

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9105930

Heterosocial cues and perceptions of sexual intentions: Effects of sexual connotativeness, verbal refusal, and rape outcome

Kowalski, Robin Marie, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

NOTE TO USERS

**THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT RECEIVED BY U.M.I. CONTAINED PAGES
WITH SLANTED PRINT. PAGES WERE FILMED AS RECEIVED.**

THIS REPRODUCTION IS THE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

HETEROSOCIAL CUES AND PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL INTENTIONS:
EFFECTS OF SEXUAL CONNOTATIVENESS, VERBAL REFUSAL,
AND RAPE OUTCOME

by

Robin Marie Kowalski

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1990

Approved by

Jacquelyn W. White

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Jacquelyn W. White

Committee Members Mark R. Leary
Thomas J. White
R. Reed Holt
Diane L. Bell

March 23, 1990
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 23, 1990
Date of Final Oral Examination

KOWALSKI, ROBIN MARIE. Ph.D. Heterosocial Cues and Perceptions of Sexual Intentions: Effects of Sexual Connotativeness, Verbal Refusal, and Rape Outcome. (1990) Directed by Dr. Jacquelyn White. 205 pp.

This study was designed to examine the extent to which men's and women's perceptions of consent by a woman to sexual intercourse are determined by the additive and interactive effects of the woman's verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors, the degree of consistency between these two modes of communication, and whether or not the woman is forced to have sex. After reading a scenario describing a couple on a date, subjects rated the man and the woman on a number of attributes and completed questions relevant to what they had read.

Consistent with previous research, this study found strong support for the suggestion that men have a lower threshold than women for imputing sexual meaning to behaviors. In addition, perceptions of consistency between the woman's verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors affected subjects' ratings not only of the woman but also of the man. Subjects rated both the man and the woman more favorably when the woman's verbal statements were consistent with her nonverbal behaviors. Finally, contrary to previous research, this study provided little evidence for the suggestion that people often blame the victim for having precipitated a rape. Rather, subjects were less likely to attribute blame and responsibility to the woman when she was forced to have intercourse than when she was not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to extend her grateful appreciation to several people who have contributed their time, effort, and patience to the completion of this project. First, I would like to thank Dr. Jacquelyn White, my adviser and the chairman of my dissertation committee for her support, encouragement, and advice, in addition to her role in stimulating my interest in this area of research. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee for their contributions to the present study: special thanks to Dr. Tim Johnston, Dr. Reed Hunt, and Dr. Diane Gill. In addition, I would like to extend a special thanks to the final member of my dissertation committee, Dr. Mark Leary, for his support, encouragement and guidance over the past five years as my master's adviser, a role model, and a friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE.	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Definitions of Rape	3
Socialization and Attitudes toward Rape	4
Acquaintance Rape	6
Victim-Precipitation.	7
The Role of Consent	11
Heterosocial Cues and Sexual Aggression	12
Purpose and Overview of the Study	24
II. PILOT STUDY	28
Method.	28
Analysis.	29
III. PRIMARY STUDY -- METHOD	33
Subjects.	33
Materials	33
Procedure	34
IV. RESULTS	39
Manipulation Checks	40
Perceptions of Mary's Verbal and Behavioral Indicators of Sexual Desire.	41
Perceptions of Mary's Sexuality	58
Mary's Role in the Sexual Encounter	74
General Impressions of Mary	76
John's Role in the Sexual Encounter	84
Perceptions of John's Arousal	86
General Impressions of John	91
Justification and Foreseeability.	103
Summary	126

V. DISCUSSION.	108
The Effects of Verbal Refusal	109
The Effects of Nonverbal Cues	114
The Interactive Effects of Verbal Refusal and Nonverbal Cue	116
Gender Differences.	118
The Effects of Outcome.	121
Summary	126
Limitations and Ideas for Future Research	127
BIBLIOGRAPHY	130
APPENDIX A. HETEROSOCIAL CUES	139
APPENDIX B. SCENARIOS	142
APPENDIX C. INFORMED CONSENT.	168
APPENDIX D. EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- CONTROL	170
APPENDIX E. EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- NO OUTCOME.	178
APPENDIX F. EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- FORCED SEX OUTCOME.	186
APPENDIX G. DEBRIEFING.	194
APPENDIX H. SUPPLEMENTAL RESULTS.	196

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Men's and Women's Perceptions of Heterosocial Cues. . .	31
Table 2.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Perceptions of Mary . . .	42
Table 3.	Effects of Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary. . .	45
Table 4.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of Mary's Desire for Sexual Intercourse	49
Table 5.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's Desire for Sexual Intercourse -- Control Scenarios.	50
Table 6.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of the Extent to which Mary was Leading John on . .	52
Table 7.	Effects of Verbal Refusal on Perceptions of Mary. . .	55
Table 8.	Effects of Outcome on Perceptions of Mary	59
Table 9.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's Flirtatiousness -- Control Scenarios	63
Table 10.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's Sexiness -- Control Scenarios	66
Table 11.	Effects of Verbal Refusal, Outcome, and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's Promiscuity. . . .	67
Table 12.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's Promiscuity -- Control Scenarios	69
Table 13.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of the Frequency with which Mary has had Sexual Intercourse Relative to the Average Female College Student	71

Table 14.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of the Frequency with which Mary has had Intercourse Relative to the Average Female College Student	73
Table 15.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Attributions of Blame and Responsibility to Mary -- Control Scenarios . .	75
Table 16.	Factor Structure of Nonsexual Adjectives Describing Mary.	77
Table 17.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue, Verbal Refusal, and Outcome on Perceptions of Mary's Likeability. . . .	79
Table 18.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue, Verbal Refusal, and Outcome on Perceptions of Mary's Power.	81
Table 19.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Verbal Refusal on Perceptions of Mary's Competence.	83
Table 20.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Attributions of Blame and Responsibility to John -- Control Scenarios . .	87
Table 21.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Sexual Attraction to Mary	89
Table 22.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Sexual Arousal.	90
Table 23.	Effects of Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's Arousal and Sexual Attraction to Mary -- Control Scenarios	92
Table 24.	Factor Structure of Nonsexual Adjectives Describing John.	94
Table 25.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Nonverbal Cue on Perceptions of John's Sincerity	95
Table 26.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's Sincerity	97
Table 27.	Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Passivity	99

Table 28.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Passivity	100
Table 29.	Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's Likeability	102
Table 30.	Effects of Verbal Refusal, Outcome, and Sex of Subject on Subjects' Likelihood of Labeling an Incident as Rape	105

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of rape, particularly among the college-aged population, is astounding. Several researchers have asked college students whether they ever have forced or been forced to participate in unwanted sexual intercourse. Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957) surveyed 291 women regarding their exposure to sexual aggression. Fifty-six percent of these women had experienced some level of forced intimacy. Of these, 20.9% had experienced forceful attempts at intercourse and 6.2% had been subjected to violent attempts to obtain intercourse against their will. Similarly, in a study of 930 women, Russell (1984) reported that 44% had experienced at least one rape or attempted rape. More recently, in a national survey of college students, Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) reported that of the 3187 women surveyed, 53.9% had experienced some form of sexual victimization. Over 25% of the 2972 men surveyed reported having engaged in some form of sexual aggression.

However, although these statistics reflect the high incidence rate for both completed and attempted rapes, they reveal nothing about cohort effects of completed or attempted rape. In his sample of 930 women, Russell (1984) delineated five cohorts -- (1) those born in 1918 or earlier, (2) those born between 1919 and 1928, (3) those born between 1929 and 1938, (4) those born between 1939 and 1948, and (5) those born between 1949 and 1960. Across all cohorts, Russell found

that women in their late teens and early twenties reported particularly high incidence rates for completed or attempted rape. Even more interesting, however, was the relationship between cohort and incidence report. While 21.5% of women in the oldest cohort reported being victims of attempts at forced intercourse, the percentages for each successive cohort increased linearly. The comparable percentages for each successive cohort were, respectively, 33.9%, 46.2%, 58.7%, and 53.2%. Furthermore, Russell noted that these differences across cohorts were unlikely to reflect a greater willingness on the part of younger women to discuss their victimization.

Some instances of forced sexual assault among acquaintances may stem from men's misunderstanding of women's sexual intentions conveyed through both their verbal and nonverbal behavior (Abbey, 1982; Abbey, 1987). A woman's friendly behavior is often misinterpreted as a desire for sex. The present study was designed to examine more fully perceptions of a woman's verbal and nonverbal behavior in terms of the extent to which these behaviors connoted an interest in sex. First, the paper examines definitional problems surrounding the topic of rape, focusing specifically on the legal and social definitions of rape. Specific terms, such as socialization, acquaintance rape, and victim-precipitated rape, that are incorporated within the social definition of rape, will also be examined. These are discussed from an attributional perspective. An investigation of research looking at nonverbal communication and, specifically, the differential perception of cues within a dating situation follows. The introduction ends with

a general overview of the present study and a description of the study itself.

Definitions of Rape

Legal definitions. Although numerous researchers have examined the question "What is rape?" many of them have come up with different definitions. Part of the problem in defining rape stems from the distinction that is drawn between legal and social definitions of rape. According to Burkhart and Stanton (1988), there are three key components to the legal definition of rape. First, there must be proof that the man sexually penetrated the woman. Second, the woman must not have given her consent to have sexual intercourse. Third, force or threat must have been used by the man to obtain sexual penetration. In many cases, one or more of these conditions is difficult to prove, resulting in one of two outcomes: many women fail to report that they were raped and/or the men are rarely convicted (Burkhart & Stanton, 1988; Koss & Burkhart, 1989; Malamuth, 1981; Quackenbush, 1989; Yegidis, 1986). Some estimate that only one in five rapes is reported to authorities; that is, about 80% go unreported. Thus, statistics such as the 1986 FBI report indicating that 87,340 cases of forced sexual assault meeting the legal definition of rape were reported in 1985 (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987) fail to include adjustments for the number of unreported cases (Berger, Searles, Salem, & Pierce, 1986).

Social definitions. Burkhart and Stanton (1988) argue that the legal definition of rape can only fully be understood within the

context of a social definition that incorporates the cultural supports for and sex-role stereotyping of male dominance that operate to normalize sexual assault. The social definition of rape focuses on a different set of factors from those constituting the legal definition (Burkhart & Stanton, 1988; Burt, 1930; Burt & Albin, 1981; Klemmack & Klemmack, 1976). Social definitions of rape are affected by what Burt (1980) has labeled "rape supportive belief systems." The endorsement of these rape belief systems (or rape supportive myths), such as "the woman really wanted to be raped" and "she enjoyed the rape" affects the breadth of a person's view of rape (Burt, 1980; Burt & Albin, 1981). Consequently, some people's social definitions of rape fail to recognize many instances of forced sexual assault as rape. Research has indicated that endorsement of these belief systems is significantly correlated with the degree to which men indicate some likelihood of raping a woman (Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984).

These belief systems are thought to stem from what Brownmiller (1975) has called a "rape culture" (see also Burkhart & Stanton, 1988). She coined this term to refer to a society "distinguished by beliefs, attitudes, and social patterns that legitimize and support forms of sexual aggression against women as a way of maintaining the inequitable distribution of power in society" (p. 35).

Socialization and Attitudes Toward Rape

One of the primary components of the "rape culture" is the way in which men and women are socialized. As part of this socialization process, men and women are exposed to divergent sexual scripts in

which men are expected to be the initiators and the aggressors and women are expected to be the passive recipients of sex (Ellis & Beattie, 1983; Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Shotland, 1989). Thus, what is in fact forced sexual assault may be interpreted as a woman and a man simply fulfilling the roles for which they have been socialized (Krulewitz & Nash, 1979). Furthermore, women are socialized to offer at least token resistance to a man's sexual advances and men are socialized to believe that women really want sex. In this way, men's efforts to have intercourse despite their partner's protestations become justified (Abbey, 1982; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Gross, 1978). Both men and women are simply responding in accordance with their sex-role socialization (Krulewitz & Nash, 1979). According to Beneke (1982, p. 16),

not every man is a rapist but every man who learns American English learns to think like a rapist, to structure his experience of women and sex in terms of status, hostility, control, and dominance....if men go out on dates with the idea that sex is achievement or possession of a valued commodity, the woman's consent is likely to be of peripheral concern.

Support for the impact of socialization on people's definition of rape can be found in research that examined the relationship between the endorsement of traditional sex-role attitudes and attitudes toward rape (see White & Humphrey, in press, for a review). These studies have consistently found strong relationships between these two factors (Feild, 1978; Hegeman & Meikle, 1980; Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Krulewitz & Payne, 1978). For example, individuals who endorse

traditional attitudes toward women are more likely than nontraditional persons to blame the victim for having precipitated the rape (Burt & Albin, 1981; Feild, 1978; Muehlenhard, 1988), to endorse rape myths (Burt, 1980), to perceive the rapist as motivated solely by sex, and to perceive the victim as less attractive following the rape (Feild, 1978).

In addition, a study by Quackenbush (1989) examined how men's own sex-role attitudes affected their endorsement of rape myths. He found that rather than a strong endorsement of masculine traits being an accurate predictor of rape supportive attitudes, the lack of feminine traits seemed to be more applicable. Men classified as high in masculinity or undifferentiated (low in both masculinity and femininity) endorsed rape myths more strongly than men classified as androgynous (high in both masculine and feminine traits). He attributed this not only to the lack of feminine characteristics but specifically to the lack of interpersonal social skills reflected in many of the feminine traits.

Acquaintance Rape

Acquaintance rape refers to rape between individuals who know each other, at least casually. The extent to which two individuals are acquainted with each other has been cited as an important component of the social definition of rape (Burkhart & Stanton, 1988; Burt, 1980; Koss & Oros, 1982). Specifically, the labeling of an instance of sexual aggression as rape is negatively correlated with the degree to which the two individuals are acquainted with each other

(Burkhart & Stanton, 1988; Klemmack & Klemmack, 1976; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). According to Klemmack and Klemmack (1976, p. 144), "if any relationship is known to exist between the victim and the accused, no matter how casual, the proportion of those who consider the event rape drops to less than 50 percent."

MacKinnon (1983) argues that people are more likely to infer that women consented to sex when they are acquainted with their assailant. Acquaintance rapes do not fit with people's typical conceptions of a "classic rape" (Costin, 1985). This results in many women not realizing that they have, in fact, been raped as well as many perpetrators not realizing that they have committed a rape (Burkhart & Stanton, 1988). This restrictive definition of rape becomes particularly problematic given that over 80% of rapes are committed by someone that the victim knows (Warshaw, 1988).

Victim-Precipitation

When the label of rape is applied to instances of forced sexual assault between acquaintances, the incident is frequently viewed as victim-precipitated rape (Costin, 1985). In other words, people look to the victim (her appearance, behavior, etc.) for causal explanations for the event. Two primary explanations have been offered for the tendency to blame the victim -- one motivational and the other cognitive.

Motivational explanation. The motivational explanation, known as the "just world hypothesis," involves people's need to perceive their world as fair and orderly (Lerner, 1966; Lerner & Simmons, 1966).

They assume that people get what they deserve. Applied to rape, the just world hypothesis suggests that people protect themselves from the knowledge that a similar event could happen to them (in the case of women) or that they could do such a thing (in the case of men) by blaming the victim for precipitating a rape. Factors such as her appearance or her behavior contribute to judgments of blame.

