes towards rape victims. The authors suggested men may not uniformly over interpret women's behavior as sexually interested, and the problem is men's selective attention

(Bondurant & Donat). That is, underlying male motivations may influence male interpretation of date behavior in date rape (Bondurant & Donat).

Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) asked college men and women to answer a questionnaire assessing sexual aggression in reference to a personal experience of a normal date and an experience of sexual aggression if applicable. Participants also completed measures assessing attitudes towards women, adversarial sexual beliefs, rape myth acceptance, and acceptance of interpersonal violence. Results showed both men and women reported “being led on” as a factor contributing to the occurrence of sexual aggression, but women almost always stated this miscommunication was unintentional. Additionally, for men who reported both a normal and sexually aggressive date experience, male reports of female sexual interest were higher in the aggressive date compared to the normal date. The authors suggested sexual aggression was influenced by male misinterpretation of female behavior (Muehlenhard & Linton)

Other studies have suggested goals and motivations may influence the perpetration of sexual aggression in males. O’Byrne and colleagues (2006) conducted male focus groups to investigate men’s ability to identify and understand women's sexual refusals. The focus group discussions revealed participants recognized both verbal and nonverbal female refusals. In fact, almost all of female refusals identified by participants were nonverbal and many of the female nonverbal refusals to sex were indirect and subtle. O’Byrne et al. concluded that these findings give strong evidence that date rape is not a function of miscommunication or misunderstanding of subtle cues, but rather the intention of a male to employ sexual coercion to obtain sex. These studies suggest that the motivation or goal of the man to have sex may be a more influential factor in the perpetration of rape rather than misperception or miscommunication.

McCaw and Senn (1998) examined what they refer to as the “Miscommunication Hypothesis” which suggests that due to gender differences in communication, women may experience a sexual encounter as coercive while males may experience it as consensual. Specifically, women may not be clear in their refusal of sex and or feel coerced into sex, while men interpret her overt behavior as token or overestimate her interest in sex (McCaw and Senn). The authors performed a qualitative study to investigate gender differences in behavioral cues used in sexual encounters. Three behavioral cues: interest, refusal, and coercion were examined. Male and female participants completed the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES, Koss et. al., 1987) and a measure that requires participants to read an ambiguous date scenario, place themselves in the story, and write the scene as they imagine it advancing. Participants were also asked specific questions regarding initial sexual advance, refusal, and how the characters in the scenario were feeling and thinking. Analyses revealed men and women agreed on women refusal cues suggesting men are capable of recognizing refusal cues from women. It was suggested that males may knowingly use coercive behaviors to gain sex (McCaw and Senn).

Although there are some inconsistencies in the data, the above studies suggest there may be some gender differences in how men and women interpret one another’s behaviors and sexual intention in social and dating contexts. Personal attitudes and beliefs regarding women and rape may influence male perceptions of sexual interest. Personal motivations and goals may play a role in how men behave in dating contexts. This incongruence in male and female perceptions of sexual interest may lead to males exhibiting sexual pressures that are experienced as unwanted by females.

Risk Appraisal

Women's ability to detect risk cues in sexual interactions has been suggested to contribute to the use of effective resistance strategies. Research suggests risk recognition is necessary for activating behavioral responses to unwanted sexual pressure, and delays in risk recognition may result in delays implementing effective resistance. Rozee and Koss (2001) proposed a conceptual model of resistance implementation using cognitive appraisal factors. The AAA strategy consists of 3 stages; assess, acknowledge, and act. This model begins with the decision making process following a woman's first "no" and the male continuing to make sexual advances. The *assess* stage includes the woman's assessment that a situation is potentially dangerous. It is during this stage that situational factors, such as degree of isolation and ability to escape, contribute to assessment of risk. The next stage is *acknowledge*, in which the woman has deemed a situation as risky and labels it as a potential rape situation. There are several factors that can inhibit labeling a situation as risky, such as relationship investment, trust in the male's motivation not to harm, and adherence to rape scripts. In the final stage, *act*, behavior options and outcomes are appraised. Once a situation is determined to be risky and there is a potential for rape, women decide on resistance strategies. Rozee and Koss suggest this algorithm, if learned and rehearsed, can be useful in preparing women with a plan for potential date rape situations.

Wilson, Calhoun, and Bernat (1999) argued resistance to unwanted sexual pressures was contingent on risk recognition, and risk recognition was a contributing factor to revictimization of sexual assault. The authors investigated risk recognition ability in women with and without a victimization and revictimization history. College women were exposed to an audio vignette developed by Marx and Gross (1995) that depicts a female resisting sexual contact as the male continues to make sexual advances. The vignette increases in intensity of female resistance and

male sexual aggression and ends with completed rape. Participants were instructed to indicate when the male's sexual advances had "gone too far." Based on responses to sexual victimization questionnaires women were grouped as nonvictims, single incident victims, and revictimized women. Group comparisons revealed revictimized women had significantly longer response latencies to the audiotape compared to nonvictims and single incident victims. The authors suggested revictimized women may have delays in risk recognition resulting in delays in responses to sexual aggression.

Marx, Calhoun, Wilson, and Meyerson (2001) conducted a longitudinal study on college women examining risk perception and revictimization following exposure to rape prevention intervention. At the start of the study participants were asked to complete measures of sexual assault, self-efficacy, and psychological functioning. Participants were assigned to either an intervention group or control group. The intervention consisted of training in risk perception, factual knowledge of rape, strategies for rape resistance, and problem-solving and communication skills. Following the intervention both groups completed a response to risk latency task in which participants were asked to listen to an audio vignette depicting date rape and indicate when they believed the man had gone "too far". At the two month follow up sexual victimization since first assessment was assessed along with self- efficacy and psychological functioning. Results revealed no between group differences in risk recognition, suggesting the intervention in risk perception was ineffective. However, response latencies were significantly longer in women who reported sexual victimization occurring during the two month follow up. The authors suggested that compared to women not reporting revictimization, women who experienced revictimization may identify risk but do not respond to it quickly, increasing their risk of experiencing an assault. (Marx, Calhoun, Wilson, & Meyerson).

VanZile-Tamsen and colleagues (2005) investigated the mediating effect of risk appraisal to resistance in a date rape scenario for women with and without sexual assault histories. A community sample of women completed measures of sexual victimization and sexual assertiveness. Participants were exposed to one of four date rape vignettes and asked to imagine being the women in the vignette. The male was described as a boyfriend, friend, date, or acquaintance. Participants subsequently completed measures of risk appraisal and behavioral intention regarding how they would have responded in the vignette situation. It was reported that sexual assault history was related to lower sexual assertiveness and lower resistance to sexual aggression. No differences in risk appraisal were observed between victims and nonvictims. Sexual assertiveness was related to level of resistance to sexual aggression. Risk appraisal was also related to resistance. Relative to women in the friend, date, and acquaintance conditions, women in boyfriend assailant condition reported the lowest perceived risk of sexual assault. The authors suggested that victimization and revictimization may not be a function of risk appraisal deficits, but rather ineffective resistance to unwanted sexual pressures (VanZile-Tamsen et al.). Moreover, women may be more likely to recognize rape related threat with a man with whom there is no relationship history or relationship expectation (VanZile-Tamsen et al.). The authors suggested that the association between victim-perpetrator relationship status and intended sexual resistance is mediated by risk appraisal.

Factors Influencing Resistance and Risk Appraisal

As noted above, direct and forceful resistance strategies have been identified as protective strategies against rape completion, while indirect and passive resistance is related to rape completion. Risk appraisal has been shown to influence the implementation of effective

resistance strategies. Researchers have examined the impact of contextual and emotional factors on how women perceive sexual risk and resistance to sexual advances.

Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) assessed college women's fears about and risks of experiencing stranger and acquaintance rape, as well as what precautionary behaviors they displayed. Participants were also identified as victims (stranger or acquaintance) and nonvictims of rape. Results revealed women reported significantly more worry of rape by a stranger than by an acquaintance, and engaging in more precautionary behaviors in relation to stranger rape. Interestingly, women reported believing acquaintance rapes occur more than stranger rapes. Participants also reported feeling they had more control over acquaintance rape situations compared to stranger rapes. The authors suggested women may feel a sense of trustworthiness towards the male perpetrator if he is an acquaintance and less likely to perceive his actions as aggressive or indicating risk (Hickman and Muehlenhard).

Livingston and Testa (2000) examined women's biases in risk recognition in a dating context. The effects of alcohol on risk recognition were also studied. Single women in a community sample were assigned to one of three alcohol conditions (alcohol, placebo, no alcohol) and asked to read a vignette depicting a female and intoxicated male with a dating history interacting alone. The vignette set the stage for a potential date rape by containing cues that were suggestive of male sexual aggression, but the vignette did not include an ending. Participants were asked to imagine themselves as the woman in the vignette and write how they saw the interaction described in the vignette ending. Participants' responses were qualitatively analyzed. Three main themes were identified: risk recognition, relationships concerns, and caretaking. The risk recognition theme consisted of participants identifying the male as intending to make sexual advances, their nervousness in the situation, and identifying some risk of the

situation ending badly. The relationship concerns theme consisted of women reporting interest in a relationship with the male and being attracted to the male. The caretaking theme included reports of preventing the male from driving while intoxicated. Alcohol consumption was not related to any of the themes suggesting alcohol consumption did not influence women's perception of the dating scenario. Results revealed 58% of women recognized the risk associated with an intoxicated male making sexual advance. Despite this risk detection, 83% of those women indicated they would remain with the male and try to control the situation. The relationship concern theme was seen in 51% of the women's reports. These women indicated they would remain in the situation with the male due to positive relationship expectations. The authors suggested that women who judge a man as trustworthy may underestimate risk in a date situation, and may exhibit an unrealistic level of optimism concerning their ability to manage a risky situation (Livingston & Testa) They also suggested women may dismiss threat cues and continue in a situation focusing instead on maintaining the relationship and avoiding damaging the relationship (Livingston & Testa).

Macy, Nurius, and Norris (2006) administered measures of victimization history, alcohol consumption, relationship expectancies, and sexual assertiveness to college women reporting at least one incident of physically or verbally coerced sexual contact. Measures of primary and secondary appraisals of threat, emotional and behavioral responses to assault, and assailant actions in reference to their sexual coercion experience were also gathered. Results revealed women with higher relationship expectancies with the perpetrator had greater concern for relationship outcomes during an assault, and were significantly more likely to use diplomatic responding to resist aggressive sexual advances (Macy, Nurius, & Norris). Self consciousness in responding was related to positive relationship expectancies and verbal coercion. The authors

suggested perpetrators may play upon the victim's feelings of self consciousness and the established relationship to coerce a woman into sexual contact (Macy, Nurius, & Norris).

Nurius and colleagues (2000) investigated cognitive appraisals and emotional responses that may mediate women's responses to unwanted sexual pressures. A sample of college women having experienced severe unwanted sexual advances from an acquaintance completed questionnaires in reference to the reported experience. Primary threat appraisals, accountability, secondary threat appraisals, emotional responses, behavioral responses, and assailant actions were assessed. Primary appraisal is the assessment of a situation as dangerous, including encoding and interpretation of contextual cues as risky or signaling potential danger. Secondary appraisal includes the assessment of where the risk comes from, who is responsible, possible situation outcomes, and desired outcomes. Secondary appraisals are also referred to as psychological barriers and include feeling of self consciousness, fear of exacerbating injury, and concerns for preserving the relationship. Regression analysis revealed assertive responses were predicted by increased appraisal of assailant actions as isolating/controlling, assailant use of physical force, increased concern for exacerbating injury, increased feelings of anger, and decreased concern for preserving the relationship. Conversely, increased diplomatic behavioral responses were predicted by assailant use of verbal coercion, increase in feelings of self consciousness in responses, and sadness. Confidence in one's ability to respond to unwanted sexual pressures was directly predictive of assertive resistance. Primary threat appraisals were more predictive of psychological barriers than behavioral responses, but psychological barriers were directly predictive of behavioral responses suggesting a mediating effect of psychological barriers. The authors suggested psychological concerns such as fear of embarrassment or damaging the relationship may be at the forefront of women's appraisals, making detection and

interpretation of significant sexual risk cues difficult. This confusion and concern may delay the implementation of effective resistant strategies to unwanted sexual pressures (Nurius et al.).

Nurius (2000) argued that women enter into social and dating situations with positive bias based goals and scripts from previous social interactions that shape how women behave in these situations. These cognitive biases are automatic in nature. Risk cues are interpreted in congruence with anticipated positive social interactions. Until working memory aimed at self protection is activated, women perceive and interpret the environment based on the anticipation of what is supposed to occur in social situations. These biased perceptions influence risk reduction and self protection behaviors (Nurius).

Nurius, Norris, Macy, and Huang (2004) investigated how personal goals and motivations influence risk perception and behavioral responses to sexual aggression. Personal goal orientations were defined as either achieving independent identity or achieving intimacy in relationships. College women reporting at least one incidence of acquaintance sexual assault were asked to complete a series of measures assessing life circumstances prior to the assault, specifics about the assault, and background information. Measures concerning life before the assault consisted of life task orientation and primary appraisals of the perpetrator's behavior before the attack. The sexual assault was assessed with measures concerning secondary appraisals, emotions during the assault, and behavior responses. Results revealed independent oriented goals were significantly related to low self-blame, low concern for judgment from the male, and seeing self as powerful. Intimacy achieving goals were related to higher concern for judgment from the male, high self-blame and higher resentment. High concern for judgment from the male was related to higher use of diplomatic behavioral responses and low assertive responses to the perpetrator's aggressiveness. High self-blame was related to high diplomatic

and immobilizing responses and low assertive responses. Threat appraisals were also related to concerns about male judgment. Appraising a male's behavior as manipulative was related to greater concern about male judgment, which as mentioned above was related to high diplomatic and low assertive responding. The authors suggested secondary appraisals, such as concerns about male judgment, mediate the relationship between personal goals and risk appraisal. These concerns for the relationship influence how women perceived the risk of the situation. The authors proposed women have to cope with concerns for safety and concerns for the relationship hindering quick and efficient responding to sexual threat cues (Nurius, Norris, Macy, & Huang).

These studies provide evidence for a number of factors that may influence women's perception and interpretation of threat, generation of behavioral responses, and implementing resistance strategies in date rape contexts. Unique to date rape contexts, knowing one's assailant has been shown to hinder female resistance to unwanted sexual advances due to fear of embarrassment, self consciousness, and value placed on preserving the relationship. Risk appraisal may be impeded as women are not anticipating the need for risk assessment and are more focused on navigating a social situation. This focus on success in social situations may lead to misperceptions of potential danger cues resulting in less efficient resistance to unwanted sexual pressures.

Social Information Processing

Nurius and Norris (1996) offer a cognitive model of women's responses to unwanted sexual pressures in dating contexts as a heuristic framework for understanding variables that play a role in women's decisions to respond to sexual aggression. This model attempts to account for both personal and environmental factors which may influence behavior. Their model suggests 3

main groups of variables that influence behavior: ontogenetic variables (personal traits affecting behavior such as assertiveness, prior victimization, and sex role socialization), exosystem variables (environmental factors such as social influences from peers and romantic partners, interpersonal goals, assumptions, and expectations), and microsystem variables (alcohol consumption, setting, type of relationship between the male and female, and type of coercion). All three levels influence the next two steps in appraisals of the social context. Primary appraisals entail searching a context in order to interpret social cues. In this step, risk of sexual assault is determined. Once risk has been recognized secondary appraisals are activated. These appraisals consist of processing a number of questions: what is the threat, who is at fault, what are my resources, can I act efficiently, what will be the consequences of my behavior, what do I want to happen. Lastly, the cognitive model states that both primary and secondary appraisals are biased by not only the previously discussed levels, but also by emotion and social/popularity concerns. Nurius and Norris' cognitive model of resistance suggests women experience cognitive steps as they decide how to act in a social situation, and that these cognitive steps are influenced by a variety of environmental, interpersonal, and intrapersonal variables.

A similar, but broader model for understanding behavior in social contexts was developed by Crick and Dodge (1994). The Social Information Processing Model was proposed to explain children's social adjustment, specifically aggressive behavior in children. Social Information Processing Theory (SIP) suggests that in social situations individuals undergo successive cognitive stages in determining how to respond to social stimuli, and these stages are influenced by biological predispositions and memories of past experiences (Crick and Dodge). Crick and Dodge suggest information processing involves six stages. In the first stage, encoding of cues, children simply attend to both internal and external cues, and encoding is influenced by

selective attention. In stage 2, interpretation of those cues occurs and is influenced by one or more factors such as personal representations of social situations, evaluation of goals, self efficacy evaluation, outcome expectations, and attributions of others perspectives. In stage 3, goal clarification, desired outcomes and goals for the social interaction are determined. Stage 4, response construction, consists of taking inventory of possible behavioral responses, and is based on memory and learning history from previous social situations. During stage 5 behavioral response decisions. This stage is influenced by all previous steps in that available responses are considered with desired outcomes, self efficacy, and outcome expectations. Finally, in stage 6 the chosen behavioral response is implemented. This 6 stage process is thought to be automatic and fluid in that change in one stage can influence subsequent steps. Crick and Dodge proposed individual memory, social learning history, social knowledge, and social schema affect each stage of social information processing resulting in a process that is unique to each individual.

Several investigators have explored the usefulness of SIP as a model for understanding reactive and proactive aggressive behavior in young children. Crick and Dodge (1996) investigated patterns in SIP and types of aggression in children. Based on teacher ratings, 3rd - 6th grade children were identified as being proactive aggressive, reactive aggressive, combined proactive and reactive aggressive, or non-aggressive. The youth were exposed to a vignette in which a child is provoked by a peer, but the intentions of the provocateur are ambiguous. Participants then answered questions concerning whether the provocateur's behavior was intentional (e.g., interpretation of cues), response decision making (e.g., outcome expectancies, self efficacy), and social goals. Results revealed that compared to non-aggressive children, reactive aggressive children displayed higher levels hostile attributions. Compared to all other groups proactive aggressive children had significantly higher positive outcome expectations and

self efficacy in acting aggressively. Also, proactive aggressive children had greater instrumental goals than relational goals compared to all other groups. The authors suggest biases in specific social information processing stages create distinct patterns in SIP that are related to specific aggressive behaviors.

Landsford and colleagues (2006) used Crick and Dodge's SIP model to examine SIP biases and aggressive behavior in children. This longitudinal study assessed participants annually beginning in kindergarten through eleventh grade. Annual assessments involved measures of externalizing behaviors, interviews, and questionnaires. Social information processing was assessed in children through video vignettes, cartoons of social situations, and written vignettes (depending on child age). Aggressive and hostile biases in SIP stages were calculated based on responses. Scores in earlier stages (encoding and making hostile attributions) and later stages (selecting goals, generating responses, and evaluating responses) were collapsed to give overall early and later SIP step scores. Children were identified as belonging to one of four groups; no problems in SIP, hostile bias in early stages, hostile bias in later stages, and hostile bias in all stages. Results revealed compared to children with no SIP problems, children with biases in early, later, and both early/late stages displayed significantly more external behavior problems per teacher/parent reports. Children with problems in both early and later SIP stages had the highest level of externalizing scores. SIP problems in grade 3 were not predictive of problems in grade 11, but problems in grade 8 were predictive of SIP problems in grade 11. The authors suggested that as children develop cognitive schemas change. Children may develop adaptive ways to respond to social situations, but as children become older hostile biases become more concrete and stable (Landsford et al.). Children with deficits in both early and later stages may be most at risk of displaying hostile externalizing problems (Landsford et al.).