Jones and Aronson (1973) examined the attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of her respectability. They presented subjects with rape scenarios in which mention was made that the victim was either a virgin, married, or divorced. Previous ratings in the Jones and Aronson study indicated that both a virgin and a married woman were perceived to be significantly more respectable than a divorcee, the former two not differing significantly from one another. Subjects indicated that the victim was more to blame when she was a virgin or married than when she was divorced. Jones and Aronson concluded that in order for a rape to have happened to a respectable person undeserving of any misfortune, there must have been something about the individual's behavior that induced her to be raped.

However, according to Luginbuhl and Mullin (1981), the Jones and Aronson (1973) study has a major shortcoming. In Lerner's (1966) original formulation of the just world hypothesis, he distinguished between the tendency of perceivers to make character (dispositional) attributions, behavioral attributions, and chance attributions. The Jones and Aronson study failed to distinguish whether subjects'

attributions of blame to the victim were dispositional, behavioral, or chance.

Thus, in a partial replication of the Jones and Aronson (1973) study, Luginbuhl and Mullin (1981) examined the extent to which subjects attributed blame to the victim's character, her behavior, or to chance. They found that subjects attributed less blame for a rape to a respectable woman's character and more to chance relative to an unrespectable woman. Furthermore, men were more likely than women to make a characterological attribution. Conversely, relative to men, women made more behavioral and chance attributions. Similar findings were obtained by Janoff-Bulman (1979) in an investigation of self-attributions made by victims of rape. She found that victims were more likely to attribute their misfortune to their behavior than to their character.

The sex differences obtained by Luginbuhl and Mullin (1981) contradict findings obtained by researchers endorsing the just world hypothesis who argue that women are more likely than men to make a dispositional attribution to the woman for precipitating the rape. By adopting this attributional perspective, women cease to perceive the rape as due to chance and so reduce their own feelings of being at risk (Walster, 1966).

Similarly, Shaver (1970), in his model of defensive attribution, endorsed the just world perspective but argued that people's self-esteem plays a critical role in the degree to which they will attribute responsibility for an event to the victim (see also Coates,

Wortman, & Abbey, 1979). For women to blame the victim for precipitating a rape suggests that others might blame her should she be raped. From this perspective, then, women are less likely to derogate the victim.

Researchers have also argued that the tendency to attribute a rape to dispositional attributes of the victim or to situational determinants is a function of whether the perceiver adopts the perspective of the actor or the observer (Calhoun, Selby, & Warring, 1976; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977). The idea that adopting the position of actor or observer affects subsequent attributions of behavior was introduced by Jones and Nisbett (1972). They argued that actors are more likely than observers to make situational rather than dispositional attributions for behavior. Calhoun et al. argued that because women can identify with the female rape victim, they are more likely than men to adopt the attributional perspective of the victim. Because of this, they are more likely to make situational attributions for a rape. Men, on the other hand, adopt the position of observers and tend to make more dispositional attributions to the victim.

Cognitive explanation. The second explanation for the tendency to blame the victim of rape and to attribute responsibility to her for the sexual assault is the hindsight phenomenon. The hindsight effect suggests that when individuals are informed of the outcome of an event, they increase their ratings of the likelihood of the event. Because, with the benefit of hindsight, individuals perceive particular events as more likely, they are more likely to believe that

the individuals involved could also have predicted the outcome of the event and done something to avoid it (Janoff-Bulman, Timko, & Carli, 1985). Thus, people believe, in retrospect, that women who are victims of rape should have been able to take measures to avoid being raped. Indeed, research has indicated that individuals perceive victims as more responsible and more to blame when they, as perceivers, are informed of a rape outcome than when they are not given information regarding the completion of a rape (Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Krulewitz & Payne, 1978).

The Role of Consent

The tendency to blame the victim as well as the likelihood of defining the event as rape seem to be moderated by the extent to which the woman's behavior implies consent (Burt & Albin, 1981; Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). According to MacKinnon (1983, p. 650), "the line between rape and intercourse commonly centers on some measure of the woman's will." Jones and Aronson (1973) found that the reputation of the woman affected the extent to which she was thought to readily consent to sexual intercourse. For example, divorcees were thought to consent more readily than virgins.

Although a woman is expected to offer "token resistance" to a man's sexual advances, she can demonstrate her lack of consent to the sexual advances if she offers verbal or physical refusal that extends beyond "token resistance." Krulewitz and Payne (1978) found that when the victim made verbal and physical protestations to the man's sexual advances, subjects perceived her as less to blame and as less

responsible for the sexual assault than when she offered little resistance. However, some research has indicated that this effect is moderated by the sex of the observer. Scroggs (1976) and Krulewitz and Nash (1979) found that relative to women, men assigned a less severe sentence to a man purported to have committed a rape and attributed greater responsibility to a woman when she did not resist a man's sexual advances than when she offered more forceful resistance. Women, on the other hand, assigned more severe penalties to a man who ostensibly committed a rape when a woman did not resist than when she did. In addition, women were more likely to attribute responsibility to the victim of a rape when she actively resisted a man's advances than when she offered no resistance. However, other researchers (Deitz, Littman, & Bentley, 1984) have found that men may also perceive a perpetrator to be less responsible when a woman actively resists than when she offers no resistance.

Heterosocial Cues and Sexual Aggression

As discussed previously, men have been socialized to make sexual advances despite the woman's protestations. Because of this and the commonly held belief that women want to be and enjoy being forced into sex (Burt, 1980), many sexually aggressive men are ignorant of the fact that they have actually committed a rape. When questioned, they readily point to numerous situational variables that assured them of the woman's willingness and desire for sex. Typically, the basis for men's perceptions of a woman's willingness to have sex appears to center on the woman's verbal and nonverbal behaviors. In many

instances, men try to estimate the likelihood of sex with the woman without directly asking. Frequently, involvement by the woman in any kind of intimate activity (i.e., kissing, petting, etc.) is perceived by the man as an indication that she would like him to make further advances. Thus, even when the woman protests verbally that she does not want sex, many men still perceive that she desires sex because of her nonverbal behavior. Because it tends to be easier for individuals to regulate their verbal messages while allowing their nonverbal messages to convey their true feelings (Ekman & Friesen, 1975), men may attach greater importance to the woman's nonverbal cues as opposed to her verbal protestations.

The importance of these nonverbal cues cannot be underestimated. Argyle, Alkema, and Gilmour (1971) suggested numerous functions for nonverbal behavior, including the communication of interpersonal attitudes, the expression of emotions, self-presentation, and providing feedback (see also Argyle, 1969; Eckman & Friesen, 1975). Argyle (1969) suggested that while verbal information is used primarily for the communication of external events, nonverbal communication functions as a means of establishing interpersonal relationships. Argyle et al. (1971) had subjects rate a performer communicating either a friendly, neutral, or hostile message. They found that subjects' ratings indicated the performer's nonverbal communication was more effective than verbal information regardless of whether the message was friendly or hostile (see also, Argyle, Salter,

Nicholson, Williams, & Burgess, 1970). This has been found to be true particularly when the perceiver and the individual being judged were not acquainted with one another (Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979).

The weight people place on nonverbal cues to infer attitudes and affect increases when the information conveyed verbally is inconsistent with that conveyed nonverbally. Mehrabian and Wiener (1967) presented subjects with inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages; that is, the emotional overtones in the verbal channel were discrepant from those presented nonverbally. They found that emotions that were conveyed nonverbally had over five times greater impact than emotions conveyed verbally. According to Archer and Akert (1977, p. 449), "nonverbal cues appear to provide...a qualitative 'script' without which verbal cues cannot be interpreted accurately."

However, DePaulo, Rosenthal, Eisenstat, Finkelstein, and Rogers (1978) have found that the greater weight assigned to nonverbal cues relative to verbal communications when the messages are inconsistent is a function of the degree of discrepancy between the two. In other words, the more discrepant the verbal and nonverbal messages are, the less weight is attached to the nonverbal communications. Similar findings were obtained by Argyle et al. (1971). They reported that the reliance on nonverbal information as a means of inferring affect diminished as the strength of the information communicated verbally increased.

Nevertheless, Argyle, Alkema, and Gilmour (1971) suggested that the emission of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages by an individual affects subsequent ratings of that individual. Subjects who emitted friendly nonverbal behaviors but hostile verbal messages were perceived to be unstable and insincere. Argyle et al. suggested that when confronted with these inconsistent messages, the perceiver experiences cognitive dissonance. In an effort to reduce this dissonance, the perceiver views the individual as confused and insincere.

Although similar research examining the relative contributions of verbal and nonverbal communications has not been applied to research on rape, there appear to be clear implications for encounters between men and women in an interpersonal context. The fact that people place greater weight on nonverbal behaviors than on spoken words to infer the intentions of another may explain the tendency on the part of many men to ignore a woman's verbal protestations in an interpersonal context. If a woman's nonverbal behaviors convey a friendly and receptive attitude, a man might infer that she is open to sexual advances. In addition, if he perceives her verbal and nonverbal messages as inconsistent, his attribution to her of insincerity may stimulate the perception that she has led him on, that "she really wants it," and that her verbal refusal is only a token resistance prescribed by society. Such perceptions may also explain why many instances of forced sexual assault have a hostile, aggressive quality

to them. Because the man feels that he has been led on, he might be motivated to harm or punish the woman (Groth, 1979).

The importance placed on nonverbal communications becomes problematic when individual differences in the ability to decode nonverbal behavior are examined, particularly as a function of gender. Research has been equivocal on whether men and women differ in their ability to encode and decode nonverbal stimuli. On the one hand, researchers have argued that, even where individuals have been found to differ in their abilities to encode and decode nonverbal cues (Thompson & Meltzer, 1964), this variability is not a function of gender. As much variation exists within a given gender as between genders (Ekman & Friesen, 1971; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). On the other hand, some researchers argue that gender is a key factor in explaining variability among individuals in their ability to encode and decode nonverbal communication (Rosenthal et al., 1979). In an attempt to reconcile these discrepancies, Hall (1978) reviewed 75 studies that reported results regarding the accuracy of decoding nonverbal information as a function of gender. Based on a meta-analysis of the studies, she concluded that women tend to be significantly better than men at decoding nonverbal communications, i.e., women are more accurate in their interpretation of the nonverbal communications of others than men. Because of this, men are more prone than women to misinterpret the friendly behaviors of women as laden with sexual overtones.

Henley (1977) suggested that socialization may explain why many men are less accurate than women in decoding nonverbal information. She noted that when confronted with ambiguous stimuli, people often resort to the most cognitively accessible schema for explanation. For men socialized to adopt the male role, this may involve accessing traditional sex-role stereotypes, such as a "woman's dress reflecting seductiveness." She stated that "in a sense, men and women do seem to know different languages nonverbally, but interpret each other's actions as if they spoke the same language" (p. 17).

Socialization may also explain why women are better decoders of nonverbal information than men (Henley, 1977). Because of women's subordinate status in society, their accuracy at reading nonverbal cues may function as a means of social control. Their attentiveness to nonverbal stimuli allows them to "read" the intentions of others thereby giving them some control over the situation. Unfortunately, this social control may not be possible in situations in which forced sexual assault occurs because men provide too few nonverbal cues regarding their intentions. Pearson (1985) has shown that men use nonverbal communications less frequently than women, i.e., they maintain less eye contact and are less expressive.

As mentioned, people differ greatly in their ability to decode nonverbal information (Thompson & Meltzer, 1964). Drawing on this theme, Lipton, McDonel, and McFall (1987) examined the accuracy of heterosocial perception among rapists, violent nonrapists, and nonviolent nonrapists, all of whom were incarcerated. They

administered the Test for Reading Affective Cues (TRAC), which consists of 72 30-sec videotaped vignettes of a couple on a first date or after several dates. Participants reported which of five affective cues were being displayed by the man and the woman portrayed in the vignettes -- romantic, positive, neutral, negative or bad mood. Compared to violent nonrapists and nonviolent nonrapists, rapists were deficient at accurately decoding the cues, particularly the negative cues emitted by the couple interacting on a first date.

Although the relative importance of verbal and nonverbal messages as social stimuli in sexual aggression have not been examined, considerable research has investigated gender differences in the perception of sexual cues in an interpersonal context. According to Kenin (1969), "the typical male enters into heterosocial interactions as an eager recipient of any subtle signs of sexual receptivity broadcasted by his female companion" (p. 26).

Abbey's (1982) research is noteworthy in this regard. She (1982) brought together groups of four students, two women and two men, who comprised two mixed-sex pairs. One pair participated as "observers" and the other pair as "participants." Participants were instructed to engage in a five minute conversation in the presence of observers. Following the conversation, all subjects rated their perceptions of the male and female participants. Both male and female participants were rated as more promiscuous and seductive by the male observer than by the female observer. In addition, the male participant rated his female partner as more promiscuous and seductive than the female

participant rated her experimental partner. These gender differences in perceptions of the participant were obtained only on measures containing a sexual component, not on other measures assessing how considerate, interesting, intelligent, and likeable they perceived the target individuals to be. Furthermore, male students indicated that they were more sexually attracted to the opposite-sexed participant than females indicated they were. Abbey interpreted these findings as indicative that men more than women impute sexual meanings into women's displays of friendliness. Because this tendency was also found in ratings of the male participant, however, Abbey concluded that the misinterpretation of women's cues is one part of a much larger behavioral repertoire stemming from a generalized social expectancy on the part of men to perceive the world in sexual terms (see also, Goodchilds, Zellman, Johnson, & Giarrusso, 1989; Shotland, 1989).

Surprisingly, these differential perceptions of women's cues as a function of gender do not appear to vary as a function of the ambiguity of the cues. Abbey and Melby (1986) had subjects view photographs of a male-female dyad in which one of three nonverbal behaviors was manipulated -- interpersonal distance, eye contact, and touch -- each of which was represented by what they perceived to be nonambiguous and ambiguous indications of sexual intent. For example, three interpersonal distances were used -- close, medium, and far. The researchers assumed that close and far interpersonal distances were unambiguous stimuli and indicative of sexual intent or a lack of

sexual intent, respectively. In addition, they assumed that a moderate interpersonal distance implied uncertainty in sexual intent. However, the hypothesis that ratings by men and women of male and female targets on the dimensions of seductiveness, sexiness, promiscuousness, and flirtatiousness would be more divergent as a function of the ambiguity of the cue was not confirmed. Rather than men and women rating the targets similarly when the cues were not ambiguous, male subjects consistently rated the female and male targets as more seductive, sexy, and promiscuous than females rated the same targets. In addition, men expressed more sexual interest than women in the opposite-sex target, replicating the findings of Abbey (1982). Abbey and Melby interpreted these findings to indicate that men impute more sexual meaning to events than do women, leading them to interpret nonverbal cues in an interpersonal context in significantly different ways.