Luebbe and colleagues (2010) investigated how positive and negative biases in social information processing are related to internalizing problems in children. Youth between the ages of 8-13 were administered measures assessing depressive and anxiety symptoms. Social Information Processing was assessed using the Children's Evaluation of Everyday Social Encounters Questionnaire (ChEASE-Q), a vignette based measure that involves interpretation of ambiguous social situations. In reference to the vignettes, participants responded to multiple choice/fixed response questions assessing positive bias (e.g., positive intent and causal attributions, face-saving or relationship focused goals) and negative bias (e.g., negative intent and causal attribution, avoidant and distress-expression goals) corresponding to five of the social information processing stages (interpretation, goal clarification, response generation, response decision, and response evaluation). Responses were collapsed into an overall score identifying children as possessing a negative processing style (NIPS), a positive processing style (PIPS), or positive response evaluation style (PRES). Positive response evaluation style is concerned with response justification and is described as solution focused, face-saving and affect managing. Results revealed NIPS was positively correlated with anxiety and depression symptoms. PRES was negatively correlated with depression. Neither PRES nor PIPS was significantly correlated with anxiety. The authors suggest patterns in SIP may supplement the development of internalizing problems in children which in turn contribute to behavioral problems (Luebbe et al.).

The above review suggests the social context in which date rape occurs is complex with interpersonal, intrapersonal, and environmental variables influencing male and female behaviors that may increase the likelihood of date rape. Research suggests that resisting unwanted sexual pressure is a decision that may be impeded at different levels by many factors. Failure to

recognize risk may lead to delays in implementing effective resistance, but risk recognition alone does not account for resistance. A number of factors such as self efficacy, emotional responses, and relationship concerns are also associated with the use of resistance. In men, misperception of women's intent and miscommunication between men and women may lead to behaviors men believe are appropriate while women internalize these behaviors as unwanted.

The purpose of this study was to examine the cognitive process male and females experience in date rape contexts. In particular, how men and women process ambiguous sexual encounters, and how they differ in their interpretation of cues and response decision making in these social contexts. Participants were asked to listen to an audio vignette developed by Marx and Gross (1995) depicting a female resisting sexual contact as the male continues to make sexual advances. The tape was paused at a point in the vignette in which there is some ambiguity concerning the sexual intentions of both the male and female. Crick and Dodge's (1994) stages of social information processing were assessed using a procedure similar to that developed by Luebbe et al. (2010). Participants were asked multiple choice/forced answer questions reflecting five stages in social information processing (causal and intent interpretation, goal clarification, response decision, response efficacy, and response evaluation). Congruent with the literature it was predicted males would possess more sexual intent biases and sexually driven goals while women would possess more concern for relationship consequences bias. At the causal and intent interpretation stages it was predicted men would interpret the interaction as a result of the female's interest in him and her not wanting to seem too available, while women would interpret the situation as a result of her behavior implying sexual interest, her attractiveness or his affection for her and his want to have a relationship or sex with her. At the stage assessing emotional reaction to the women's sexual refusal situation, it was predicted men would endorse

feelings of sexual arousal and frustration, while women would endorse feelings of disappointment, frustration or nervousness. At the goal clarification stage it was predicted men would endorse goals of attaining sex and not embarrassing himself (face saving), while women would endorse goals of not ruining the relationship and establishing relationship rules and expectations. Finally, at the response generation stage it was predicted men would select responses aimed at acquiring sex (verbal or physical coercion) while women would select responses aimed at controlling further sexual advances and protecting the relationship (continuing kissing and resisting further advances). In women it was expected resistance responses would be correlated with identifying male sexual intent, feelings of frustration and/or disappointment, and goals of controlling the situation. In men it was expected physical and verbal coercion responses would be correlated with higher sexual intent interpretation, greater sexual arousal, and goals to obtain sex.

METHOD

Participants

One hundred and seventy seven undergraduate students enrolled in a psychology course at a public university located in the southeastern United States served as participants. Participants were recruited through classroom announcements and received course credit for participating. The sample ranged in age from 18-25 ($M= 19.8$ years, $SD= 1.5$) and consisted of 94 male (53.1%) and 83 female (46.9%) participants. The sample was composed of 56.5% Caucasian, 37.3% African American, 3.4% Asian, 0.6% Hispanic, 0.6% Native American, and 0.6% Multi-racial with the remaining 1.1% not reporting an ethnic background. Class standing at the time of the survey was 46.3% Freshman, 20.3% Sophomore, 18.6% Junior, and 14.7% Senior. Relationship status of the participants was 94.9% single, 2.8% indicating “other”, and 2.3% married. Participants identified as 96.6% heterosexual, 1.7% bisexual, and 1.7% homosexual/lesbian. Sorority/Fraternity membership was 33.3%. Sexual intercourse was experienced by 76.3% of participants. Demographic statistics are presented in Table 1.

Measures

The revised Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss et. al., 2007) is a self report measure used to identify victims and perpetrators of unwanted sexual experiences. Based on the original Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss & Oros 1982), the revised form consists of 10 questions measuring forms of unwanted sexual contact. The items correspond with varying degrees of

sexual touching, rape, and attempted rape. Unlike past versions of the SES, the revised version assesses the number of times each victimization/perpetration incident occurred in the past year and since the age of fourteen. Items also assess methods the perpetrator used to pressure or threaten the victim (e.g., telling lies, getting angry, taking advantage while drunk, threatening harm and physical force). At the time of the revised measure's release, no psychometric data had been collected, as the authors state that others' work will generate the large sample needed to support psychometric analyses (Koss et al, 2007). The prior version of the SES consists of ten, yes/no self report items measuring incidents of sexual coercion, sexual abuse, sexual assault, and no victimization. Koss and Gidycz (1985) used large normative samples of college to obtain data on reliability and validity due to college aged women appear to have a higher risk of sexual victimization. The item responses yielded a .74 internal consistency for women and a test-retest consistency of 93%.

Crick and Dodge's (1994) social information processing model will be assessed through multiple choice/forced answer questions. Similar to the procedure of Luebke et al. (2010) each stage was assessed in sequential order and with questions assessing causal and intent attribution/interpretation, emotional reaction, goal clarification, response decision, enactment efficacy, and goal attainment efficacy. SIP questions were presented from a first person perspective with participants being asked to answer as if they are the same sex actor in the vignette. SIP questions and their corresponding SIP stage are listed in Table Appendix B. Responses were in a multiple choice/forced answer format and participants can only select one response per question. Answer choices corresponding to the questions for each SIP stage were developed based on the review of date rape literature.

Crick and Dodge's six stages of information processing were reduced to five stages in the measure used. Response generation was eliminated. Responses were provided for participants to choose from in the response decision making stage. This was done to keep a consistent multiple choice format, concentrate responses to those commonly found in the literature, and to reduce extraneous responses. An open-ended question asking participants to briefly describe what was happening in the vignette was included to orient participants to the vignette events and assess vignette clarity and participant understanding. The open-ended question was coded by two independent coders for congruence in response and vignette events. Data from participants with incongruent responses to the open-ended question were removed before data analysis.

Stimulus Material

The stimulus material for this study consisted of an audio vignette developed by Marx and Gross (1995) depicting a male and female interacting at the male's home following a date. In the vignette the couple begins to kiss and the male's first attempts at touching the female's breasts are met with resistance. The female goes on to establish she only wants to kiss and asks for the male to continue kissing her. The male apologizes and couple begins to kiss again. Shortly after the kissing resumes the male attempts to touch the female's buttocks. This action is again met with resistance, and again she indicates she would like to be close and kiss. It is at this point the audio tape will be stopped due to potential ambiguity in the context as the female has established a boundary, but still wants to engage physically, and the male agrees with this boundary, but continues to make sexual advances.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through classroom announcements. Participation was solicited in psychology courses and participants received extra credit in their enrolled classes. Recruitment announcements informed participants all responses to survey questions concerning sexual experiences and behavior in sexual experiences would be confidential. Participants were instructed participation would consist of completing an in-person online survey. Participants signed up for scheduled times in groups of seven to come to a computer lab to complete surveys. Groups were limited to seven to ensure adequate space between participants during survey completion, allowing for privacy. Upon arrival to the lab participants were seated individually in front of a computer. All computers were spaced at least three feet apart. Via computer participants were first administered informed consent and a demographics questionnaire. Next, participants were administered the vignette and the SIP questionnaire. Participants listened to the audio vignette through head phones. After listening to the vignette the SIP questionnaire was administered. The SES (2007) was administered following completion of SIP task. Informed consent, demographics questionnaire, the stimulus audio vignette, SIP task, and SES were all administered via computer through Qualtrics, an online survey tool. A trained research assistant administered the vignette and set up online surveys to make sure all data collected is secure to ensure confidentiality and privacy.

RESULTS

Prior to analyses participants' responses to the open ended question of the SIP were examined to determine participant understanding of the vignette. In order to examine reliability of coding of the open ended question of the SIP, each answer was coded by two independent raters. Participants descriptions of what was taking place in the vignette was coded as accurate if there was concordance between events in the vignette and participant report of events. That is, accuracy was based on description of factual events (e.g. a guy and girl went on a date and kissed, the girl resisted his advances; a couple went to a movie and went back to his place, etc.) and did not include participant interpretations (e.g. the girl doesn't like the guy, the guy is going to rape her, the couple is going to have sex, etc.) of the vignette. There was 100% coder agreement. No responses provided were deemed inaccurate. Responses from participants who did not complete the open ended question were removed from further analysis. Analyses were conducted using the final total sample, N= 177.

Based on the results using the criteria of Mahalanobis distance no outliers were identified. Descriptive statistics were calculated (Table 1). The distribution of scores for each of the dependent variables was evaluated and the frequency of male and female responses of each SIP stage was determined.

Victimization and perpetration rates were calculated to identify participants who reported experiences of rape (e.g. oral, anal, or vaginal penetration acquired through physical force, threat of force, or no consent through intoxication). Results from the SES (Koss et al., 2007) indicated

38.6% of female participants endorsed an item indicating she had experienced oral, vaginal, or anal rape (is this legal definition? If so note that) since the age of 14. Among male participants 5.3% endorsed an item indicating perpetration of oral, vaginal, or anal rape since the age of 14. However, only 8.4% of female participants responded “yes” to the item directly asking if she had ever been raped. Among male participants 1.1% responded “yes” to the item directly asking if he had ever raped someone.

In order to examine gender differences in SIP stage response themes, a series of chi square tests were conducted. These data are summarized in Table 2. As predicted, male and female participants significantly differed in response themes on all SIP stages. At the causal interpretation stage [$\chi^2(3) = 31.998, p = .000$] “your behavior led him to think you are interested in sex” (65.1%), followed by “you are pretty/attractive” (28.9%) were responses receiving the most female endorsements. The highest endorsed male responses included “your behavior led her to think you are interested in sex” (64.95); and “she likes you” (22.3%).

At the intent interpretation stage [$\chi^2(4) = 55.37, p = .000$] the highest endorsed intent interpretation responses for women were “he wants to have sex with you” (44.6%) and “he thinks your refusals aren’t serious” (44.6%). Highest endorsed intent interpretation responses for men were “she doesn’t want to seem easy” (44.7%) and 17% for “she wants to show she is interested”, “she wants a relationship with you”, and “she wants to show her control in the relationship.”

Analyses revealed at the emotional reaction stage [$\chi^2(5) = 42.266, p = .000$] highest endorsed responses from women included “frustrated” (31.3%), “angry/mad” (26.5%), and “nervous” (25.3%). However, highest endorsed responses from men were “disappointed” (30.9%), “frustrated” (23.4%), “nervous” (16%), and “attractive/desirable” (14.9%).

Gender differences at the goal clarification stage [$\chi^2(5) = 84.721, p = .000$] revealed highest endorsed responses from women “let him know how you feel about the situation” (69.9%), followed by “set relationship rules and expectations” (22.9%). The highest endorsed responses from men were “not to upset her” (29.8%), closely followed by “not ruin the relationship” (26.6%).

Finally, gender differences were also seen in the Response decision stage [$\chi^2(40) = 21.964, p = .000$]. The most frequently endorsed responses from women were “leave his apartment” (32.5%), followed by “talk him into stopping further sexual advances” (24.1%) and “continue to kiss” (20.5%). In contrast, highest endorsed responses from men were “continue to kiss” (41.5%), followed by “attempt to change her mind by talking” (26.6%).

Participants’ goal attainment efficacy (confidence in response choice meeting response goals) and enactment efficacy (ability to perform response) stages of the SIP measure were also examined using a chi square test to determine significant differences. There was no significant difference between men and women in their confidence in response decision or ability to perform their chosen response effectively.

In order to evaluate the predictive ability of prior SIP stage responses on response decision making, a multinomial logistic regression analyses was performed. Prior to regression analyses, correlations among predictor variables’ were examined and did not indicate multicollinearity. However, examination of the raw data revealed limited variability in terms of regression criterion (i.e., singularities in the Hessian matrix used in constructing the multinomial regression equation). Values of several predictors were associated with identical, non-varying, values of dependent variables. In order to alleviate this problem all values across predictor variable responses were summed to create an omnibus predictor score. The dependent variable,

decision-making response, was dichotomized and coded based on the theoretical nature (i.e., functionality) of the response. Responses “resist continuing contact/stop all contact” and “leave his apartment/take her home” were coded as functional responses as the literature suggests these responses are most likely to result in rape avoidance. Responses “continue to kiss/continue but only kiss,” “allow for more physical contact/try to get her to go further physically” and “talk him into stopping further sexual advances/attempt to change her mind through talking” were coded as non functional responses as these behaviors are more likely to result in completed rape. Scores were dummy coded such that functional responses were assigned a value of 0 and nonfunctional responses a value of 1.

A logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict response decision making using the summation of the prior SIP stages as predictors. A test of the full model against a constant only model was not significant, indicating that the predictors did not reliably distinguish between functional and nonfunctional decision making responses (chi square = 7.394, $p = .119$ with $df = 4$). Prediction success overall was 59.2% (94% for nonfunctional and 9% for functional). The Wald criterion demonstrated that only emotional reaction approached significance as a contribution to prediction ($p = .055$). Causal interpretation, intent interpretation, and goal clarification were not significant predictors.

Given the emergence of a single predictor approaching significance, another isolated logistic regression was performed to allow a clear estimate of the influence of emotional reaction on decision responses. The full model against a constant only model was statistically significant, indicating that emotional reaction reliably distinguished between functional and nonfunctional decision-making responses ($\chi^2 = 4.393$, $p = .037$ with $df = 1$). Prediction success overall was 62.1% (100% for nonfunctional and 0% for functional). The Wald criterion demonstrated that

emotional reaction made a significant contribution to prediction ($p = .038$), although its impact was highly differential given its limited accurate categorization of functional behaviors.

To further examine which specific emotion reactions reliably predicted functional versus nonfunctional decision making another logistic regression was performed with each of the emotion reactions entered as independent predictor variables. Each emotion reaction choice was dichotomously coded as endorsed (yes=1) or not endorsed (no=0). This led to five predictor variables (e.g. attractive, frustrated, aroused, disappointed, and mad) entered into the logistic regression. A test of the full model against a constant only model was significant, indicating that the predictors reliably distinguished between functional and nonfunctional decision making responses ($\chi^2 = 18.527$, $p = .002$ with $df = 5$). Prediction success overall was 67.2% (92.8% for nonfunctional and 24.2% for functional). The Wald criterion demonstrated that attractive emotional reaction was significant as a contribution to prediction $p = .043$). The odds ratio estimates that the odds of selecting a nonfunctional behavioral response are 9.043 times higher than selecting a functional behavior for participants selecting the emotional reaction of attractive. The Wald criterion also demonstrated that mad emotional reaction was significant as a contribution to prediction ($p = .023$). The odds ratio estimates that the odds of selecting a nonfunctional behavioral response are 0.283 times lower than selecting a functional behavior for participants selecting the emotional reaction of mad.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present investigation was to examine gender differences in decision making processes during a date rape situation using Crick and Dodge's (1996) Social Information Processing model. Consistent with expectations men and women significantly differed in responses to each of the SIP stages assessed. As noted above, after the female's initial refusal of sexual contact beyond kissing, the vignette was stopped following the male's second attempt to touch her sexually, and participants imagining themselves as the same sex actor were asked what they believed was leading the interaction to develop as portrayed in the vignette. At the causal interpretation stage, women indicated their behavior and attractiveness were responsible for the man's sexual advances. The belief that her behavior resulted in sexually aggressive male behavior is consistent with research suggesting women experiencing sexual aggression frequently blame themselves for the aggressor's behavior (Littleton & Breitkopf, 2006; Ullman, et al., 1997; Frazier, 1990; Janoff-Bulman, 1979), particularly in the context of a date, (Finkelsin, 2005).

At the causal interpretation stage males viewed the man's sexual advances to be the result of his sexual interest in the female, and to the woman's sexual interest in the man. Viewing female interest in her date as the reason for the man to make sexual advances is consistent with data suggesting men tend to interpret mundane and or romantic female behavior as reflecting an interest in sex (Kowalski, 1993).

At the intent interpretation stage when asked about the women's interpretation of a man's continued sexual advances women indicated that the man did not believe her refusals were sincere. Similar findings have been reported by Marx and Gross (1995) who referred to this phenomenon as perceived token resistance. Meuhlenhard, Andrews, & Beal (1996) similarly reported that when women say "no" to a man's sexual advances it may be misperceived by men as reflecting her efforts to conform to traditional female scripts, when in reality she wants to engage in sexually activity.

Men's intent interpretation of a woman's sexual refusal behavior was also identified as reflecting her desire not "to seem easy." It may be that for men being encouraged to continue kissing and hugging following his date's request to stop attempting more intimate sexual contact neutralizes or greatly diminishes the salience of gentle female sexual refusals (Gross, Weed, & Lawson, 1998). This finding is also consistent with data indicating that women who express forceful verbal and physical refusals, compared to women who express gentle verbal refusals, are less likely to experience rape following unwanted sexual advances (Clay-Warner, 2002; Zoucha-Jensen & Coyne, 1993).

Unlike previous stage responses, in which participants' responses were limited to 2-3 item choices, the emotional reaction stage had the largest variance in response choices. Women endorsed feelings of frustration, nervousness, and anger. This finding is in concordance with research indicating relative to men, women report greater degrees of anger and fear in response to a date rape scenario (Earnshaw, Pitpitan, and Chaudior, 2010). Female reports of frustration may suggest feelings of powerlessness and/or insecurity concerning potential date outcomes.

In the current study men reported feeling disappointment, frustration, nervousness, and being attractive/desirable as emotional reactions to the women's sexual resistance. These reactions are consistent with situations where behaviors which produce reinforcers are blocked. Research suggests that in dating contexts males may feel they are “owed” as repayment for dating expenses (Muehlenhard, 1998, Basow & Minieri, 2010). Additionally, feelings of being attractive or desirable are not unexpected given the high frequency of interpretations of the female as sexually interested and her sexual resistance as being a token gesture. Participants who identified their emotional reaction as nervousness may attest to the male’s uncertainty concerning how best to address the woman's sexual resistance. While her refusals may not be seen as sincere, they may still elicit a warning to the male to proceed with caution, thus leading to nervousness and uncertainty in how to proceed behaviorally.