In a third study, Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin, and Harnish (1987) investigated the effects of two other cues -- revealingness of clothing and composition of the dyad -- on perceptions of sexual intent. Previous research indicated that male adolescents perceive revealing clothing to be indicative of a desire for sex on the part of a man or a woman, although this effect is less pronounced when the person portrayed in revealing clothing is a man (Zellman & Goodchilds, 1983). In addition, Major and Heslin (1982) found that subjects perceived targets as desiring sex more when they were portrayed interacting in mixed-sex pairs rather than same-sex pairs. Based on

this, Abbey et al. (1987) has subjects view photographs of either a male-female dyad or a female-female dyad in which one or both of the individuals were portrayed in revealing clothing. For women, revealingness was indicated by a low-cut blouse, a slit skirt, and high-heeled shoes. Men in revealing clothes were portrayed in a partially unbuttoned shirt and tight pants. Contrary to the findings of Major and Heslin, female targets were perceived by male subjects to be more sexy and seductive than male targets regardless of the composition of the dyad. In addition, women portrayed in revealing clothing were perceived to be more sexy, seductive, flirtatious, and promiscuous than women wearing nonrevealing clothing. The revealingness of the clothing also significantly increased the degree to which subjects rated the female target as sexually attracted to the male target in the male-female dyad and the extent to which the couple was romantically involved.

As a result of their greater attribution of sexual intent to women's cues, Abbey et al. (1987) suggested that many men may feel "led on." This has implications not only for whether the man will attempt or actually commit a rape but also for how justified he feels in perpetrating the act. Previous research has indicated that even among adolescents, the perception of a woman's behavior as indicative of a desire for sex leads young men to feel more justified in raping a woman because she has led him on (Giarrusso, Johnson, Goodchilds, & Zellman, 1979; McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986).

Muehlenhard, Friedman, and Thomas (1985) extended Giarrusso et al.'s (1979) research to college students. They examined 268 male undergraduates' perceptions of the willingness of the woman portrayed in a scenario to engage in seven behaviors, such as kissing, touching the man's genitals, and sexual intercourse. In addition, they assessed the degree to which subjects perceived the man as justified in obtaining these behaviors through the use of force. In their scenarios, the researchers manipulated who initiated the date, who paid, and where the couple went. Although none of the subjects perceived rape to be strongly justifiable, ratings differed as a function of the situations portrayed. When the couple went to the man's apartment (as opposed to a religious function), when the woman asked the man out (as opposed to him inviting her), and when the woman allowed the man to pay all expenses, she was perceived by the male students as more willing to engage in sexual activities. In addition, under these conditions, the man was seen as more justified in obtaining these behaviors through the use of force. These findings were particularly salient for men who endorsed traditional sex-role attitudes.

To examine whether these perceptions varied as a function of the gender of the perceived, Muehlenhard (1988) asked both male and female undergraduates to read the scenarios and answer questions similar to those used in the previous study (Muehlenhard et al., 1985). As in that study, when the woman initiated the date, went to the man's apartment, or allowed the man to pay all expenses, the woman was

perceived as more willing to engage in sex and the man more justified in obtaining sexual behaviors by force. Although this pattern was obtained in ratings by both male and female perceivers, male ratings were consistently higher than female ratings.

All of these studies provide strong support for the contention that men perceive the world more sexually than women. The misperceptions of a woman's friendly behavior as sexually connotative suggests that men cannot distinguish between friendly and sexually connotative behavior. However, Muehlenhard, Miller, and Burdick (1983) found that men can, in fact, distinguish friendly behavior from sexually laden behavior.

Furthermore, women may be as likely to misperceive sexual behavior as friendly as men are to perceive friendly behavior as sexually connotative (Shotland, 1989). According to Shotland,

all that can be said about men and women generally is that men have lower thresholds for labeling sexually interested behavior than do women. This perceptual mismatch is important because... if a miscommunication about sexual intent occurs..., a likely outcome is for the man to perceive sexual intent when the woman felt she communicated none (p. 255).

All of these studies highlight the importance of heterosocial cues in affecting subjects' ratings of a woman's willingness to engage in sex and the man's justifiability in forcing a woman to engage in sexual intercourse. However, they have examined only isolated cues without obtaining any prior information regarding the relative salience of each of these cues as indicating a willingness for sex.

Abbey and Melby (1986) suggested that certain cues would be perceived by all observers as indicative of a desire for sex, while others would clearly indicate a lack of sexual desire. However, no empirical evidence for this statement has been obtained.

Purpose and Overview of the Study

The primary study was designed to develop a theoretical account of social definitions of rape. It is assumed that a core concept is consent, and the question is "what is the best way to explain perceptions of consent?" The general hypothesis was that perceptions of consent are determined by the additive and interactive effects of verbal refusals and nonverbal cues, in conjunction with the degree of consistency between the two. In addition, perceptions of the woman were expected to vary as a function of the outcome of the interaction.

Each subject read one of twenty-one scenarios describing a couple, John and Mary, on a date. Three control scenarios contained a single manipulation--Mary's nonverbal behaviors. Eighteen scenarios represented all combinations of the three independent variables that were manipulated in the study. First, three levels of nonverbal cues were used--low, medium and high. These cues were obtained from a pilot study in which subjects rated the extent to which each of 27 nonverbal cues connoted a woman's desire for sex. Based on average ratings of the cues across all subjects, cues that indicated a low, medium, and high degree of sexual desire on the part of the woman were retained for use in the primary study.

Second, three levels of refusal to the man's sexual advances were included. One third of the scenarios contained no verbal refusal, a third had the woman simply saying "no, I don't want to do that," and a third had the woman's verbal refusal accompanied by her slapping the man. Not surprisingly, previous research has shown that the degree of a woman's refusal affects subjects' perceptions of the willingness of the woman to engage in sexual intercourse and of the portrayal as rape (Krulowitz & Nash, 1979; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Yescavage, 1989). The more forceful the protest, the less the woman was perceived to have desired sexual intercourse.

Finally, the outcome of the date was manipulated. In half of the scenarios, John forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse. In the remaining scenarios, no mention was made of a forced sexual assault occurring. Because of the hindsight phenomenon (Janoff-Bulman et al., 1985), the presence versus absence of the forced sexual assault outcome was expected to result in differential attributions of blame and responsibility being made toward the victim.

Thus, the design was a 3 (verbal refusal: absent/no/no with slap) x 3 (nonverbal: low/medium/high) x 2 (outcome: forced sexual assault/no forced sexual assault) x 2 (sex of subject: male/female) between-groups design. Main effects for the three manipulated variables as well as for sex of subject were expected across the dependent variables. For example, when the verbal refusal was accompanied by a slap as opposed to being absent, subjects were expected to attribute less desire for sexual intercourse to Mary and

to be less likely to attribute blame and responsibility for the sexual encounter to her. Conversely, behavioral cues connoting a high desire for sex were expected to lead subjects to attribute greater blame and responsibility to Mary relative to when she engaged in behaviors that connoted little interest in sex. Subjects were also expected to attribute more blame and responsibility to Mary when the outcome involved forced sex than when no outcome was specified. Relative to women, men were expected to attribute greater blame and responsibility to Mary as well as to perceive her as having a greater desire for sexual intercourse regardless of level of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, or outcome.

In addition, an interaction between the level of refusal and nonverbal cue was expected. When the verbal refusal was accompanied by a slap, subjects were expected to perceive Mary as desiring sex less at every level of nonverbal cue than when the refusals were absent or not accompanied by a slap, i.e., no significant differences were expected as a function of the level of nonverbal cue when the refusal included a slap. This would be consistent with the findings of DePaulo et al. (1978). When no verbal refusals were present, significant differences were expected in subjects' ratings of Mary's desire for sexual intercourse as a function of her nonverbal behaviors. When her nonverbal behaviors connoted a high desire for sexual intercourse, subjects were expected to perceive her as more to blame and more responsible for a forced sexual assault than when her nonverbal behaviors connoted little interest in sex. Nonsexual

inferences about Mary, such as her sincerity, were also expected to vary with the inconsistency between her verbal and nonverbal messages. According to Mehrabian and Wiener (1967), this inconsistency leads the perceiver to view the target as insincere and confused.

A three way interaction of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue and rape outcome was expected. When the verbal refusal was accompanied by a slap, no significant differences were expected as a function of outcome or level of nonverbal cue. However, when there was no verbal refusal, subjects' ratings of the sexual connotativeness of Mary's behavior and the degree to which she was to blame were expected to differ significantly as a function of both the level of nonverbal cue and the outcome. Specifically, when a verbal refusal was absent and when a forced sex outcome was presented, subjects were expected to be more likely to blame Mary and perceive her behaviors as implying consent, particularly when the nonverbal cues connoted an interest in sex than when no outcome was presented.

CHAPTER II

PILOT STUDY

One factor of interest in the primary study was the degree to which the woman behaved in ways that led her date to believe that she desired to have sex. A pilot study was conducted to identify cues that differ in the extent to which they connote an interest in having sexual intercourse.

In the past, research on heterosocial perception has examined the impact of a few relatively arbitrary heterosocial cues on perceptions of rape. Clearly, some cues are more likely to be interpreted as indicative of a man's or a woman's desire for sexual intercourse than others. Because of this, different cues have differential effects on others' perceptions of the degree to which a woman desired sex and/or "led the man on," and on how justified a man was in forcing the woman to engage in intercourse. The purpose of this pilot study was to generate a more global list of heterosocial cues that might be perceived as differentially indicative of a desire for sex.

Method

Subjects

One hundred sixty-two men and 186 women at a small private university participated in partial fulfillment of a course research requirement.

Procedure

A list of 27 heterosocial cues was generated for this research (see Appendix A). These cues were obtained from several studies examining heterosocial behavior (Abbey, 1982; Muehlenhard, 1988) in addition to a few generated by the researcher. The cues were listed in random order. A female experimenter asked subjects to imagine that a couple was on a date. They then rated on a 5-point scale the extent to which each of the 27 behaviors was indicative of a desire for sexual intercourse (1 = indicates no interest in sexual intercourse; 5 = indicates an intense interest in sexual intercourse).

Analysis

Average ratings for each item were obtained across subjects, yielding an index of the degree to which each item indicated a desire for sex. The items were then rank-ordered according to the degree to which subjects perceived them to be indicative of a desire for sexual intercourse. A Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was conducted to examine intersubject agreement in the rank ordering. The resultant value, $W = .55$, $p < .001$, indicated strong agreement in the subjects' rank orderings.

Then, nine cues reflecting a low (she holds his hand, she maintains eye contact with him, and she slow dances with him), medium (she offers to give him a back rub, she places her hand on his thigh, and she passionately kisses him), and high (she removes her blouse, she touches his genitals, and she undresses him) degree of sexual desire were abstracted for use in the central study. A Kendall's

Coefficient of Concordance ($\underline{W} = .81, p < .001$) conducted on these nine cues indicated strong interrater agreement among subjects on their rankings of the cues. T-tests were conducted to assure that the three classifications of cues differed significantly from each other. Significant effects were obtained between the low and medium cues, $\underline{T}(346) = -10.93, p < .001$, as well as between the medium and high cues, $\underline{T}(347) = -26.32, p < .001$.

In addition, ANOVAs were conducted to examine differences in the average ratings of each item as a function of the gender of the rater. The results confirmed findings by Abbey (1982) that, relative to women, men perceive the behavior of women in a more sexualized way. Significant differences between men and women were obtained on 21 of the 27 heterosocial cues. Of these, all but two (she slipped into something more comfortable, she asks him to spend the night) were rated as more indicative of a desire for sex by men than by women. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Heterosocial Cues

<u>Cue</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
She asked him out on a date	1.71	1.38
She goes to his apartment	2.41	2.11
She touches his genitals	4.46	4.27
She passionately kisses him	3.28	2.99
She has dinner with him	1.59	1.32
She wears revealing tight pants	2.64	2.32
She invites the man to her apartment	3.04	2.76
She maintains eye contact with him	2.14	1.71
She allows him to pay for the date	1.38 _a	1.32 _a
She undresses him	4.62 _b	4.51 _b
She accompanies him to a movie	1.45	1.25
She places her hand on his thigh	2.90	2.62
She smiles at him	1.43	1.25
She allows him to touch her bare breasts	3.65 _c	3.60 _c
She accepts an invitation from him for a date	1.49	1.30
She slow dances with him	1.68 _d	1.56 _d
She has a drink with him	1.62	1.44
She attends a party with him	1.61	1.34
She removes her blouse	3.85 _e	3.73 _e
She plays romantic music on the stereo	2.35	2.10

Table 1 continues

Table 1 (cont.)

<u>Cue</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
She lies beside him on the couch	2.56 _f	2.58 _f
She compliments him	1.68	1.41
She leans her head on his shoulder	1.99	1.69
She offers to rub his back	2.59	2.25
She holds his hand	1.80	1.54
She slips into something more comfortable	3.75	4.04
She asks him to spend the night	4.57	4.77

Note. Means sharing a common subscript do not differ significantly
($p > .05$).

CHAPTER III
PRIMARY STUDY -- METHOD

Subjects

Three hundred and fifteen men and 315 women at a small private university participated in the study. These students were drawn from introductory psychology classes as well as six additional classes in both psychology and sociology. Half of the students received partial course credit for participating.

Materials

Scenarios. Twenty one scenarios were used in the present study. Eighteen of these scenarios reflected all combinations of refusal (absent/no/no with slap), the sexual connotativeness of nonverbal behaviors (low/medium/high), and outcome (no forced sex/forced sex). In addition, three control scenarios were included. Each of these control scenarios ended immediately after the woman's nonverbal behaviors were mentioned and before any sexual advances were made by the man. Thus, these three scenarios revealed nothing about the woman's refusal or about the outcome. Each of the 21 scenarios included nonverbal cues reflecting either a low, moderate, or high interest in sex.

All 21 scenarios described "John and Mary" on a date. With the exception of the verbal refusals, nonverbal behaviors, and outcomes, the scenarios were parallel in their descriptions. The couple was

portrayed as having become acquainted in a class they were taking. The nonverbal behaviors included in the scenarios were based on the ratings of the heterosocial cues obtained in the pilot study. For example, heterosocial cues that were rated as strongly indicative of a woman's desire for sex were used as the "high interest" nonverbal cues.

The refusals varied in the degree to which they indicated a lack of consent on the part of the woman. In response to the sexual advances made by the man, the woman either did not make a verbal refusal, she said "no, I don't want to do this," or she said "no, stop, I don't want to do this," in combination with slapping the man.

Of the 18 scenarios representing all combinations of the independent variables, half ended with the man forcing the woman to engage in sexual intercourse, while the remaining half concluded with John stopping his sexual advances. The three control scenarios concluded with the woman's nonverbal behaviors. (See Appendix B.)

Procedure

Subjects reported to the study in mixed-sex groups ranging in size from 35 to 100 people. A female experimenter conducted every session. After reading and signing an informed consent form, subjects were randomly assigned to read one of the twenty one scenarios. (See Appendix C.) Fifteen men and 15 women received each scenario. After reading one of the scenarios, subjects were asked to complete a series of questions and rating scales. (See Appendices D, E, and F.) Scenarios were removed before subjects completed the experimental questionnaire. Three versions of the experimental questionnaire were

used as a function of the outcome depicted in the scenario; that is, separate but similar questionnaires were administered to subjects who received one of the eighteen scenarios stating that Mary either was or was not forced to have sex. These two questionnaires were identical with the exception of asking subjects' perceptions of the woman and the man if he had forced her to have sexual intercourse (no forced sexual assault condition) versus subjects' perceptions given the fact that he did force the woman to engage in intercourse (forced sexual assault outcome).

The third questionnaire was created for subjects who received one of the control scenarios. This questionnaire was identical to the questionnaires given to subjects whose scenarios included no forced sexual assault with two modifications: (a) because sexual advances by John were not included, question 16 assessing John's sexual arousal was changed to read: "how sexually aroused do you think John was" and (b) the manipulation check item assessing Mary's refusal to John's sexual advances was deleted.