At the goal clarification stage, women indicated they would aim to communicate their feelings and set relationship rules. The goals of this stage appeared to reflect goals of attempting to maintain her sexual boundaries and relationship preservation. This finding is consistent with research indicating in date contexts women are not anticipating the situation will end in sexual assault, and therefore rape threats may not be recognized (VanZile-Tamsen, 2005; Brady et al., 1990) resulting in goals not aimed at protection, but rather relationship attainment.

Surprisingly, attaining sex was not the most frequent response of men at the goal clarification stage. This is particularly surprising given the earlier stage interpretation that her refusal was not sincere. Males reported goals of not ruining the relationship and not upsetting the female. Endorsement of goals, which are explicitly stated intentions of wants, may be biased due to social desirability given men were asked to set goals and respond to a woman twice refusing sexual advances. However, the stages of the SIP model are conceived to be fluid, and

the choice to preserve the relationship as a goal may reflect a subsequent reinterpretation of her behavior (she is not going to be persuaded to have sex) undetected by the current experimental paradigm.

At the response decision stage women selected several response choices including: talking him into stopping further advances, leaving the situation, and continuing to kiss. These responses represent quite a behavioral spectrum, and research shows different outcomes associated with each of these behaviors. Leaving the situation is associated with the best outcome (Norris & Nurius, 1996). Talking and kissing typically occur together, as in our vignette the female asks the male to stop further advances while continuing to kiss in an attempt to establish boundaries. These behaviors may reflect the above identified goals of establishing sexual boundaries and preserving the relationship by showing a willingness only to engage in limited physical contact. Unfortunately, as noted above it may be that consenting to engage in any sexual contact after stopping the man's sexual advances invalidates the boundary just established (Gross et al., 1988). Moreover, the notion of being able to verbally convince him to stop is consistent with data indicating women may possess an optimistic bias regarding their ability to control sexual situations leading women to remain in situations in which they are experiencing unwanted sexual advances. Livingston and Testa (2000) suggested this belief in control may account for low reports of physical resistance to unwanted sexual pressures.

Although during the goal clarification stage males selected response choices that focused on relationship maintenance (e.g. not ruin the relationship and not upset the female), response decisions reflected sexual contact attainment (e.g. continuing to kiss and acquiring more sexual contact through talking). This finding is contrary to previous findings suggesting for men sex attainment goals may be an exceptionally strong influence on the male behavioral responses in a

sexual situation (O’Byrne et al., 2006). As stated above, our finding may have been influenced by social desirability. As compared to the goal clarification choice of “have sex”, which was not highly endorsed, the response choice “talk the woman into further sexual contact” may have been considered a socially acceptable sex strategy. Research reveals that rather than immediate compliance with a woman's sexual refusal, men frequently question the woman’s decision and attempt to persuade her to engage in sexual activity (Byers, 1988). Since kissing a date is generally an initial entry point in a sexual liaison, response choices aimed at maintaining kissing and advancing contact are also consistent with the men’s interpretation of insincerity in refusal and perceived sexual interest from the female.

Interestingly, when entered into the regression model stages of the SIP model were not predictive of behavioral response choices. Emotion was the only independent variable that predicted functional versus non functional behavior choices. This finding may attest to the fluid nature of social information processing and the difficulty of assessing interpretations that change and adjust quickly within complex and uncertain social interactions like that presented in the vignette. Lemerise and Arsenio (2000) argued for integration of emotion processing into Crick and Dodge’s SIP model due to the impact of emotion on cognitive processing. In particular, they note emotion processing’s influence in information processing when knowledge about a social context is uncertain and/or incomplete. Given the vignette’s purposeful ambiguity and the numerous interpretations that may be inferred from the interaction, emotion may play a role in cognitive processing by reducing the number of choices and outcomes in behavior to emotionally congruent responses. Emotion may be a salient motivator in behavior response.

In the current study emotions of mad/anger were predictive of responses associated with rape avoidance, while emotions of attractive/desirable was predictive of responses associated

with rape occurrence. For example, as the male or female interprets the situation negatively eliciting a mad emotion their response choices may become limited to responses that are congruent with their emotions such as leave his house or stop all contact. This was similarly found with men and women reporting feeling attractive and desirable selecting responses that were consistent with this emotion such as continuing contact, increasing contact, and remaining in the situation.

Finally, it is possible that the failure of the regression to predict response choices may be a limitation of the assessment method. The fluidity of SIP makes it difficult to prospectively assess beyond a snap shot of cognitive processing. Social Information Processing is conceptualized as a fluid process that changes as new information is processed, making it difficult to assess in a self-report fixed response form. Unfortunately, as previously mentioned, assessing sexual behaviors and cognitive and emotional processes in real-time is difficult due to the sensitive nature of the subject.

Sexual dating contexts are unique in that they are complex and difficult to predict. Men and women likely have learning histories of inconsistent and/or incongruent sexual signals from past and even present dating partners (e.g. a dating partner who after conveying lack of interest in sexual contact changes positions and encourages sexual contact) which may contribute to difficulty accurately identifying intent in sexual encounters. Given the fluid nature of sexual intent, it is likely that statements/behaviors of intent change during interactions further complicating intent interpretation. Additionally, social and cultural norms and expectations in way of traditional gender roles and acceptable social and sexual behavior are also influencing cognitive processing. Endorsement of the response choice to “talk” from both men and women may be an appropriate response in attempts to clarify intent, but as the significant differences in

interpretation at each stage shows, this clarification may be difficult. Moreover, emotion processing may also play a larger role in response decisions in part due to this uncertainty, limited knowledge, and demand for quick responses within these contexts.

Limitations

The present study utilized a college sample, and while research shows that individuals in college and between the ages of 18-25 are at highest risk of experiencing date rape, a more diverse community sample may lend to the generalizability of the findings. Measures used in this study were self-report and therefore subject to social desirability as noted above. However, self report is the relied upon method to assess social information processing at this time. In regards to assessing disclosure of sexual behavior, sexual assault researchers recommend the use of anonymous self-administered surveys as they have been shown to increase disclosure (Fisher, 2009). Unfortunately, it was necessary to administer surveys in a laboratory setting by a research assistant to ensure participant understanding and survey completion.

Response choices on the SIP measure were limited to 5-6 responses at each stage which may have limited participant responses leading to little variability at some stage responses. Assessing SIP with no response restrictions may lead to more variable responses and provide more insight into common processing themes in sexually ambiguous contexts. However, it should be noted that response choices at each social information processing stage were largely in accordance with the predicted model. Another limitation was the analog nature of the study. Participants were asked to report how they believed they would react in reference to the presented situation, rather than report of real life experiences. This limitation is common in sexual assault research.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attribution for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 830-838.
- Bondurant, B. & Donat, P.L. (1999). Perceptions of women's sexual interest and acquaintance rape: The role of sexual overperception and affective attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 691-705.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2003, December). *Criminal victimization in the United States 2002*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2008, August). *Criminal victimization in the United States 2006*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010, February). *Criminal victimization in the United States 2007*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Brener, N.D., McMahon, P.M., Warren, C.W., & Douglas, K.A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 252-259.
- Clay-Warner, J. (2002). Avoiding rape: The effects of protective actions and situational factors on rape outcomes. *Violence and Victims*, 17, 691-705.
- Crick, N.R. & Dodge, K.A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychology Bulletin*, 115, 74-101.
- Crick, N.R. & Dodge, K.A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, 67, 993-1002.

- Finkelson, Laura (1995). College date rape: Incidence and reporting. *Psychological Reports*, Vol 77, 526.
- Fisher, B.S. (2009). The effects of survey questions wording on rape estimates. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 133-147.
- Girard, A.L. & Senn, C.Y. (2008). The role of the new “Date rape drugs” in attributions about date rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 3-20.
- Gross, A.M., Weed, N.C., & Lawson, G.D. (1998). Magnitude scaling of intensity of sexual refusal behaviors in a date rape. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 329-343.
- Gross, A.M., Winslett, A., Roberts, M. & Gohm, C.L. (2006). An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 288-300.
- Harper, B.D, Lemerise, E.A., & Caverly, S.L. (2010). The effect of induced mood on children’s social information processing: Goal clarification and response decision. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 38, 575-586.
- Hickman, S.E. & Muehlenhard, C.L. (1997). College women’s fears and precautionary behaviors relating to acquaintance rape and stranger rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 527-547
- Himelein, M.J. (1995). Risk factors for sexual victimization in dating: A longitudinal study of college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 31-48.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1798–1809.

- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.
- Koss, M.P., Dinero, T.E., Seibel, C.A., Cox, S.L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.
- Koss, M.P., Heise, L., & Russo, N.F. (1994). The global health burden of rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 509-537.
- Kowalski, R.M. (1993). Inferring sexual interest from behavioral cues: Effects of gender and sexually relevant attitudes. *Sex Roles, 29*, 13-36
- Landsford, J.E., Malone, P.S., Dodge, K.A., Crazier, J.C., Petit S.P., & Bates, J.E. (2006). A 12-year prospective study of patterns of social information processing problems and externalizing behaviors. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*, 715-724.
- Lemerise, Elizabeth A. Arsenio, William F. (2000). An integrated model of emotion processes and cognition in social information processing. *Child Development, 71*, 107-118.
- Lindgren, K.P., Parkhill, M.R., George, W.H., & Hendershot, C.S. (2008). Gender differences in perceptions of sexual intent: A qualitative review and integration. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 423-439.
- Littleton, H., & Breitkopf, C. R. (2006). Coping with the experience of rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 106-116.