Perceptions of Mary's verbal and behavioral indicants of sexual desire. The first set of questions assessed subjects' perceptions of Mary's desire for sexual intercourse. Seven questions were answered on 12-point scales with five scale labels: (a) how much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse, (b) how certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse, (c) to what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease, (d) to what extent did Mary's behavior indicate a desire for

sexual intercourse with John, (e) to what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John, (f) to what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John, and (g) how sexually attracted was Mary to John.

Perceptions of Mary's sexuality. Research by Abbey (1982) indicated that perceptions of a woman's sexiness, flirtatiousness, etc., varied as a function of the heterosocial cues operative in an interpersonal interaction. Thus, a second series of questions examined subjects' perceptions of the woman's sexuality: (a) how flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be, (b) how sexy do you think Mary is, (c) how promiscuous do you think Mary is, and (d) relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse.

General impressions of Mary. Abbey (1982) also found that men's ratings of a woman portrayed in a forced sexual encounter varied on sexual attributes but not on attributes that were nonsexual. Several items were included in the present study to see if Abbey's findings would be replicated, but more importantly to see if ratings of the woman varied as a function of the inconsistency between her verbal and nonverbal messages (see Argyle, Alkema, & Gilmour, 1971). Subjects were asked to rate the woman on 25 7-point bipolar adjective scales that assessed their perceptions of her along dimensions such as sincerity, femininity, assertiveness, gullibility, physical attractiveness, etc.

Mary's role in the sexual encounter. Two questions assessed subjects' perceptions of the extent to which Mary was responsible for the situation described and the extent to which she was to blame for the events transpiring as they were depicted: (a) if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would Mary be for the forced sexual encounter (how responsible was Mary for the forced sexual encounter) and (b) if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would Mary be for the sexual encounter (how much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter).

John's role in the sexual encounter. Subjects answered three questions assessing the man's role in the encounter presented: (a) if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would he be for the sexual encounter (how much to blame was John for the sexual encounter), (b) if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would he be for the sexual encounter (how responsible is John for the sexual encounter), and (c) how justified was John (would John be) in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary.

Perceptions of John's arousal. Two items examined how sexually aroused subjects perceived John to be and how sexually attracted to Mary they thought he was: (a) how sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary and (b) how sexually attracted was John to Mary.

General impressions of John. The same bipolar adjective scales used to assess subjects' general impressions of Mary were also used to assess their perceptions of John.

Justification and foreseeability. Four questions examined subjects' perceptions of the justifiability of rape as well as the likelihood that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior: (a) to what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman, (b) to what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse, (c) (if) John (had) forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse against her will, how likely are you to say that John raped Mary, and (d) based on what you read in the story, how likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior.

Manipulation checks. Three questions were included to insure that the manipulations induced the desired perceptions. Each of these was followed by a list of items from which subjects selected their answer: (a) which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date, (b) which of the following behaviors does the story say that Mary performed, and (c) which of the following did Mary do in response to John's sexual advances. The third manipulation check item was not included in the questionnaire administered to subjects receiving one of the three control scenarios.

Following completion of the questionnaire, subjects were fully debriefed and dismissed. (See Appendix G.)

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Separate analyses were conducted for the control scenarios and the remaining eighteen. Preliminary analyses of internal consistency were conducted for each conceptually related subset of variables: perceptions of Mary's verbal and behavioral indicants of sexual desire, perceptions of Mary's sexuality, general impressions of Mary, Mary's role in the sexual encounter, John's role in the sexual encounter, perceptions of John's arousal, general impressions of John, and justification and foreseeability. These analyses revealed that, although the variables were significantly correlated, reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was unacceptably low. Therefore, rather than compute a composite score for each subset, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA with Pillai's trace as the criterion for determining F) were conducted. Subjects' general impressions of Mary and John were analyzed with factor analyses followed by MANOVAs on the factor scores. Significant multivariate effects for each subset are included in Appendix H. ANOVAs were examined only for those effects on which significant multivariate effects were obtained and are explained below. In addition, all post hoc tests were conducted using tests of simple effects and Tukey's HSD test, with $\alpha = .05$. Significant effects obtained on the eighteen scenarios will be described first, followed by significant effects for the control scenarios.

Manipulation Checks

The manipulations of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome successfully induced the desired perceptions. Chi-square values are reported in Appendix H. On the item asking "Which of the following did Mary do in response to John's sexual advances?", all but 22 subjects marked a verbal response category that was consistent with Mary's refusal in the scenario they received. Similarly, in response to the item asking "Which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date?", most subjects answered in a manner consistent with their condition. However, 95 subjects who received a scenario in which John stopped his sexual advances responded that no outcome had been specified in the story, compared to only 20 subjects who were told that John forced Mary to have sex.

In addition, in response to the manipulation check for Mary's nonverbal behaviors only a few subjects responded to each cue in a manner inconsistent with their condition as indicated by the number following each cue: (a) eye contact (19); (b) touching John's genitals (4); (c) offering to give John a back rub (12); (d) passionately kissing John (17); (e) holding John's hand (47); (f) slow dancing with John (8); (g) placing her hand on John's thigh (12); (h) undressing John (21); (i) Mary removing her blouse (12). Subjects who responded to any one of the three manipulation check items in a manner inconsistent with their condition were retained for further analyses.

Perceptions of Mary's Verbal and Behavioral Indicators of Sexual Desire

Seven questions examined subjects' perceptions of the degree to which Mary desired sexual intercourse. A 3(nonverbal cue:

low/medium/high) x 3(verbal refusal: absent/no/no with slap) x 2(outcome: no rape/rape) x 2(sex of subject: male/female) MANOVA conducted on these items revealed a significant multivariate interaction of outcome by verbal refusal as well as multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, outcome, and sex of subject (see Appendix H). Items on which these effects were significant at the univariate level are described in the following sections.

Desire for sexual intercourse. ANOVAs conducted on the item asking subjects how much they thought Mary desired sexual intercourse revealed significant main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 500) = 74.38, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 500) = 100.79, p < .001$, outcome, $F(1, 500) = 36.99, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 500) = 4.31, p < .04$, as well as a significant interaction of outcome by level of verbal refusal, $F(2, 500) = 6.29, p < .002$. Not surprisingly, as Mary's nonverbal behaviors increased in their sexual connotativeness, subjects perceived her to have increased desire for sex, all means differed significantly, $ps < .05$. Significance values and means for the main effect of nonverbal cue are reported for all items in Table 2. Furthermore, consistent with previous research, men perceived Mary to desire sex more than did women. Means for the effects of sex of subject for all items are given in Table 3.

The main effect of outcome was qualified by the outcome by verbal refusal interaction. The simple main effect of outcome was significant when Mary made no verbal refusal at all, $F(1, 503) = 42.95, p < .001$, or when Mary said "no" to John's sexual advances,

Table 2

Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Perceptions of Mary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
How much do you think Mary wanted to wanted to have sexual intercourse? $F(2, 500) = 100.79, p < .001$	2.9 _a	4.4 _a	6.6 _a
How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse? $F(2, 500) = 1.32, p > .20$	7.8	7.2	7.5
To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease? $F(2, 500) = 205.99, p < .001$	3.8 _a	6.8 _a	9.8 _a
To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = 234.49, p < .001$	3.5 _a	6.0 _a	9.4 _a
To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = .21, p > .80$	2.3	2.4	2.4
To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = 212.85, p < .001$	4.5 _a	6.8 _a	10.1 _a
How sexually attracted was Mary to John? $F(2, 500) = 109.32, p < .001$	6.1 _a	8.2 _a	9.3 _a
How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be? $F(2, 493) = 155.42, p < .001$	5.9 _a	8.6 _a	10.0 _a
How sexy do you think Mary is? $F(2, 493) = 12.44, p < .001$	6.6 _{ab}	7.4 _a	7.7 _b

Table 2 continues

Table 2 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
How promiscuous do you think Mary is? $F(2, 493) = 145.77, p < .001$	3.8 _a	6.1 _a	8.4 _a
Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse? $F(2, 493) = 42.60, p < .001$	5.6 _a	6.4 _a	7.9 _a
How responsible is Mary for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 75.41, p < .001$	3.4 _a	4.8 _a	7.5 _a
How much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 72.58, p < .001$	2.9 _a	4.3 _a	6.6 _a
How responsible was John for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 26.32, p < .001$	10.8 _a	10.3 _b	9.1 _{ab}
How much to blame is John for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 32.55, p < .001$	11.0 _a	10.4 _a	9.3 _a
How justified was John in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary? $F(2, 504) = 12.76, p < .001$	1.3 _a	1.5 _b	2.1 _{ab}
How sexually attracted was John to Mary? $F(2, 504) = 4.84, p < .008$	9.4 _a	8.9	8.8 _a
How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary? $F(2, 504) = 11.48, p < .001$	9.9 _a	9.9 _b	10.6 _{ab}
How likely are you to say that John raped Mary? $F(2, 502) = 40.39, p < .001$	11.2 _a	10.8 _b	9.2 _{ab}

Table 2 continues

Table 2 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman? $F(2, 502) = 6.92, p < .001$	1.2 _a	1.2 _b	1.4 _{ab}
To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse? $F(2, 502) = 9.39, p < .001$	11.7 _a	11.7 _b	11.1 _{ab}
How likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior? $F(2, 502) = 97.01, p < .001$	5.8 _a	7.6 _a	10.1 _a

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Table 3

Effects of Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sex of Subject</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse? $F(1, 500) = 4.31, p < .04$	4.9a	4.5a
How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse? $F(1, 500) = .003, p > .90$	7.5	7.5
To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease? $F(1, 500) = 11.76, p < .001$	7.2a	6.4a
To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 3.82, p < .05$	6.5a	6.1a
To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 24.63, p < .001$	2.8a	2.0a
To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 5.65, p < .02$	7.4a	6.9a
How sexually attracted was Mary to John? $F(1, 500) = .02, p > .89$	7.9	7.9
How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be? $F(1, 493) = .08, p > .70$	8.2	8.2
How sexy do you think Mary is? $F(1, 493) = .24, p > .60$	7.2	7.3

Table 3 continues

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sex of Subject</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
How promiscuous do you think Mary is? $F(1, 493) = .40, p > .50$	6.2	6.0
How responsible is Mary for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 4.34, p < .04$	5.5 _a	4.9 _a
How much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 9.15, p < .003$	5.0 _a	4.2 _a
How responsible was John for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 6.85, p < .009$	9.8 _a	10.3 _a
How much to blame is John for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 4.37, p < .037$	10.0 _a	10.4 _a
How justified was John in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary? $F(1, 504) = 2.60, p > .10$	1.7	1.5
How sexually attracted was John to Mary? $F(1, 504) = 1.97, p > .15$	9.1	8.9
How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary? $F(1, 504) = 2.56, p > .10$	10.3	10.0
How likely are you to say that John raped Mary? $F(1, 502) = 24.01, p < .001$	9.9 _a	10.9 _a
To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman? $F(1, 502) = 26.21, p < .001$	1.4 _a	1.1 _a

Table 3 continues

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sex of Subject</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse? $F(1, 502) = 33.22, p < .001$	11.1 _a	11.8 _a
How likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior? $F(1, 502) = 3.89, p < .01$	8.1 _a	7.6 _a

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

$F(1, 503) = 5.59, p < .02$, but not when Mary slapped John, $F(1, 503) = 3.12, p > .05$. Specifically, when Mary made no verbal refusal or said "no," she was perceived to desire sex more when she was not forced to have intercourse than when she was forced. (See Table 4.)

Furthermore, both when John forced Mary to have intercourse, $F(2, 503) = 16.79, p < .001$, and when he did not, $F(2, 503) = 60.10, p < .001$, subjects perceived that Mary desired intercourse more when a verbal refusal was absent than when she said "no" or said "no" in addition to slapping John, $p_s < .05$. However, subjects' inferences regarding how much Mary wanted sexual intercourse did not differ significantly as a function of her saying "no" or accompanying that "no" with a slap.

Examination of the univariate ANOVAs performed on the control scenarios revealed a significant interaction of nonverbal cue by sex, $F(2, 82) = 3.62, p < .03$, as well as a significant main effect of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 82) = 61.38, p < .001$, on the item asking subjects how much they thought Mary desired sexual intercourse. Tests of simple effects revealed that the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for both men, $F(2, 84) = 18.67, p < .001$, and women, $F(2, 84) = 44.75, p < .001$. Both men and women perceived Mary to desire sex more when her behaviors were high in sexual connotation than when her behaviors were low or moderate in sexual connotation, $p_s < .05$. (See Table 5.) Thus, in the absence of any type of verbal refusal and information regarding the outcome of the interaction between John and Mary, subjects made clear differentiations between the levels of nonverbal cues.

Table 4

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of Mary's Desire
for Sexual Intercourse

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	7.7 _{acd}	4.2 _{bc}	4.1 _d
Rape	5.3 _{aef}	3.3 _{be}	3.4 _f

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Table 5

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's
Desire for Sexual Intercourse -- Control Scenarios

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Men	5.5 _{ab}	7.7 _b	10.4 _b
Women	2.7 _{ac}	7.6 _c	10.1 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

However, the simple main effect of sex was significant only when Mary's behavior was low in sexual connotation, $F(1, 84) = 12.02$, $p < .001$, but not when her behavior was moderately, $F(1, 84) = .06$, $p < .81$, or strongly, $F(1, 84) = .11$, $p < .74$, sexually connotative. When Mary's behaviors indicated little interest in sex, men ($M = 5.5$) attributed more desire to Mary than women ($M = 2.7$).

Extent to which Mary was a tease. A univariate ANOVA revealed significant main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 500) = 205.99$, $p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 500) = 11.76$, $p < .001$, in addition to a significant interaction of outcome by verbal response $F(2, 500) = 7.73$, $p < .004$, on the item asking subjects the extent to which Mary was leading John on, being a tease. Mary was perceived to be more of a tease as her nonverbal behaviors moved from being low in sexual connotativeness ($M = 3.8$) to medium ($M = 6.8$) to high ($M = 9.8$), all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$. In addition, men were more likely to perceive Mary as being a tease ($M = 7.2$) than women ($M = 6.4$).

Tests of simple effects performed on the interaction of outcome and verbal refusal indicated that the simple main effect of outcome was significant when the verbal refusal was absent, $F(1, 503) = 4.19$, $p < .04$, and when Mary refused John with a slap, $F(1, 503) = 6.79$, $p < .009$, but not when Mary said "no," $F(1, 503) = .22$, $p > .50$. (See Table 6.) When Mary did not refuse verbally, subjects perceived her to be more of a tease when John forced her to have sex ($M = 7.1$) than when he didn't ($M = 6.1$). The reverse pattern was found when Mary

Table 6

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of the Extent to which Mary was Leading John on

Outcome	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	6.1 _{ac}	6.7	7.7 _{bc}
Rape	7.1 _a	6.5	6.7 _b

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

refused John by saying no and slapping him, in which case Mary appeared to be leading John on to a greater extent when she was not forced into intercourse ($\underline{M} = 7.7$) than when she was ($\underline{M} = 6.7$).