- Livingston, J.A., & Testa, M. (2000). Qualitative analysis of women's perceived vulnerability to sexual aggression in a hypothetical dating context. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 729-741.
- Luebke, A.M., Bell, D.J., Allwood, M.A., Swenson, L.P., & Early, M.C. (2010). Social information processing in children: Specific relations to anxiety, depression, and affect. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 39*, 386-399.
- Macy, R.J., Nurius, P.S., & Norris, J. (2006). Responding in their best interest. *Violence against Women, 12*, 478-500.
- Marx, B.P. & Gross, A.M. (1995). Date rape: An analysis of two contextual variables. *Behavior Modification, 19*, 451-463.
- Marx, B.P., Calhoun, K.S., Wilson, A.E., & Meyerson, L.A. (2001). Sexual revictimization prevention: An outcome evaluation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1*, 25-32.
- McCaw, J.N. & Senn, C.Y. (1998) Perception of cues in conflictual dating situations. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 609-624.
- Messman-Moore, T.L. & Brown, A.L. (2006). Risk perception, rape, and sexual revictimization: A prospective study of college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 159-172.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. & Linton, M.A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 186-196.

- Muehlenhard, C.L. (1988). 'Nice women' don't say yes and 'real men' don't say no: How miscommunication and the double standard can cause sexual problems. *Women and Therapy*, 7, 95-108.
- Norris, J., Nurius, P.S., & Dimeff, L.A. (1996). Through her eyes: Factors affecting women's perception of and resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 123-145.
- Nurius, P.S. & Norris, J. (1996). A cognitive ecological model of women's responses to male sexual coercion in dating. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, 8, 117-139.
- Nurius, P.S. (2000). Risk perception for acquaintance sexual aggression: A social-cognitive perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 1, 63-78.
- Nurius, P.S., Norris, J., Young, D.S., Graham, T.L., & Gaylord, J. (2000). Interpreting and defensively responding to threat: Examining appraisals and coping with acquaintance sexual aggression. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 187-208.
- Nurius, P.S., Norris, J., Macy, R.J., & Huang, B. (2004). Women's situational coping with acquaintance sexual assault: Applying an appraisal-based model. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 450-477.
- O'Bryne, R., Rapley, M., & Hansen, S. (2006). 'You couldn't say 'no', could you?' Young men's understandings of sexual refusal. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16, 133-154.
- Rozee, P.D. & Koss, M.P. (2001). Rape: A century of resistance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 295-311.

- Senn, C.Y., Desmarais, S., Verberg, N., & Wood, E. (2000). Predicting coercive sexual behavior across the lifespan in a random sample of Canadian men. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 95-113.
- Testa, M., Vanzile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J.A., Koss, M.P. (2004). Assessing women's experiences of sexual aggression using the sexual experiences survey: Evidence for validity and implications for research. *Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 28*, 256-265.
- Turchik, J.A., Probst, D.R., Chau M., Nigoff, A., Gidycz, C.A. (2007). Factors predicting the type of tactics used to resist sexual assault: A prospective study of college women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*, 605-614.
- Ullman, S.E. & Knight, R.A. (1991). A multivariate model for predicting rape and physical injury outcomes during sexual assaults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 724-731.
- Ullman, S.E., Filipas, H.H., Townsend, S.M., & Starzynski, L.L. (2007). Psychosocial correlates of PTSD symptom severity in sexual assault survivors. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20*, 821-831.
- Van Acker, Carrie A. (2005). College women's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to acquaintance sexual aggression. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, Vol 65,5426.
- Vanzile-Tamsen, C., Testa, M., & Livingston, J.A. (2005). The impact of sexual assault history and relationship context on appraisal of and response to acquaintance sexual assault risk. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 813-832.

Wilson, A.E., Calhoun, K.S., & Bernat, J.A. (1999). Risk recognition and trauma-related symptoms among sexually revictimized women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 705-710.

Winslett, A.H. & Gross, A.M. (2008). Sexual boundaries: An examination of the importance of talking before touching. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 542-562.

Zoucha-Jensen, J.M., & Coyne, A. The effects of resistance strategies on rape. *American journal of Public Health, 83*, 1633-1634.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPEDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographics Questionnaire

1. What is your age? _____
 - a. 18
 - b. 19
 - c. 20
 - d. 21
 - e. 21+

2. What is your gender? _____
 - a. Male
 - b. Female

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - a. Hispanic
 - b. African American
 - c. Asian or Pacific Island American
 - d. Caucasian
 - e. Native American
 - f. Multi-racial
 - g. Other

4. What is your class standing?
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior

5. What is your marital status?
 - a. Single
 - b. Engaged
 - c. Married
 - d. Separated
 - e. Divorced
 - f. Other

6. Are you currently in a monogamous relationship?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

7. How many serious monogamous relationships have you been in?
 - a. 1-2
 - b. 3-4
 - c. 5-6
 - d. 6+

8. Are you a member of a sorority/fraternity?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

9. What is your sexual orientation?
 - a. Heterosexual, straight
 - b. Homosexual
 - c. Bisexual

10. Have you ever had sexual intercourse (penile-vaginal penetration) with a member of the opposite sex?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

APPENIDX B: SOCIAL INFORMATION PROCESSING MEASURE

SIP Questions:

FEMALE

1. **Open Ended:** What is going on in this story?

Answer the following questions as if you are the woman in the vignette:

2. Do you think what happened was because:
 - a. You are pretty/attractive
 - b. Your behavior has led him to think you are interested in sex
 - c. He likes you
 - d. He is angry with you

3. Do you think he responded to your refusal as he did because
 - a. He wants a relationship with you
 - b. He wants to have sex with you
 - c. He thinks your refusal isn't serious
 - d. He wants to show he is interested in you
 - e. He wants to show his control in the relationship

4. If this happened to you, how would you feel?
 - a. Attractive/desirable
 - b. Frustrated
 - c. Sexually aroused
 - d. Disappointed
 - e. Angry/mad
 - f. Nervous

5. What would your goal in handling the situation be?
 - a. Not to ruin the relationship
 - b. Have sex
 - c. To not embarrass yourself
 - d. Let him know how you feel about what is going on
 - e. Not to upset him
 - f. Set relationship rules and expectations

6. What would you do? Think about what you WOULD do, not what you should do.
 - a. Resist his continuing contact
 - b. Leave his apartment
 - c. Continue to kiss
 - d. Allow for more physical contact
 - e. Talk him into stopping further sexual advances

7. How much would your response meet your chosen goal?
 - a. Not very well
 - b. Somewhat well
 - c. Moderately well
 - d. Fairly well
 - e. Very well

8. How well do you think you could do the response you circled?
 - a. Not very well
 - b. Somewhat well
 - c. Moderately well
 - d. Fairly well
 - e. Very well

MALE

1. **Open Ended:** What is going on in the story?

Answer the following questions as if you are the man in the vignette:

2. Do you think what happened was because:
 - a. You are attractive
 - b. Your behavior has led her to think you are interested in sex
 - c. She likes you
 - d. She is angry with you

3. Do you think she responded to your advances as she did because:
 - a. She wants a relationship with you
 - b. She wants to have sex with you
 - c. She doesn't want to seem too available
 - d. She wants to show she is interested in you
 - e. She wants to show her control in the relationship

4. If this happened to you, how you would feel?
 - a. Attractive/desirable
 - b. Frustrated
 - c. Sexually aroused
 - d. Disappointed
 - e. Angry/Mad
 - f. Nervous

5. What would your goal in handling the situation be?
 - a. Not to ruin the relationship (relationship saving)
 - b. Have sex
 - c. To not embarrass yourself (face saving)
 - d. Let her know how you feel about the situation (show emotion)
 - e. Not to upset her (caretaking)
 - f. Establish relationship rules and expectations

6. What would you do? Think about what you WOULD do, not what you should do.
 - a. Stop all contact
 - b. Take her home
 - c. Continue but only kiss
 - d. Try to get her to go further physically
 - e. Attempt to change her mind by talking

7. How much would your response meet your chosen goal?
 - a. Not very well
 - b. Somewhat well
 - c. Moderately well
 - d. Fairly well
 - e. Very well

8. How well do you think you could do the response you circled?
 - a. Not very well
 - b. Somewhat well
 - c. Moderately well
 - d. Fairly well
 - e. Very well

APPENDIX C: SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY-SHORT FORM PREPETRATION

DRAFT—Released for Testing by Permission Only
(Koss & the SES Collaborative, 2006)

The following questions concern sexual experiences. We know these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box showing the number of times each experience has happened. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion--for example, if one night you told some lies and had sex with someone who was drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

Sexual Experiences	How many times in the past 12 months?	How many times since age 14?
<p>1. I fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of someone’s body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of their clothes without their consent <i>(but did not attempt sexual penetration)</i> by:</p>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
<p>Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn’t want to.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2. I had oral sex with someone or had someone perform oral sex on me without their consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

3. I put my penis or I put my fingers or objects into a woman's vagina without her consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry		

but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

4. I put in my penis or I put my fingers or objects into someone's butt without their consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

5. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to have oral sex with someone or make them have oral sex with me without their consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED put in my penis or I tried to put my fingers or objects into a woman's vagina without their consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

7. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis or I tried to put my fingers or objects into someone's butt without their consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

8. Did you do any of the acts described in this survey 1 or more times?

Yes No

If yes, what was the sex of the person or persons to whom you did them?