In addition, the simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when John did not force Mary to have intercourse, $F(2, 503) = 7.42$, $p < .001$, but not when he did, $F(2, 503) = .56$, $p > .50$. When there was no forced attempt at intercourse, Mary was seen as more of a tease when she slapped John ($\underline{M} = 7.7$) than when she made no refusal at all ($\underline{M} = 6.1$), the mean for the "no" verbal response falling between these two.

Examination of the univariate ANOVAs performed on the control scenarios revealed a significant effect of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 82) = 13.25$, $p < .05$. Subjects perceived Mary to be less of a tease when her nonverbal behaviors connoted little interest in sex ($\underline{M} = 3.8$) than when they connoted a moderate ($\underline{M} = 7.8$) or high ($\underline{M} = 7.2$) interest, $ps < .05$. Furthermore, Dunnett's tests were performed to compare the means obtained from the treatment scenarios with the control means. When Mary's nonverbal behaviors were moderately sexually connotative, subjects in the experimental conditions rated Mary as less of a tease than subjects who read the control scenarios (and, thus, were uninformed regarding her verbal refusal and outcome). However, when Mary's behavior was high in sexual connotation, experimental subjects rated her as more of a tease than control subjects, $ps < .05$.

Behavioral indications of a desire for sex. Significant main effects of nonverbal cue were obtained on the items asking subjects the

extent to which Mary's behavior indicated a desire for sexual intercourse, $F(2, 500) = 205.99, p < .001$, and the extent to which her nonverbal behaviors indicated a desire for sexual intercourse, $F(2, 500) = 212.85, p < .001$. For both items, ratings of Mary's desire for intercourse increased with the degree to which her nonverbal behaviors connoted an interest in sex. (See Table 2.) Furthermore, Dunnett's test revealed that, relative to ratings by subjects receiving one of the control scenarios, experimental subjects' perceptions of the extent to which Mary's behaviors and her nonverbal behaviors indicated a desire for sex were significantly lower when those behaviors were either moderate or high in sexual connotation, $ps < .05$.

Significant univariate effects of verbal refusal were obtained on the items asking the extent to which Mary's behavior, $F(2, 500) = 8.30, p < .001$, Mary's verbal statements, $F(2, 500) = 8.58, p < .001$, and her nonverbal behaviors, $F(2, 500) = 5.32, p < .005$, indicated a desire for sexual intercourse. For each item, subjects perceived Mary to desire sex significantly more when there was not a verbal response than when she told John no. For all items, means for each level of verbal refusal are reported in Table 7.

Furthermore, men perceived that Mary's behavior, her verbal statements, and her nonverbal behaviors indicated a greater desire for sexual intercourse than women. Means and significance values are reported in Table 3.

In addition, subjects' perceptions of Mary's desire for sex were affected by the outcome of the encounter. Univariate ANOVAs indicated

Table 7

Effects of Verbal Refusal on Perceptions of Mary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse? $F(2, 500) = 74.38, p < .001$	6.5 _{ab}	3.8 _a	3.7 _b
How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse? $F(2, 500) = 1.78, p > .15$	7.2	7.9	7.4
To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease? $F(2, 500) = 2.42, p > .05$	6.6	6.6	7.2
To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = 8.30, p < .001$	7.0 _{ab}	5.9 _a	6.1 _b
To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = 8.58, p < .001$	2.8 _a	1.9 _a	2.4
To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(2, 500) = 5.32, p < .005$	7.6 _{ab}	6.8 _a	7.0 _b
How sexually attracted was Mary to John? $F(2, 500) = 4.84, p < .008$	8.2 _a	7.6 _a	7.8
How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be? $F(2, 493) = 3.48, p < .03$	8.1 _a	7.9 _{ab}	8.5 _b
How sexy do you think Mary is? $F(2, 493) = .68, p > .50$	7.2	7.1	7.4

Table 7 continues

Table 7 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
How promiscuous do you think Mary is? $F(2, 493) = 22.60, p < .001$	7.1 _{ab}	5.4 _a	5.8 _b
Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse? $F(2, 493) = 41.79, p < .001$	7.9 _{ab}	6.1 _a	5.9 _b
How responsible is Mary for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 5.53, p < .004$	5.8 _a	4.7 _a	5.1
How much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 5.66, p < .004$	5.1 _a	4.1 _a	4.6
How responsible was John for the sexual encounter? $F(2, 504) = 5.00, p < .007$	9.8 _a	10.5 _a	9.9
How much to blame is John for the encounter? $F(2, 504) = 5.77, p < .003$	9.9 _a	10.6 _a	10.2
How justified was John in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary? $F(2, 504) = .45, p > .60$	1.7	1.6	1.6
How sexually attracted was John to Mary? $F(2, 504) = 8.92, p < .001$	8.6 _{ab}	9.4 _a	9.1 _b
How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary? $F(2, 504) = 1.65, p > .15$	10.0	10.17	10.29
How likely are you to say that John raped Mary? $F(2, 502) = 5.32, p < .005$	10.0 _a	10.7 _a	10.5

Table 7 continues

Table 7 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman? $F(2, 502) = .75, p > .45$	1.3	1.2	1.3
To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse? $F(2, 502) = .41, p > .65$	11.4	11.5	11.5
How likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior? $F(2, 502) = 2.83, p < .06$	8.3	7.6	7.6

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

that subjects perceived Mary's behavior, $F(1, 500) = 9.34, p < .002$, her verbal statements, $F(1, 500) = 5.04, p < .03$, and her nonverbal behaviors, $F(1, 500) = 9.99, p < .002$, to be more indicative of a desire for sex when she was not forced to have sex than when she was forced. Table 8 contains the means for the two levels of outcome for all items.

The ANOVA performed on the control scenarios revealed a significant main effect of nonverbal cue on subjects' perceptions of the extent to which Mary's behaviors, $F(2, 82) = 45.28, p < .001$, Mary's verbal statements, $F(2, 82) = 3.76, p < .03$, and Mary's nonverbal behaviors, $F(2, 82) = 54.25, p < .001$, indicated a desire for sex. Subjects perceived Mary's behaviors and nonverbal behaviors to indicate an increased interest in sex as they became more sexually connotative, $ps < .05$. In addition, subjects perceived Mary's verbal statements to be more sexually connotative when her nonverbal behaviors were moderately sexually connotative ($M = 4.1$) than when they were low ($M = 2.4$) or high ($M = 2.9$) in sexual connotation, $ps < .05$.

Perceptions of Mary's Sexuality

Four items examined subjects' perceptions of Mary's sexuality. These questions assessed how flirtatious, sexy, promiscuous, and sexually active subjects perceived Mary to be relative to the average female college student. A MANOVA conducted on these items revealed multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome, as well as significant multivariate interactions of verbal

Table 8

Effects of Outcome on Perceptions of Mary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Outcome</u>	
	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>
How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse? $F(1, 500) = 36.99, p < .001$	5.3 _a	4.0 _a
How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse? $F(1, 500) = .02, p > .85$	7.5	7.5
To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease? $F(1, 500) = .10, p > .75$	6.8	6.7
To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 9.34, p < .002$	6.7 _a	6.0 _a
To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 5.04, p < .03$	2.6 _a	2.2 _a
To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John? $F(1, 500) = 9.99, p < .002$	7.5 _a	6.8 _a
How sexually attracted was Mary to John? $F(1, 500) = 7.45, p < .007$	8.1 _a	7.6 _a
How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be? $F(1, 493) = .55, p > .45$	8.3	8.1
How sexy do you think Mary is? $F(1, 493) = 2.06, p > .10$	7.1	7.4
How promiscuous do you think Mary is? $F(1, 493) = 4.79, p < .03$	6.3 _a	5.9 _a

Table 8 continues

Table 8 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Outcome</u>	
	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>
Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse? $F(1, 493) = 2.83, p > .05$	6.8	6.5
How responsible is Mary for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = .09, p > .75$	5.2	5.2
How much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 1.42, p > .20$	4.8	4.5
How responsible was John for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = 6.08, p < .02$	10.3 _a	9.8 _a
How much to blame is John for the sexual encounter? $F(1, 504) = .89, p > .30$	10.1	10.3
How justified was John in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary? $F(1, 504) = .18, p > .65$	1.7	1.6
How sexually attracted was John to Mary? $F(1, 504) = 18.53, p < .001$	8.7 _a	9.4 _a
How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary? $F(1, 504) = 15.41, p < .001$	9.9 _a	10.4 _a
How likely are you to say that John raped Mary? $F(1, 502) = .50, p > .40$	10.3	10.5
To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman? $F(1, 502) = 2.08, p > .10$	1.2	1.3

Table 8 continues

Table 8 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Outcome</u>	
	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>
To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse? $F(1, 502) = .06, p > .80$	11.5	11.5
How likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior? $F(1, 502) = 10.86, p < .001$	8.2 _a	7.4 _a

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

refusal by outcome by sex of subject, outcome by verbal refusal, and nonverbal cue by sex of subject (see Appendix H).

Flirtatiousness. Univariate analyses revealed significant main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 493) = 3.48, p < .03$, and nonverbal cue, $F(2, 493) = 155.42, p < .001$, for the item asking subjects how flirtatious they perceived Mary to be. Mary was perceived to be less flirtatious when she refused John with a "no" ($M = 7.9$) than when she slapped John ($M = 8.5$) or did not make a verbal refusal ($M = 8.1$), the latter two means not differing significantly (see Table 7).

In addition, subjects rated Mary as more flirtatious as her nonverbal behaviors moved from being low in sexual connotativeness ($M = 5.9$) to medium ($M = 8.6$) to high ($M = 10.0$), $p_s < .05$ (see Table 2). Dunnett's tests revealed that when Mary's nonverbal behaviors were highly sexually connotative, subjects in the experimental conditions rated Mary as more flirtatiousness than subjects who read the control scenarios, $p < .05$.

Univariate analyses performed on the control scenarios revealed a significant main effect of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 82) = 11.30, p < .001$, and a significant interaction of nonverbal cue and sex of subject, $F(2, 82) = 6.65, p < .002$. The interaction showed that the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for women, $F(2, 82) = 16.29, p < .001$, but not for men, $F(2, 82) = 1.78, p > .15$. When Mary's behavior connoted little interest in sex ($M = 5.1$), women perceived her to be less flirtatious than when her behavior was moderate ($M = 9.2$) or high ($M = 9.9$) in its sexual connotations. (See Table 9.)

Table 9

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's
Flirtatiousness -- Control Scenarios

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Men	7.1 _a	8.7	7.2 _b
Women	5.1 _{acd}	9.2 _c	9.9 _{bd}

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

The simple main effect of sex of subject was significant when Mary's behavior was low, $F(1, 82) = 5.17, p < .03$, or high, $F(1, 82) = 8.22, p < .01$ in sexual connotativeness, but not when her behavior moderately connoted a desire for sex, $F(1, 82) = .35, p > .50$. When Mary's behavior showed little indication of desire for intercourse, men ($M = 7.1$) perceived Mary to be more flirtatious than women ($M = 5.1$). However, when her behavior strongly connoted a desire for intercourse, men ($M = 7.2$) were less likely than women ($M = 9.9$) to view Mary as flirtatious.

Sexiness. A significant main effect of nonverbal cue was obtained on the item asking subjects how sexy they perceived Mary to be. As expected, Mary was perceived as more sexy when her behaviors were highly sexually connotative ($M = 7.7$) than medium ($M = 7.4$) or low ($M = 6.6$) in the degree to which they connoted a desire for sex, the latter two means not differing significantly. Interestingly, relative to controls, subjects' ratings of Mary's sexiness were higher when her nonverbal behaviors were low or high in sexual connotation, $ps < .05$.

Examination of the control scenarios showed significant univariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 82) = 3.65, p < .03$, and sex, $F(1, 82) = 12.24, p < .001$, as well as a significant interaction of nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $F(2, 82) = 3.87, p < .03$. Tests of simple effects revealed that the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for women, $F(2, 82) = 6.36, p < .003$, but not for men, $F(2, 82) = 1.18, p > .30$. Women perceived Mary to be significantly less sexy when her nonverbal behavior connoted little interest in

sexual intercourse ($\underline{M} = 4.7$) than when it conveyed moderate ($\underline{M} = 6.9$) or high ($\underline{M} = 7.1$) interest, $ps < .05$. Men's perceptions of Mary's sexiness did not vary significantly as a function of her behavioral sexual connotativeness. Furthermore, when Mary's behavior was low in the degree to which it indicated a desire for sex, men ($\underline{M} = 7.7$) perceived Mary to be sexier than women ($\underline{M} = 4.7$), $F(1, 82) = 16.56$, $p < .001$. (See Table 10.)

Promiscuity. Significant univariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 493) = 22.60$, $p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 493) = 145.77$, $p < .001$, and outcome, $F(1, 493) = 4.79$, $p < .03$, were obtained on the question asking subjects how promiscuous Mary was. As Mary's nonverbal behaviors increased in their sexual connotativeness from low ($\underline{M} = 3.8$) to medium ($\underline{M} = 6.1$) to high ($\underline{M} = 8.4$), subjects perceived her to be significantly more promiscuous, all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$.

The main effects of verbal refusal and outcome were qualified by a significant interaction of verbal refusal, outcome, and sex of subject, $F(2, 493) = 3.02$, $p < .05$. (See Table 11.) The simple main effect of outcome was significant for women only when Mary either made no refusal at all, $F(1, 501) = 6.48$, $p < .01$, or when she said "no", $F(1, 501) = 3.81$, $p < .05$. When Mary did not make a verbal refusal, women perceived her to be more promiscuous when she was not forced by John to have sex ($\underline{M} = 7.5$) than when she was ($\underline{M} = 6.2$), $p < .05$. However, the reverse pattern was found when she said "no" to John's sexual advances. When Mary said "no," women perceived her to be more

Table 10

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's
Sexiness -- Control Scenarios

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Men	7.7 _a	8.3	7.1
Women	4.7 _{abc}	6.9 _b	7.1 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Table 11

Effects of Verbal Refusal, Outcome, and Sex of Subject on Perceptions
of Mary's Promiscuity

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>					
	<u>Absent</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No with slap</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
No rape	7.8	7.5 _{ac}	5.7	5.0 _{bc}	5.8	6.3 _c
Rape	7.0 _{de}	6.2 _a	5.1 _d	6.0 _b	5.7 _e	5.3

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

promiscuous when John forced her to have intercourse ($\underline{M} = 6.0$) than when he did not force her ($\underline{M} = 5.0$), $p < .05$.

Furthermore, the simple main effect of verbal response was significant for men when John forced Mary to have intercourse, $\underline{F}(2, 501) = 6.89$, $p < .001$, and for women when John did not force Mary to have sex, $\underline{F}(2, 501) = 11.7$, $p < .001$. When John forced Mary to have intercourse, men perceived her to be more promiscuous when she made no refusal at all ($\underline{M} = 7.0$) than when she said "no" ($\underline{M} = 5.1$) or said no in addition to slapping John ($\underline{M} = 5.7$), $ps < .05$. When Mary was not forced to have intercourse, women perceived her to be significantly more promiscuous when there was no verbal refusal ($\underline{M} = 7.5$) than when she said no ($\underline{M} = 5.0$) or slapped John ($\underline{M} = 6.3$), $ps < .05$.

Univariate analyses of the control scenarios revealed significant main effects of sex $\underline{F}(1, 82) = 6.89$, $p < .01$, and nonverbal cue, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 40.30$, $p < .001$, as well as a significant interaction of nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 3.27$, $p < .04$. Decomposition of the interaction revealed that the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for both men, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 10.18$, $p < .001$, and women, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 33.68$, $p < .001$. Both men and women perceived Mary to be more promiscuous when her nonverbal behaviors connoted a strong desire for sexual intercourse than when they indicated a moderate or low interest in sex. However, when she demonstrated little interest in sex, men ($\underline{M} = 6.1$) perceived Mary to be more promiscuous than women ($\underline{M} = 3.2$), $\underline{F}(1, 82) = 12.54$, $p < .001$. (See Table 12.)

Table 12

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of Mary's
Promiscuity -- Control Scenarios

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Men	6.1 _{ab}	8.6 _b	9.9 _b
Women	3.2 _{ac}	7.7 _c	9.9 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Sexual activity of the woman. An ANOVA performed on the item asking subjects "relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse" revealed significant main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 493) = 41.79, p < .001$, and nonverbal cue, $F(2, 493) = 42.6, p < .001$, as well as significant interactions of outcome by verbal refusal, $F(2, 493) = 4.51, p < .01$, and nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $F(2, 493) = 5.69, p < .004$. Decomposition of the interaction of outcome and verbal refusal showed the simple main effect of outcome to be significant when there was not a verbal refusal, $F(1, 497) = 11.12, p < .001$, but not when Mary said "no," $F(1, 497) = .98, p > .30$, or accompanied her no with a slap, $F(1, 497) = .42, p > .50$. (See Table 13.) When Mary did not refuse John's advances, subjects perceived her to have had intercourse more frequently when she was not forced into intercourse ($M = 8.5$) than when she was forced to have sex ($M = 7.4$).

The simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant both when there was a forced sexual encounter, $F(2, 497) = 10.53, p < .001$, and when there was no forced sex, $F(2, 497) = 35.94, p < .001$. In both instances, Mary was perceived to have had intercourse more frequently when she did not make a verbal refusal to John's advances than when she said "no" or slapped John, $ps < .05$.

Tests of simple effects performed on the nonverbal cue by sex of subject interaction indicated that the simple main effect of sex was significant when Mary's behaviors indicated either a high desire for sexual intercourse, $F(1, 497) = 4.73, p < .03$, or a low desire for

Table 13

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of the Frequency
with which Mary has had Sexual Intercourse Relative to the Average
Female College Student

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	8.5 _{abc}	5.9 _b	6.0 _c
Rape	7.4 _{ade}	6.3 _d	5.7 _e

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

sexual intercourse, $F(1, 497) = 6.61, p < .01$, but not when they connoted a moderate interest in sex, $F(1, 497) = .01, p > .90$. When Mary's behavior connoted a strong desire for sex, women ($M = 8.3$) perceived her to have had intercourse more frequently than men ($M = 7.5$), $ps < .05$, the mean for both men and women being significantly lower than the control mean, $ps < .05$. However, when Mary's behavior indicated little interest in sexual intercourse, men ($M = 6.1$) perceived her to have had intercourse more frequently than women ($M = 5.2$), $p < .05$. The treatment mean for women differed significantly from the control mean, $p < .05$, with women in the experimental conditions rating Mary as more sexually active relative to women in the control conditions. When Mary's nonverbal behaviors connoted a moderate interest in sex, both men and women rated Mary as having sex less frequently, relative to subjects in the control conditions, $ps < .05$.

The simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for both men, $F(2, 497) = 8.9, p < .001$, and women, $F(2, 497) = 39.4, p < .001$. Both sexes perceived Mary to have had intercourse more frequently when her behaviors strongly connoted a desire for sex than when they did not. (See Table 14.)

Analyses of the control scenarios showed a main effect of nonverbal cue for perceptions of the frequency with which Mary has had intercourse, $F(2, 82) = 36.24, p < .001$. Subjects' perceived Mary to have had intercourse more frequently as her behaviors increased in the degree to which they connoted an interest in sex from low ($M = 5.9$) to

Table 14

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of the
Frequency with which Mary has had Intercourse Relative to the Average
Female College Student

<u>Sex of Subject</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Male	6.1 _b	6.4 _c	7.5 _{abc}
Female	5.2 _d	6.3 _d	8.3 _{ad}

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

medium ($\underline{M} = 8.6$) to high ($\underline{M} = 10.3$), all means differing significantly, $p_s < .05$.

Mary's Role in the Sexual Encounter

Multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and sex of subject were obtained on the two items examining subjects' perceptions of the extent to which Mary was responsible for and to blame for the sexual encounter (see Appendix H). Univariate ANOVAs indicated significant effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and sex of subject for subjects' perceptions of Mary's blame and responsibility. (See Appendix H for F-values.) When there was not a verbal refusal, Mary was perceived to be more responsible and more to blame than when she said no to John's sexual advances. (See Table 7.) The mean for the "no with slap" condition fell midway and did not differ from the other two cells. Furthermore, subjects attributed more blame and responsibility to Mary as the degree to which her behavior indicated a desire for sexual intercourse increased. (See Table 2.) Finally, men were more likely to attribute blame and responsibility to Mary than were women. (See Table 3.)

Univariate analyses of the control scenarios obtained a main effect of nonverbal cue for the question assessing Mary's responsibility, $\underline{F}(2, 83) = 20.03$, $p < .001$, and for the question examining the extent to which she was to blame, $\underline{F}(2, 83) = 19.41$, $p < .001$. As Mary's nonverbal behaviors increased in sexual connotativeness, subjects attributed more blame and responsibility to her. (See Table 15.) Interestingly, comparison of the treatment and

Table 15

Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Attributions of Blame and Responsibility
to Mary -- Control Scenarios

	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
To what extent was Mary to blame for the sexual encounter	2.7a	5.3a	7.7a
How responsible was Mary for the sexual encounter	3.4b	6.2b	8.6b

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

control means revealed that when Mary's behaviors connoted a moderate or high interest in sex, subjects in the treatment conditions rated Mary as less responsible and blame-worthy than subjects in the control conditions.

General Impressions of Mary

Twenty-five bipolar adjectives were included to examine subjects' perceptions of Mary on nonsexual attributes. A principal axes factor analysis using an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation conducted on the items yielded four factors with eigenvalues greater than one. These factors (named likeability, power, competence, and shyness) along with their factor loadings are included in Table 16. A MANOVA conducted on the standardized factor scores for these four factors revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, outcome, and sex of subject, in addition to significant multivariate interactions of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome, and nonverbal cue by verbal refusal (see Appendix H).

Mary's likeability. One factor was defined by attributes associated with "likeability" with the highest loading items consisting of: sociable, sensitive, likeable, sincere, warm, and popular. (See Table 16.) Univariate analyses conducted on the factor score for this factor revealed significant univariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 490) = 7.16, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 490) = 24.27, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(1, 490) = 5.08, p < .03$, a significant interaction of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome, $F(4, 490) = 2.62, p < .04$, and a significant interaction of nonverbal cue by verbal refusal, $F(4, 490) = 2.76, p < .03$.

Table 16

Factor Structure of Nonsexual Adjectives Describing Mary

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
<u>Item</u>	<u>Competence</u>	<u>Shyness</u>	<u>Likeability</u>	<u>Power</u>
Not aggressive	.09	-.52	.01	-.18
Sociable	.05	.23	-.41	-.07
Strong	.36	-.04	.04	.43
Capable	.55	.02	-.01	.19
Sensitive	.02	-.46	-.54	-.01
Sophisticated	.61	.05	.06	.12
Well-adjusted	.63	-.21	-.21	-.08
Likeable	.25	-.19	-.55	-.09
Rational	.34	-.39	.02	.07
Sincere	.06	-.56	-.44	.06
Shy	-.14	-.77	.11	-.08
Conventional	.05	-.59	-.07	-.09
Intelligent	.24	-.40	-.20	.23
Flexible	.26	.03	-.18	-.12
Warm	.01	-.20	-.64	.01
Subtle	-.003	-.61	.02	.03
Popular	.05	.01	-.57	.08
Physically attractive	-.004	.04	-.26	.17
Independent	.18	-.07	-.23	.40
Dominant	.07	.24	.06	.66
Active	-.06	.31	-.18	.55
Stubborn	-.07	.01	.02	.64
Self-confident	.33	-.05	-.22	.39
Superior	.20	.03	-.20	.50
Not gullible	.21	-.14	.13	.50

Decomposition of the interaction of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome revealed that the simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when John forced Mary to have intercourse and her nonverbal behaviors were strongly sexually connotative, $F(2, 490) = 11.8$, $p < .001$, but not when there was no attempt at forced sex and her nonverbal behaviors indicated a strong interest in sex, $F(2, 490) = 2.53$, $p > .05$. When John forced Mary to have intercourse and her behaviors connoted a high desire for sex, subjects perceived Mary to be less likeable when she slapped John ($M = -.89$) than when she said no ($M = -.10$) or made no refusal to John ($M = +.11$). (See Table 17.)

In addition, the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant when John forced Mary to have sex and she slapped him, $F(2, 490) = 19.31$, $p < .001$. When John forced Mary to have intercourse and she refused him by slapping him, subjects perceived her to be less likeable when her behavior was high in its sexual connotations ($M = -.89$) than when they exhibited moderate ($M = +.18$) or low interest in sex ($M = +.36$), $ps < .05$.

When Mary's nonverbal behaviors were high in their sexual connotations and she responded to John's sexual advances by saying "no," subjects perceived her to be more likeable when John forced her to have sex ($M = .10$) than when he did not ($M = .59$), $F(1, 490) = 5.13$, $p < .03$. Thus, subjects were more likely to perceive Mary to be likeable when she demonstrated consistency between her verbal statements and her nonverbal behaviors.

Table 17

Effects of Nonverbal Cue, Verbal Refusal, and Outcome on Perceptions
of Mary's Likeability

<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>					
	<u>Absent</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No with slap</u>	
	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>
Low	-.24	-.16	-.26	-.35	-.0002	-.36 _c
Medium	-.17	-.47	.03	-.13	.13	-.18 _d
High	.13	-.11 _a	.59 _e	.10 _{be}	.50	.89 _{abcd}

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Power. A univariate interaction of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome was also significant for the factor containing items relevant to inferences regarding Mary's power: strong, independent, dominant, active, stubborn, secure, superior, and not gullible, $F(4, 490) = 3.59, p < .01$. In addition, a significant interaction of verbal refusal and nonverbal cue, $F(4, 490) = 4.49, p < .001$, as well as significant main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 490) = 3.39, p < .03$, sex of subject, $F(1, 490) = 9.92, p < .002$, and outcome, $F(1, 490) = 68.02, p < .001$ were obtained. The main effect of sex revealed that women ($M = .11$) perceived Mary to be more powerful than men ($M = -.11$). The main effects of nonverbal cue and outcome, as well as the interaction of verbal refusal by nonverbal cue were qualified by the interaction of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome.

Tests of simple effects indicated that when Mary's behaviors connoted little interest in sex, the simple main effect of outcome was significant when Mary refused John by saying "no," $F(1, 490) = 26.78, p < .001$, or by slapping him, $F(1, 490) = 12.92, p < .001$, but not when she did not make a refusal, $F(1, 490) = 1.20, p > .20$. (See Table 18.) When her behaviors were low in sexual connotativeness, subjects perceived Mary to be more powerful when she refused John's advances with a no or a slap and was not forced to have sex than when she was.

Furthermore, when Mary's behaviors connoted little interest in sex and John did not force her to have intercourse, subjects perceived her to be less powerful when she made no refusal to his advances ($M =$

Table 18

Effects of Nonverbal Cue, Verbal Refusal, and Outcome on Perceptions
of Mary's Power

<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>					
	<u>Absent</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No with slap</u>	
	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>	<u>No rape</u>	<u>Rape</u>
Low	-.32 _{abde}	-.55	.42 _{df}	-.70 _{fgh}	.59 _{ei}	-.22 _i
Medium	.23 _a	-.18	.22	-.06 _g	.33	-.02
High	.69 _{bc}	-.25	.09 _c	-.18 _h	.39	-.51

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

-.32) than when she said "no" ($\underline{M} = .42$) or slapped him ($\underline{M} = .59$), $\underline{F}(2, 490) = 9.89$, $p < .001$.

When there was no forced sexual encounter and Mary made no refusal to John's sexual advances, subjects perceived her to be less powerful when her behaviors indicated little interest in sex ($\underline{M} = -.32$) than when they indicated a moderate ($\underline{M} = .23$) or a high ($\underline{M} = .69$) interest in sex, $p_s < .05$. This same pattern was obtained in the forced sex condition when Mary refused John's advances by saying "no." Thus, subjects perceived Mary's resistance to John's advances to connote power relative to when she seemingly passively submitted to his advances.

Competence. Several items loaded on a factor containing items relevant to Mary's competence: strong, capable, sophisticated, well-adjusted, rational, and secure. Univariate analyses performed on the factor score for this factor revealed significant main effects of verbal refusal, $\underline{F}(2, 490) = 7.28$, $p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $\underline{F}(2, 490) = 35.91$, $p < .001$, and outcome, $\underline{F}(1, 490) = 19.58$, $p < .001$, in addition to a significant verbal refusal by nonverbal cue interaction, $\underline{F}(4, 490) = 2.76$, $p < .03$. Subjects perceived Mary to be more competent when John did not force her to have sex ($\underline{M} = .16$) than when he did ($\underline{M} = -.16$), $p < .05$. The main effects of nonverbal cue and verbal refusal were qualified by the interaction of verbal refusal and nonverbal cue. The simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant when Mary refused John's advances by saying no, $\underline{F}(2, 490) = 16.18$, $p < .001$, or by slapping him, $\underline{F}(2, 490) = 21.34$, $p < .001$, but not when she did not

make a refusal, $F(2, 490) = 3.02, p < .05$. When she told John no or slapped him, subjects perceived Mary to be more competent when her nonverbal behaviors connoted little interest in sexual intercourse than they demonstrated moderate or high interest, all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$. (See Table 19.)

Furthermore, when Mary's nonverbal behaviors were high in sexual connotativeness, subjects perceived Mary to be more competent when she did not refuse John's sexual advances ($M = -.05$) than when she said no ($M = -.42$) or slapped John ($M = -.72$), $F(2, 490) = 9.75, p < .001$. Thus, subjects' inferences regarding Mary's competence appeared to be affected by the consistency between her verbal statements and her nonverbal behaviors. When Mary demonstrated consistency, subjects perceived her to be more competent than when her verbal statements were inconsistent with her nonverbal behaviors.

Shyness. A fourth factor was defined by items that reflected Mary's shyness: not aggressive, sensitive, rational, sincere, shy, conventional, intelligent, and subtle. Univariate analyses performed on the factor score for the factor examining Mary's shyness revealed significant main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 490) = 12.30, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 490) = 163.57, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 490) = 5.63, p < .02$. Subjects perceived Mary to be more shy when she refused John's advances with a "no" ($M = -.21$) than when she did not make a refusal ($M = .17$) or slapped John ($M = .02$), $ps < .05$. They also thought that Mary was more shy when her behaviors demonstrated little interest in sex ($M = -.76$) than when they

Table 19

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Verbal Refusal on Perceptions of Mary'sCompetence

<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
Low	.28	.43 _a	.28 _b
Medium	.25	.05 _a	-.08 _b
High	-.05 _{cd}	-.42 _{ac}	-.72 _{bd}

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

indicated a moderate ($\underline{M} = .14$) or high ($\underline{M} = .60$) interest. Furthermore, men ($\underline{M} = -.08$) perceived Mary to be more shy than women ($\underline{M} = .08$). Thus, when Mary's behaviors connoted little interest in sex as well as when she refused John by saying "no," subjects perceived her to be more shy.