- Female only
- Male only
- Both females and male
- I reported no experiences

9. Do you think you may have you ever raped someone?

Yes No

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY-SHORT FORM VICTIMIZATION

DRAFT SES-SFV—Released for Testing by Permission Only
(Koss & the SES Collaborative, 2006)

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box showing the number of times each experience has happened to you. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion--for example, if one night someone told you some lies and had sex with you when you were drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

Sexual Experiences	How many times in the past 12 months?	How many times since age 14?
<p>1. Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (<i>but did not attempt sexual penetration</i>) by:</p>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
<p>Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

2. Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

3. A man put his penis into my vagina, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

me after I said I didn't want to.		
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

4. A man put his penis into my butt, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

5. Even though it didn't happen, someone TRIED to have oral sex with me, or make me have oral sex with them without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Even though it didn't happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my vagina, or someone tried to stick in fingers or objects without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were		

untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

7. Even though it didn't happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my butt, or someone tried to stick in objects or fingers without my consent by:	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

8. Did any of the experiences described in this survey happen to you 1 or more times?

Yes No

What was the sex of the person or persons who did them to you?

Female only
 Male only
 Both females and males
 I reported no experiences

9. Have you ever been raped?

Yes No

APPENDIX D: TABLES

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics Sample (N=239)

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	94	53.1
Female	83	46.9
Age		
18	26	14.7
19	74	41.8
20	29	16.4
21	28	15.8
22	10	5.6
23	4	2.3
24	2	1.1
25	4	2.3
Ethnicity/Racial Identity		
African-American	66	37.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	3.4
Caucasian	100	56.5
Hispanic	1	0.6
Native American	1	0.6
Multi-racial	1	0.6
Other	2	1.1

Descriptive Statistics #2

	Frequency	Percent
Class Standing		
Freshman	82	46.3
Sophomore	36	20.3
Junior	33	18.6
Senior	26	14.7
Marital Status		
Single	168	94.9
Married	4	2.3
Other	5	2.8
Greek Organization Membership		
Greek Member	59	33.3
Not a Greek Member	118	66.7
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	171	96.6
Gay/lesbian	3	1.7
Bisexual	3	1.7
Opposite Sex Sexual Intercourse		
Yes	135	76.3
No	42	23.7

Descriptive Statistics #3

Currently in a Monogamous Relationship

Yes	70	39.5
No	106	59.9

Number of Serious Monogamous Relationships

1-2	126	71.2
3-4	44	24.9
5-6	5	2.8
6+	2	1.1

Table 2

Causal Interpretation: “Do you think what happened was because..”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
You are pretty/attractive	4	4.3	24	28.9
Your behavior led him/her to think you are interested in sex	61	64.9	54	65.1
He/She likes you	21	22.3	5	6
He/She is angry with you	8	8.5	0	0

Intent Interpretation: “Do you think she responded to your advances as she did because”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
He/She wants a relationship with you	16	17	0	0
He/She wants to have sex with you	4	4.3	37	44.6
He thinks your refusals aren’t serious/ Her refusal aren’t serious	42	44.7	37	44.6
He/She wants to show he/she is interested	16	17	5	0.6
He/She wants to show his/her control	16	17	4	4.8

Emotional Reaction: “If this happened to you, how would you feel?”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Attractive/Desirable	14	14.9	3	3.6
Frustrated	22	23.4	26	31.3
Sexually Aroused	12	12.8	2	2.4
Disappointed	29	30.9	9	10.8
Angry/Mad	2	2.1	22	25.6
Nervous	15	16	21	25.3

Goal Clarification: “What would your goal in handling the situation be?”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not to ruin the relationship	25	26.6	1	1.2
Have sex	9	9.6	2	2.4
Not to embarrass self	9	9.6	1	1.2
Let him/her know how you feel about the situation	19	20.2	58	69.9
Not to upset him/her	28	29.8	2	2.4
Set relationship rules and expectations	4	4.3	19	22.9

Response Decision: “What would you do?”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Resist his continuing contact/Stop all contact	16	17	16	27
Leave his apt/take her home	7	7.4	27	32.5
Continue but only kiss	39	41.5	17	20.5
Allow more contact/Try to get her to go further	7	7.4	3	3.6
Talk him into stopping/Attempt to change her mind by talking	25	26.6	20	24.1

Goal Efficacy: “How much would your response meet your chosen goal?”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not very well	8	8.5	6	7.2
Somewhat well	17	18.1	12	14.5
Moderately well	27	28.7	23	27.7
Fairly well	30	31.9	18	21.7
Very well	12	12.8	24	28.9

Goal Efficacy: “How well do you think you could do the response you selected?”

	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not very well	2	2.1	2	2.4
Somewhat well	8	8.5	10	12
Moderately well	24	25.5	13	15.7
Fairly well	36	38.3	26	31.3
Very well	24	25.5	32	38.6

VITA

CARRIE E. AMBROSE

1319 Kavanaugh Blvd. – Little Rock, AR 72205 – (662) 202-2151 – ceambros@go.olemiss.edu

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology

University of Mississippi, *Oxford, MS* (APA-Accredited)

Dissertation: Interpreting Ambiguity in Sexual Dating Encounters: Social Information Processing Differences in Men and Women

(Completed December 2012)

Major Professor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.

Expected: May 2012

Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology

University of Mississippi, *Oxford, MS* (APA-Accredited)

Thesis: *Sex and Commitment: An Examination of Date Rape Victim- Perpetrator Relationship, Sexual Assertiveness, and Resistance*

(Completed August 2010)

Major Professor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.

December 2009

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

Auburn University, Auburn, AL

Summa Cum Laude

December 2004

HONORS SOCIETIES AND AWARDS

Summa Cum Laude, Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, Auburn University, 2004

Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities, 2002-2004

Dean's List, Auburn University 2001-2004

Psi Chi National Honor Society in Psychology 2004

PREDOCTORAL CLINICAL INTERNSHIP

Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System

July 2012 -present

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

U.S. Department of Defense

Little Rock, AR

General Clinical Psychology Track (APA Accredited)

Director of Psychology Training – Garrett Andrews, Psy.D., ABPP/CN

Completed and Current Rotations/Training

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Services (major rotation)

Supervisor: Garrett Andrews, Psy.D.

Description: Working with acute inpatient rehabilitation in providing brief neuropsychological assessments, individual and family follow-up psychotherapy, and aftercare consulting for a variety of medical conditions including, but not limited to stroke, deconditioning, amputation, joint replacement, polytrauma, brain injury, spinal cord injuries, and other neurological conditions; integral part of the interdisciplinary team meetings, including physiatrist, physical therapist, occupational therapist, speech-language pathologist, social workers, pharmacists, and other consults, with the purpose of targeting patient progress, rehabilitation goals, and discharge planning.

Serious Mental Illness and Family Services (minor rotation)

Supervisor: Glenn White, Ph.D., CPRP

Description: Delivery of empirically-supported treatments, with an emphasis in recovery oriented treatment, in outpatient mental health and educational services, including individual or group psychotherapy, parenting skills training (group or individual), couples therapy, psychoeducation for Veterans and families, wellness and recovery groups on inpatient units, and educational classes or groups.

Primary Care Mental Health Integration and Health Promotion Disease Prevention (major rotation)

Supervisors: Supervisors, Stephanie Kremer, Psy.D (PCMHI) , Joseph Banken, Ph.D (HPDP)

Description: Conduct brief assessments and problem-focused, solution-oriented individual interventions to address mild to moderate psychiatric and behavioral health problems including, but not limited to, depression, anxiety, chronic pain, PTSD, insomnia, stress management, tobacco use, weight management, and substance abuse disorders; utilizing motivational enhancement strategies to improve Veterans' follow through with more intensive treatment and/or make healthy lifestyle changes within primary care setting; working with primary care PACT providers, various specialty medical providers, and psychiatry in coordinating care; co-leading behavioral health intervention groups targeting chronic pain, women's health, smoking cessation, and insomnia.

Anticipated Rotations/Trainings

Clinical Geropsychology (major rotation)

Supervisor: Courtney Ghormley, Ph.D.

Description: Providing neuropsychological assessment for geriatric patients with empirically-based neuropsychological procedures for diagnostic, treatment, and rehabilitation purposes; conducting psychological services for inpatients including psychological assessment and intervention, brief cognitive evaluation, individual and group therapeutic modalities; participation as a fully integrated interdisciplinary treatment team member, provide crisis intervention, as well as staff training and staff consultation.

Health Psychology (minor rotation)

Supervisor: Tanecia Blue, Ph.D.

Description: Providing psychological assessment and brief empirically-based therapy to medical inpatients, rounds with the Psychiatry Consultation and Liaison Team, rounds with the multidisciplinary medical inpatient team, including visiting inpatients and discussing medical cases, conducting weekly rounds on dialysis patients, providing assessment and therapy services as needed, participating on a multidisciplinary Palliative Care team, and attending discharge planning meetings on a medical inpatient ward as part of the interdisciplinary team, including providing input to the team about the psychological needs of the patient.

Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Clinical Team (PCT) (major rotation)

Supervisors: Vince Roca, Ph.D., Wm. Mark Moore, Ph.D., Linda Brewer, Ph.D.

Description: Delivery of empirically-supported treatments for OEF/OIF Veteran's with to traumatic brain injury, PTSD, substance dependence, depression, anxiety, chronic pain, civilian adjustment, and other co-morbid conditions in an intensive outpatient setting; conduct intake interviews; group and individual treatment; exposure to Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT), Prolonged Exposure (PE), and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT).

Mental Health Clinic (minor rotation)

Supervisors:

Description: Providing individual therapy and personality and diagnostic evaluations of psychiatric outpatients; providing group, couple, and individual empirically-based therapy including Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Dialectical Behavior Therapy, and Interpersonal Psychotherapy; interdisciplinary approach.

Additional responsibilities: Staff training and program consulting for the Adult Day Center aimed at assessing geriatric Veterans' cognitive functioning and designing appropriate activity planning. Didactic training in Military Sexual Trauma, Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Substance Abuse treatment, suicide prevention, military culture, post-deployment issues, Prolonged Exposure Therapy, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Services, Motivational Interviewing, and Geriatric Medicine.