John's Role in the Sexual Encounter

Three items examined the extent to which John was (a) responsible for and (b) to blame for the sexual encounter as well as (c) the extent to which he was justified in using force to have sexual intercourse with Mary. A MANOVA performed on these items revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome (see Appendix H).

A significant univariate main effect of verbal refusal was obtained on the items assessing John's responsibility, $F(2, 504) = 5.0$, $p < .007$, and John's blame, $F(2, 504) = 5.77$, $p < .003$. Subjects attributed more blame and responsibility to John when Mary refused his advances with a no than when her refusal was absent, $ps < .05$. (See Table 7.)

A significant univariate main effect of nonverbal cue was obtained on all three items. (See Table 2.) Less blame and responsibility were attributed to John when Mary's nonverbal behaviors strongly connoted a desire for sex than when her behaviors were only moderate or low in their sexual connotativeness. Furthermore, John was perceived to be more justified in using force when Mary's behaviors were highly sexually connotative ($\underline{M} = 2.1$) than when they

were low ($\underline{M} = 1.3$) or moderate ($\underline{M} = 1.5$) in sexual connotativeness. However, in no instance was John perceived to be more than "slightly" justified.

Interestingly, the main effect of outcome revealed that subjects attributed more responsibility to John when he did not force Mary to have intercourse ($\underline{M} = 10.3$) than when he did ($\underline{M} = 9.8$), $\underline{F}(1, 504) = 6.08$, $p < .014$. Thus, surprisingly, subjects perceived John to be less responsible when he forced Mary to have sex than when he did not.

Analyses of the control scenarios revealed a univariate main effect of nonverbal cue for the questions examining subjects' perceptions of John's responsibility, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 6.4$, $p < .003$, and blameworthiness, $\underline{F}(2, 82) = 12.86$, $p < .001$. Subjects attributed significantly more blame and responsibility to John when Mary's behavior showed little interest in sex than when her behavior was moderate or high in sexual connotativeness, $ps < .05$. In addition, subjects attributed more blame to John when Mary's behavior was moderate in its sexual connotations than when it strongly connoted an interest in sex, $p < .05$. (See Table 20.)

Perceptions of John's Arousal

A MANOVA conducted on subjects' perceptions of John's sexual arousal and his sexual attraction to Mary revealed a multivariate interaction of verbal refusal by outcome, as well as significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and outcome (see Appendix H). On the question examining John's sexual attraction to Mary, main effects of outcome, $\underline{F}(1, 504) = 18.53$, $p <$

Table 20

Effects of Nonverbal Cue on Attributions of Blame and Responsibility
to John -- Control Scenarios

	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
To what extent was John to blame for the sexual encounter	10.9 _a	10.2 _a	7.9 _a
How responsible was John for the sexual encounter	11.1 _{bc}	9.4 _b	8.8 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

.001, and verbal refusal, $F(2, 504) = 8.92, p < .001$, were qualified by the verbal refusal by outcome interaction, $F(2, 504) = 5.23, p < .004$. The simple main effect of outcome was significant when there was not a verbal refusal, $F(1, 504) = 24.05, p < .001$, and when Mary refused John with a "no", $F(1, 504) = 4.81, p < .03$, but not when Mary slapped John, $F(1, 504) = .13, p < .72$. When Mary did not refuse John, subjects perceived John to be more sexually attracted to her when he forced her to have intercourse ($M = 9.3$) than when he did not ($M = 7.9$), $p < .05$. Similarly, when she told John no, he was perceived to be more sexually attracted to Mary when he forced her to have sex ($M = 9.7$) than when he did not ($M = 9.1$), $p < .05$.

In addition, the simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when John did not force Mary to have intercourse, $F(2, 504) = 12.25, p < .001$, but not when he did, $F(2, 504) = 1.90, p > .10$. When there was no forced sexual encounter, subjects perceived John to be less sexually attracted to Mary when she made no refusal to him ($M = 7.9$) than when she said no ($M = 9.1$) or slapped him ($M = 9.1$), $ps < .05$. (See Table 21.)

Similarly, on the item asking subjects how sexually aroused they thought John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary, the main effect of outcome, $F(1, 504) = 15.41, p < .001$, was qualified by the verbal refusal by outcome interaction, $F(2, 504) = 5.23, p < .006$. The simple main effect of outcome was significant when Mary did not refuse John's advances, $F(1, 504) = 24.21, p < .001$, but not when she told John "no," $F(1, 504) = 3.04, p > .05$, or slapped

Table 21

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Sexual Attraction to Mary

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	7.9 _{acd}	9.1 _{bc}	9.1 _d
Rape	9.3 _a	9.7 _b	9.2

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

him, $F(1, 504) = .02, p > .80$. When there was not a refusal, John was perceived to be more sexually aroused when he forced Mary to have sex ($M = 10.6$) than when he didn't ($M = 9.4$), $p < .05$. The simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when no forced sex occurred, $F(2, 504) = 6.92, p < .001$, but not when it did, $F(2, 504) = .67, p > .50$. In the absence of a forced sexual encounter, John was perceived to be significantly more aroused when Mary slapped him ($M = 10.3$) than when she said no ($M = 9.6$) or said nothing ($M = 9.4$), $ps < .05$. (See Table 22.)

The main effect of nonverbal cue obtained on both items revealed an interesting effect. Although subjects perceived John to be more sexually aroused when Mary's behaviors were strongly sexually connotative ($M = 10.6$) than when they were medium ($M = 9.9$) or low ($M = 9.9$) in their sexual connotativeness, $ps < .05$, they perceived him to be more sexually attracted to Mary when her nonverbal behaviors were low in the degree to which they connoted an interest in sex ($M = 9.4$) than when they connoted a high desire for sex ($M = 8.8$), $ps < .05$. This suggests that, although men are aroused by more clear indications of a woman's interest in sexual intercourse, their attraction to her is more a function of demonstrations of her femininity.

Analyses of the control scenarios revealed a univariate effect of sex of subject significant for both the question examining John's sexual attraction to Mary, $F(1, 81) = 11.48, p < .001$, and his sexual arousal, $F(1, 81) = 8.66, p < .004$. Relative to women, men perceived

Table 22

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Sexual Arousal

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	9.4 _{ab}	9.6 _c	10.3 _{bc}
Rape	10.6 _a	10.4	10.3

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

John to be more sexually attracted to Mary and more sexually aroused at the time he began making his sexual advances. (See Table 23.) The univariate effect of nonverbal cue was obtained only on perceptions of John's sexual arousal, $F(2, 81) = 14.93, p < .001$. Subjects perceived John to be increasingly aroused as Mary's behavior increased from connoting little interest in sex ($M = 7.2$) to a moderate interest ($M = 8.9$) to a high interest ($M = 10.1$), all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$.

General Impressions of John

The same 25 bipolar adjectives that assessed subjects' perceptions of Mary were used to examine their impressions of John. A principal axes factor analysis performed on these adjectives produced four factors with eigenvalues greater than one. After rotating the factor structure to an oblique (direct oblimin) solution, factors were interpreted by examining items that loaded greater than .35. These factors were labeled sincerity, likeability, confidence, and passivity. (The factor structure is shown in Table 24.) A MANOVA performed on the four standardized factor scores revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, outcome, and sex of subject, in addition to significant interactions of verbal refusal and outcome, nonverbal cue and outcome, nonverbal cue by verbal refusal, and nonverbal cue by sex of subject (see Appendix H).

Sincerity. One factor was defined by items reflecting subjects' perceptions of John's sincerity: weak, sensitive, sincere, flexible, warm, and meek. Univariate analyses revealed significant main effects

Table 23

Effects of Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's Sexual Arousal and Sexual Attraction to Mary -- Control Scenarios

	<u>Sex of Subject</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
How sexually aroused was John	9.4 _a	8.1 _a
How sexually attracted was John to Mary	7.8 _b	6.5 _b

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Table 24

Factor Structure of Nonsexual Adjectives Describing John

<u>Item</u>	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	<u>Sincerity</u>	<u>Likeability</u>	<u>Competence</u>	<u>Passivity</u>
Not aggressive	.31	-.17	.12	.50
Sociable	.03	.42	.17	-.27
Strong	-.47	.36	.26	.02
Capable	-.17	.38	.38	-.04
Sensitive	.46	.15	.27	.36
Sophisticated	-.15	.54	.06	.16
Well-adjusted	.27	.29	.38	.31
Likeable	.26	.39	.26	.20
Rational	.12	.32	.13	.46
Sincere	.52	.27	.15	.22
Shy	.07	-.18	.01	.71
Conventional	.18	.25	-.04	.26
Intelligent	.24	.64	-.02	.08
Flexible	.60	.14	.10	.10
Warm	.52	.34	.13	.15
Subtle	-.05	.04	-.01	.60
Popular	.06	.55	.002	-.04
Physically attractive	.03	.38	.01	-.11
Independent	-.12	.31	.31	-.03
Submissive	.30	-.10	-.14	.58
Passive	.16	-.05	-.26	.60
Meek	.54	-.06	-.09	.18
Self-confident	.01	-.06	.74	.07
Superior	.06	-.06	.75	-.15
Not gullible	-.21	.25	.13	-.07

of verbal refusal, $F(2, 485) = 6.72, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 485) = 37.03, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(1, 485) = 386.31, p < .001$, as well as significant interactions of sex by nonverbal cue, $F(2, 485) = 3.91, p < .02$, and nonverbal cue by verbal refusal, $F(4, 485) = 2.88, p < .02$. Not surprisingly, subjects perceived John to be more sincere when he did not force Mary to have sex ($M = .56$) than when he did ($M = -.57$).

The main effect of verbal refusal was qualified by the interaction of nonverbal cue and verbal refusal. The simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when Mary's behaviors indicated little interest in sexual intercourse, $F(2, 485) = 10.74, p < .001$, but not when they indicated a moderate, $F(2, 485) = .27, p > .70$, or high interest, $F(2, 485) = .97, p > .30$. When Mary's behaviors showed little interest in sex, subjects perceived John to be more sincere when Mary did not refuse his advances ($M = -.01$) than when she said no ($M = -.33$) or slapped him ($M = -.59$), $ps < .05$. (See Table 25.)

The simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant at all levels of verbal refusal. When Mary did not refuse John's advances, subjects perceived John to be more sincere when her nonverbal behaviors exhibited a strong interest in sex ($M = .30$) than when they indicated little interest ($M = -.01$), $F(2, 485) = 3.58, p < .029$. A similar pattern was obtained when Mary refused John's advances by saying no, $F(2, 485) = 16.40, p < .001$, or slapping him, $F(2, 485) = 23.57, p < .001$.

Table 25

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Nonverbal Cue on Perceptions of John's Sincerity

<u>Verbal Refusal</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Absent	-.01 _{aef}	.06	.30 _a
No	-.33 _{be}	-.01 _b	.37 _b
No with slap	-.59 _{cdf}	-.04 _c	.20 _d

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Furthermore, the interaction of nonverbal cue and sex of subject revealed that when Mary's behaviors were low in sexual connotativeness, men ($M = -.16$) perceived John to be more sincere than women ($M = -.47$), $F(1, 485) = 9.53, p < .002$. The simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for both men, $F(2, 485) = 9.22, p < .001$, and women, $F(2, 485) = 32.12, p < .001$. Both men and women perceived John to be more sincere when Mary's behaviors indicated high rather than low interest in sex. (See Table 26.)

Passivity. The items not aggressive, sensitive, rational, shy, subtle, submissive, and passive loaded on the factor reflecting John's passivity. Univariate analyses revealed main effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 485) = 6.51, p < .002$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 485) = 37.0, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(1, 485) = 225.55, p < .001$, in addition to significant univariate interactions of verbal refusal and outcome, $F(2, 485) = 3.59, p < .02$, and nonverbal cue by outcome, $F(2, 485) = 4.37, p < .01$. The simple main effect of outcome was significant when Mary did not refuse John's sexual advances, $F(1, 485) = 119.12, p < .001$, when she said no, $F(1, 485) = 58.63, p < .001$, as well as when she slapped John, $F(1, 485) = 57.05, p < .001$. Across all levels of verbal refusal, subjects perceived John to be more passive when he did not force Mary to have intercourse than when he did. (See Table 27.)

The simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when John did not force Mary to have sex, $F(2, 485) = 9.59, p < .001$, but not when he did force her, $F(2, 485) = .63, p > .50$. When there was no forced sex, subjects perceived John to be more passive when Mary

Table 26

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's Sincerity

<u>Sex of Subject</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Male	-.16 _{ab}	.05	.25 _b
Female	-.47 _{ac}	-.04 _c	.33 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Table 27

Effects of Verbal Refusal and Outcome on Perceptions of John's
Passivity

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>		
	<u>Absent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No with slap</u>
No rape	.66 _{ad}	.62 _b	.40 _{cd}
Rape	-.43 _a	-.60 _b	-.68 _c

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

did not refuse his advances ($M = .66$) than when she slapped him ($M = .40$), $p < .05$.

Examination of the interaction of nonverbal cue and outcome revealed that the simple main effect of outcome was obtained when Mary's behaviors connoted low, $F(1, 485) = 39.87$, $p < .001$, moderate $F(1, 485) = 88.22$, $p < .001$, and high interest in sex, $F(1, 485) = 106.61$, $p < .001$. Across all levels of nonverbal cue, subjects perceived John to be more passive when he did not force Mary to have sex than when he did, $ps < .05$. (See Table 28.) In addition, the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant both when John forced Mary to have intercourse, $F(2, 485) = 33.44$, $p < .001$, and when he did not, $F(2, 485) = 8.23$, $p < .001$. When there was no forced sex, subjects perceived John to be more passive when Mary's behaviors connoted a high desire for sex ($M = .90$) than when they connoted a low ($M = .01$) or moderate ($M = .52$) interest, all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$. When he forced Mary to have sex, subjects perceived John to be more passive when Mary's behaviors indicated a strong desire for sex ($M = -.24$) than when they indicated a moderate ($M = -.51$) or low interest ($M = -.69$), $ps < .05$.

Likeability. Several items loaded on the factor reflecting John's likeability: sociable, strong, capable, sophisticated, likeable, intelligent, popular, physically attractive, and independent. Univariate analyses indicated significant main effects of outcome, $F(1, 485) = 16.74$, $p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 485) = 5.05$, $p < .03$, in addition to an interaction of sex with nonverbal

Table 28

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Outcome on Perceptions of John's Passivity

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
No rape	.01 _{ad}	.52 _{bd}	.90 _{cd}
Rape	-.69 _{ae}	-.51 _{bf}	-.24 _{cef}

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

cue, $F(2, 485) = 3.92, p < .02$. Subjects perceived John to be more likeable when he did not force Mary to have sex ($M = .16$) than when he did ($M = -.16$).