GRADUATE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

Therapist, Psychological Services Center, University of Mississippi, August 2006-July 2012 (10 hours/week). Responsibilities: Completing screening and intake procedures; conducting therapy sessions; development of treatment goals; writing progress notes; crisis management; on-call emergency duty, risk management, and recommendations. Supervisors: Scotty Hargrove, Ph.D., Alan M. Gross, Ph.D., John Young, Ph.D., Thomas W. Lombardo, Ph.D., Todd Smitherman, Ph.D.

Mental Health Therapist, Communicare Region II Community Mental Health, Oxford, MS, July 2011-July 2012 (20 hours/week). Responsibilities: Triage, emergency, and intake procedures; conducting individual, family, couples, and group therapy sessions; development of written intake reports and comprehensive treatment plans; consultation with case managers and psychiatrists; TB/HIV assessment and education; hospital crisis consultation and risk assessment; pre-evaluation screenings for Mississippi involuntary commitment procedures including affidavit filing; on-call emergency duty; contact with diverse clients including pre-school age to adults, rural populations, low income families, patients with disabilities, serious mental illness, and alcohol and drug treatment. Supervisors: Elizabeth Dillon, Ph.D., Dixie Church, M.A.

Neuropsychology Intern, the Center for Pediatric Neuropsychology, Le Bonheur Children's Medical Center, June 2010-August 2011 (20 hours/week). Responsibilities: Administered and scored full assessment batteries to individuals of all ages in both outpatient and inpatient (Epilepsy Monitoring Unit) settings; assessments covered measures of intelligence, academic achievement, verbal and nonverbal memory, language, visual processing, motor, executive functioning, behavior, and personality; reviewed history and medical records, interpreted test results, designed appropriate recommendations, assigned diagnostic labels, and synthesized all information into official report. Supervisor: V.R. Brewer, Ph.D., ABPP-CN.

Mental Health Consultant, ICS, Head Start, Oxford MS and surrounding rural areas, September 2009-May 2012 (14-26 hours/month). Conduct classroom observations of teacher and student interactions; development of child behavioral interventions; parental and teacher consultation; child behavioral observation and assessments. Supervisor: Alan Gross, Ph.D.

Therapist, University of Mississippi Tupelo, Tupelo, MS, August 2007- May 2008 (20 hours/week). Responsibilities: Provided individual psychotherapy for nontraditional students attending a University of Mississippi rural satellite campus; clients presented with psychological difficulties including depression, anxiety, substance abuse, marital and parenting problems; consulted with university administration on issues of student mental health. Supervisor: Scott Gustafson, Ph.D.

Graduate Student Intern/Therapist, North Mississippi Medical Center- Behavioral Health Center, June 2006-June 2007 (20 hours/week). Responsibilities: Conducted therapy through Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for individuals, couples, families, and children with a focus on diversity issues; crisis and risk assessment and recommendations for outpatient and inpatient populations; performed psychosocial intakes and individual and group therapy sessions for inpatients on Acute, Stabilization, Geriatric, and Chemical Dependency Units. Conducted inpatient and outpatient neuropsychological testing, primarily geriatric dementia and traumatic brain injury assessments. Supervisors: Mike Oliver, Ph.D., Sandra Holmes, Ph.D., Brian Thomas, PsyD.

Behavior Specialist, DeSoto County, Mississippi School System, July 2005-July 2006 (20 hours/week). Responsibilities: Primary population consisted of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders, emotional disturbances, and behavioral problems; conducted social skills training within group and individual settings; created behavior modification plans, developed and implemented early intervention techniques, composed functional behavior analysis reports. Supervisor: Sheila Williamson, Ph.D.

Graduate Student Therapist, Act Now Tobacco Quit Program, University of Mississippi Health Services, August 2005-May 2006 (10 hours/week). Responsibilities: Providing education about tobacco cessation, health benefits, and treatment options. Providing individual therapy aimed at behavior change to aid in tobacco use cessation. Supervisor: Tom Lombardo, Ph.D.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Grant Co-Project Coordinator, University of Mississippi, April 2011- July 2012 (5 hours/week). Title of project: *Efficacy of behavioral insomnia treatment for chronic migraine: A randomized controlled pilot study. Migraine Research Foundation. (\$49,858)*. Responsibilities: Administration of both sleep management and lifestyle modification treatments; collection of baseline and outcome data, data entry and analysis; participant screening and scheduling. Supervisor: Todd A. Smitherman, Ph.D.

Grant Co-Project Coordinator, University of Mississippi, August 2008-July 2012 (10 hours/week). Title Project: *Clinical and Program Evaluation Services for Mississippi Children's Home Society (\$40,000)*. Responsibilities: Administrating, scoring and providing feedback for Behavioral Vital Signs grant project with Mississippi Children's Home Services which includes mental and behavioral health assessments in Mississippi public schools; organizing and implementing a grant for child mental and behavioral health assessments with Mississippi Youth Around the Clock (MYPAC) and Mississippi Children's Home Services including contacting regional office directors, scheduling client assessments, administering assessments in home and in office, and organizing assessment feedback. Supervisor: John Young, Ph.D.

Research Team, University of Mississippi, Department of Psychology, August 2008-July 2012.
Responsibilities: Data collection and entry, attending team meetings, attending professional conferences, development of presentations. Supervisor: John Young, Ph.D.

Research Team, University of Mississippi, Department of Psychology, August 2005- present.
Responsibilities: Weekly lab meetings, assisting in the development of research proposals, problem-solving research projects, data collection, professional conference presentations. Supervisor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.

Graduate Assistant, University of Mississippi, August 2005-May 2006 (10 hours/week). Responsibilities: Organized and led a campus wide survey on undergraduate smoking; advertising for ACT Now Tobacco Quit. Supervisor: Thomas Lombardo, Ph.D.

Research Assistant, Auburn University, August 2003- May 2004 (10 hours/week). Responsibilities: Assisted in advertising for smoking cessations study; completed participant interviews and intakes; administered carbon monoxide breathalyzer samples; managed study participation compensation; data entry in SPSS; created personal feedback forms for alcohol study; journal draft writing. Supervisor: Christopher Correia, Ph.D.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING/LICENSURE

Civil Commitment Pre-Evaluation Screening, Department of Mental Health, State of Mississippi, September 2011.

Provisionally Certified Mental Health Therapist (PCMHT), Department of Mental Health, State of Mississippi, August 2011.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Psychological Association (APA) - Student Member

Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT) - Student Member

Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABA) - Student Member

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Ambrose, C. & Gross, A. (In Press). Sex and Commitment: An Examination of Date Rape Victim-Perpetrator Relationship, Sexual Assertiveness, and Resistance. *Journal of Family Violence*.

- Benson, T.A., **Ambrose, C.**, Mulfinger, A.M., Correia, C.J. (2004). Integrating mailed personalized feedback and alcohol screening events: A feasibility study. *Journal of Drug Education*, 34, 327-334.
- Ambrose, C.**, Modlin, T., Cardin, M. (2012). Recovery Education. Presentation given at Eugene J. Towbin Healthcare Center, North Little Rock, AR.
- Ambrose, C.** (2010, February). *Sex and Commitment: An Examination of Date-Rape Victim-Perpetrator Relationship, Sexual Assertiveness, and Resistance*. Paper presented at the University of Mississippi Gender Studies Conference, Oxford, MS.
- Ambrose, C.** (2009, February). *Sex and Commitment: An Examination of Date-Rape Victim-Perpetrator Relationship, Sexual Assertiveness, and Resistance*, Results Pending. Paper presented at the University of Mississippi Gender Studies Conference, Oxford, MS.
- Kolivas, E. & **Ambrose, C.** (2008, March). *Assessing Male Sexual Perpetration: Examining the Gap between Rape Victimization and Perpetration Prevalence Rates*. Paper presented at the University of Mississippi Gender Studies Conference, Oxford, MS.
- Ambrose, C.**, Tucker, C., & Nassar, S., (June, 2008). Workplace Violence. Presentation given at the Medical Ethics Committee meeting at North Mississippi Medical Center, Tupelo, MS
- Ambrose, C.**, Gross, A. (2010). Sex and Commitment: An Examination of Date Rape Victim-Perpetrator Relationship, Sexual Assertiveness, and Resistance. Poster Presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Trent, L., **Ambrose, C.**, Heiden L., Damon J.D., Hight T.L., & Young, J. (2010). Prevalence of Prescription Drug Use among Mississippi Youth. Poster Presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies Convention, San Francisco.
- Chin, E.G., Drescher, C., Trent, L., **Ambrose, C.**, Heiden, L., & Young, J. (2010). Dissemination in School Systems: Feedback from Behavioral Vital Signs Personnel. Poster Presented at the Center for School Mental Health, New Mexico.
- Flegle, L., Trent, L., **Ambrose, C.**, Lazman, R., Young, J., (2009). Predictors of Clinical Elevations From a School-Based Mental Health Screening. Poster Presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies Convention, New York, NY.]

REFERENCES

Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
The University of Mississippi
P. O. Box 1848
University, MS 38677
Phone: (662) 915-5186
E-mail: pygross@olemiss.edu

Todd A. Smitherman, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
The University of Mississippi
P. O. Box 1848
University, MS 38677
Phone: (662) 915-1825
Email: tasmithe@olemiss.edu

John Young, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
The University of Mississippi
P. O. Box 1848
University, MS 38677
Phone: (662) 915-1775
Email: jnyoung1@olemiss.edu

Garrett Andrews, Psy.D.

Director of Internship Training
Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare
2200 Fort Roots Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72114
Phone: (501) 257-1684
Email: Garrett.Andrews@va.gov

Stephanie Kremer, Psy.D.

Primary Care Mental Health Integration
Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare
4300 West 7th Street
Little Rock, AR 72205
Phone: (501) 257-6601
Email: Stephanie.Kremer@va.gov