The main effect of sex was qualified by the interaction of sex of subject and nonverbal cue. When Mary's behaviors revealed little interest in sex, women ($M = .19$) perceived John to be more likeable than men ($M = -.29$), $F(1, 485) = 12.73, p < .001$. In addition, the simple main effect of nonverbal cue was significant for men, $F(2, 485) = 3.83, p < .02$, but not for women, $F(2, 485) = .89, p > .10$. Men perceived John to be more likeable when Mary's nonverbal behaviors showed a high interest in sex ($M = .08$) than when they showed only a slight interest ($M = -.29$), $p < .05$. (See Table 29.)

Competence. The items that loaded on the fourth factor reflected John's competence: well-adjusted, capable, independent, self-confident, and not gullible. Univariate analyses revealed significant main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 485) = 4.02, p < .02$, and outcome, $F(1, 485) = 3.76, p < .05$. Subjects perceived John to be more competent when Mary's nonverbal behaviors reflected a strong interest in sex ($M = .15$) than a low interest ($M = -.13$). In addition, subjects thought that John was more competent when he did not force Mary to have sex ($M = .08$) than when he did ($M = -.08$).

Justification and Foreseeability

Perceptions of rape. Four items examined subjects' perceptions of a) the likelihood that an incident of forced sexual assault was rape, b) the extent to which a man was justified in using force to

Table 29

Effects of Nonverbal Cue and Sex of Subject on Perceptions of John's
Likeability

<u>Sex of Subject</u>	<u>Nonverbal Cue</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
Male	-.29 _{ab}	-.06	.08 _b
Female	.19 _a	.02	.05

Note. Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

obtain sex with a woman, c) the extent to which a woman was justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse, and d) the likelihood that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior. A MANOVA conducted on these items revealed a significant multivariate interaction of verbal refusal, outcome, and sex of subject, in addition to multivariate main effects of nonverbal cue and sex of subject (see Appendix H). Univariate ANOVAs revealed significant main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 500) = 40.39, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 500) = 24.01, p < .001$, as well as a significant interaction of verbal refusal, outcome, and sex of subject, $F(2, 502) = 4.95, p < .007$ for the item asking subjects how likely they were to say that John "raped" Mary. When Mary's behavior indicated little interest in sex ($M = 11.2$), subjects were more likely to label the situation rape than when her behaviors were moderate ($M = 10.8$) or high ($M = 9.2$) in sexual connotation, $ps < .05$. The identical pattern was obtained for the significant effect of nonverbal cue in the control conditions, $F(2, 84) = 4.69, p < .05$. However, subjects receiving the treatment scenarios were more likely to label an incident rape than subjects receiving the control scenarios when Mary's behaviors were moderately sexually connotative, $p < .05$. In addition, women ($M = 10.9$) were more likely than men ($M = 9.9$) to perceive the situation as rape, $p < .05$.

The interaction showed that when there was no forced sex and Mary slapped John, women ($M = 11.4$) were more likely than men ($M = 9.2$) to say that if John had forced Mary to have sex, they would use the label

rape, $F(1, 502) = 20.58, p < .001$. A similar pattern was obtained when John did force Mary to have intercourse and she had not refused him. Again, women ($M = 10.9$) were more likely than men ($M = 9.2$) to say than John raped Mary, $F(1, 502) = 12.97, p < .001$. (See Table 30.)

For women, the simple main effect of verbal refusal was significant when there was no forced sex, $F(2, 502) = 5.01, p < .007$, whereas for men, this effect was significant both when John forced sex on Mary, $F(2, 502) = 4.52, p < .01$, and when he did not, $F(2, 502) = 3.09, p < .05$. When there was no forced sex, women were less likely to label the situation as rape when Mary made no verbal refusal ($M = 10.0$) than when she said no ($M = 11.1$) or slapped John ($M = 11.4$), $ps < .05$. Men were less likely to say that John raped Mary when she slapped him ($M = 9.24$) than when she said no ($M = 10.5$), $p < .05$. When John forced Mary to have intercourse, men were less likely to view the situation as rape when Mary made no refusal ($M = 9.2$) than when she said no ($M = 10.5$) or slapped John ($M = 10.3$), $ps < .05$.

Justification for rape. Significant univariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 502) = 6.92, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 502) = 26.21, p < .001$ were obtained on the item asking how justified a man is in using force to obtain sex. Subjects indicated that a man was more justified in using force when the woman's nonverbal behavior connoted a strong desire for sex ($M = 1.4$) than when it indicated a moderate ($M = 1.2$) or low ($M = 1.2$) interest in sex, $ps < .05$. In addition, men ($M = 1.4$) were more likely than women ($M = 1.1$) to perceive a man to be justified in using force.

Table 30

Effects of Verbal Refusal, Outcome, and Sex of Subject on Subjects'Likelihood of Labeling an Incident as Rape

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Verbal Refusal</u>					
	<u>Absent</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No with slap</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
No rape	9.8	10.0 _{bhi}	10.5 _e	11.1 _h	9.2 _{ace}	11.4 _{ci}
Rape	9.2 _{dfg}	10.9 _{bd}	10.5 _f	10.8	10.3 _{ag}	11.1

Justification for a woman's resistance. Significant main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 500) = 9.39, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 502) = 33.22, p < .001$, were obtained on the item asking subjects the extent to which they thought a woman was justified in saying no to a man's sexual advances. Not surprisingly, subjects perceived a woman to be less justified in saying no to a man's sexual advances when her behaviors connoted a strong desire for sex ($M = 11.1$) than when her behaviors were moderate ($M = 11.6$) or low ($M = 11.7$) in sexual connotativeness, $ps < .05$. Furthermore, men ($M = 11.1$) perceived the woman to be less justified in resisting a man's advances than women ($M = 11.8$), $p < .05$.

Foreseeability of the consequences. On the item asking subjects the extent to which they thought Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior, significant univariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(2, 500) = 97.01, p < .001$, sex of subject, $F(1, 502) = 3.89, p < .05$, and outcome, $F(1, 502) = 10.86, p < .001$, were obtained. When Mary's behaviors were highly sexually connotative ($M = 10.08$), subjects thought that she was more likely to have foreseen the consequences of her behavior than when her behavior was moderate ($M = 7.6$) or low ($M = 5.8$) in its sexual connotations, all means differing significantly, $ps < .05$. In addition, men ($M = 8.1$) thought it more likely than women ($M = 7.6$) that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior, $p < .05$. Subjects also thought it more likely that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior when she was not forced to have sex ($M = 8.2$) than when she was ($M = 7.4$), $p < .05$.

The ANOVAs performed on the control scenarios demonstrated significant univariate effects of nonverbal cue on the item asking subjects how likely they were to say that John raped Mary, $F(2, 84) = 4.69$, $p < .01$, and their perception that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behaviors, $F(2, 84) = 20.77$, $p < .001$. Subjects were more likely to label the situation as rape when Mary's behavior showed little interest in sex ($M = 11.6$) than when it demonstrated moderate ($M = 9.6$) or high interest ($M = 9.7$), $ps < .05$. However, they were less likely to perceive that she could have foreseen the consequences of her actions when her behaviors showed little interest ($M = 5.7$) relative to a moderate ($M = 8.9$) or high ($M = 10.0$) interest, $ps < .05$.

Finally, women ($M = 11.9$) were more likely to perceive a woman to be justified in saying no to a man's sexual advances than men ($M = 11.2$), $F(1, 84) = 9.18$, $p < .003$, but they were less likely ($M = 1.0$) than men ($M = 1.5$) to see a man as justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman, $F(1, 84) = 5.81$, $p < .02$.

Summary

The general hypothesis behind this research was that perceptions of consent are determined by the additive and interactive effects of verbal refusals and nonverbal cues, in conjunction with the degree of consistency between the two. In addition, the study examined the effects of hindsight on subjects' perceptions of Mary as well as their attributions of blame and responsibility to her. Subjects informed of a forced sexual encounter were expected to blame Mary more than

subjects not told the outcome of the interpersonal encounter.

Finally, the research examined differential perceptions by men and women of a woman's behaviors. Relative to women, men were expected to impute more sexual meaning to Mary's behaviors.

Verbal refusal. As Mary's verbal refusals to John's advances became more forceful, subjects' ratings of Mary's desire for sex as well as their attributions of blame to her for the sexual encounter were expected to decrease. Although subjects perceived Mary to desire sex more when no refusal was given than when she said no or slapped John, the observed pattern of means did not follow a linear relationship. Rather, when Mary refused John by slapping him, subjects perceived her behaviors to be more sexually connotative than when she said no. In addition, strong correlations were obtained between the forcefulness of Mary's protest and attributions of blame and responsibility to her. When Mary refused John by slapping him, subjects attributed more blame and responsibility to her.

Nonverbal cues. Subjects were expected to increase their ratings of Mary's desire for sex, perceptions of her as a tease, and attributions of blame and responsibility to her for the sexual encounter as her nonverbal behaviors increased in sexual connotativeness. These results were unequivocally confirmed.

Interactive effects of verbal refusal and nonverbal cue. A key point of interest in this study was the extent to which the degree of consistency between Mary's verbal refusals and nonverbal behaviors affected subjects' perceptions of her. As Mary's verbal refusals and

nonverbal behaviors became more divergent, subjects were expected to draw negative inferences about her.

The results were consistent with the hypothesis. However, the interactive effects of verbal refusal and nonverbal behavior were obtained only on general impressions of Mary. When Mary's verbal and nonverbal behaviors were inconsistent, subjects perceived her as less competent, likeable, and powerful than when her verbal refusals matched her nonverbal behaviors.

Interestingly, the degree of consistency between Mary's verbal refusal and nonverbal behaviors also affected subjects' perceptions of John. Subjects perceived John more favorably when Mary's verbal and nonverbal communications were consistent.

Gender differences. Men and women were expected to perceive Mary's nonverbal behaviors differently. Specifically, relative to women, men were expected to impute more sexual meaning to Mary's nonverbal behaviors. In addition, men were expected to attribute more blame and responsibility to Mary for the sexual encounter than women. The results confirmed these hypotheses. When Mary's nonverbal behaviors connoted little interest in sex, men perceived the behaviors more sexually than women. In addition, when the cues were low in sexual connotation, men perceived Mary to be more flirtatious, sexy, promiscuous, and sexually active than women. However, when little ambiguity surrounded the sexual meaning behind the cues, men and women did not differ in their ratings of Mary's sexuality.

Gender differences were also obtained on ratings of subjects' willingness to refer to a forced sexual encounter as rape. Women's likelihood ratings did not differ as a function of the presence or absence of a verbal refusal, whereas men were less likely to apply the label rape when Mary had not refused John's sexual advances.

Outcome. Subjects informed that a sexual assault had occurred were expected to attribute more blame and responsibility to her than subjects who were not told that a forced sexual assault had occurred. However, little evidence of victim derogation was obtained. Subjects were less likely to attribute responsibility to Mary when she was forced to have sex than when she was not. In addition, subjects were more likely to think that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior when she was not forced to have sex than when she was. However, subjects were more likely to blame John when he did not force Mary to have sex than when he did.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Much has been written in the literature about factors that affect judgments of victim blame for rape and judgments about when forced sex constitutes rape. However, conceptual confusion about these factors has existed because they have not been examined in any systematic way. The present study contributes to the theoretical understanding of social definitions of rape by examining the role of verbal and nonverbal cues and their consistency within an attributional framework. Specifically, this study examined the degree to which the sexual connotativeness of a woman's nonverbal behaviors and her reaction to a man's sexual advances affected subjects' perceptions of her. Because previous research on sexual assault has examined these two variables in isolation, this study broadens the conceptualization of attributions that people are likely to make when exposed to a forced sexual encounter. In conjunction with this, the study was designed to examine and clarify how these perceptions vary as a function of the gender of the subjects and the outcome of the interaction, i.e., whether the subjects were told that the woman was forced by the man to engage in sexual intercourse or that he stopped his sexual advances. Data relevant to each of these goals will be discussed in turn.

The Effects of Verbal Refusal

To behave consistently with traditional female sex role stereotypes, a woman is expected to display at least token resistance to a man's sexual advances even if she really is interested in having sex (Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). Because of this, men have been socialized not only to expect some resistance but also to assume that this resistance does not reflect the woman's true desires. Thus, men often continue making sexual advances even when women tell them that they do not want to have sex. On occasions in which the woman truly desires to have sex, few problems arise. However, if her refusal reflects her true desire, then there is clearly miscommunication between the man and the woman.

However, previous research (Krulewitz & Nash, 1979; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983) has shown that as the woman's resistance becomes more forceful, she more clearly expresses her lack of consent to the man's advances. The woman has moved beyond token resistance to active resistance. With more forceful refusal by the woman, subjects are more likely to perceive the man to be responsible for forced sexual encounters. Indeed, in the present study, subjects attributed more blame and responsibility to Mary and perceived her to desire sex significantly more when she did not refuse John's sexual advances than when she offered some type of refusal.

Furthermore, research has shown that the more forceful the woman's protest, the higher the likelihood that subjects will label an incident of forced sex as rape, although men were less likely to apply

the label than women (Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). This effect was obtained in the present study only for male subjects. When the outcome depicted in the scenario was a forced sexual assault, men were less likely to label the incident as rape when Mary did not refuse John than when she said "no" or slapped him. This parallels research by Scroggs (1976) that found that male subjects gave lighter sentences to a man accused of raping a woman when the victim did not refuse the man's advances than when she verbally or physically refused him.

Women, on the other hand, applied the label of rape to the forced sexual encounter as readily whether or not Mary refused John's advances. Indeed, even when Mary did not resist verbally, the mean likelihood rating by women for labeling the incident as rape was higher than the means at all levels of verbal refusal for men. This suggests that women are more likely than men to consider an act of forced sexual assault as rape, regardless of whether or not the woman refused a man's sexual advances. For men, labeling of a forced sexual encounter as rape seems to be contingent upon a woman indicating her lack of consent by verbally refusing his advances in a sufficiently strong manner. For men, it appears that "no" does not always mean "no."

One possible explanation for these sex effects is an identification of women with a victim who is too scared to resist (Deitz, Littman, & Bentley, 1984). Therefore, for women, the absence of a refusal does not connote consent to sex, but rather a fear reaction to the man's sexual advances. Indeed, Scroggs (1976) reported that women assigned more severe penalties to an alleged

perpetrator of sexual assault when the woman offered no resistance than when she resisted. Men, on the other hand, who are socialized to disbelieve a "token resistance" of no, infer that no refusal implies a willingness on the part of a woman to engage in intercourse. The implications of this within the legal system cannot be understated. Given the preponderance of male legislators and the legal requirement of a demonstration of lack of consent by the woman to the man's sexual advances, it is hardly surprising to find that very few alleged perpetrators are actually convicted.

One would expect, therefore, that the more forceful the woman's protest, the less consent men would infer, and the more likely they would be to apply the label rape. Indeed, Shotland and Goodstein (1983) argued that, consistent with the manner in which a woman is socialized, some refusal is expected even if she actually is interested in having sex. However, as her resistance becomes more forceful and exceeds some normative level of resistance, her lack of consent becomes more explicit and obvious. Consistent with this, they found that subjects were more likely to perceive forced sex as rape when the woman resisted both physically and verbally than when she offered only verbal resistance.

However, this pattern was not obtained in the present study. Rather, men who were told that John stopped his sexual advances, but asked how likely it was that they would use the term rape if John had forced Mary to have sex were more likely to label his behavior as rape when she said "no" than when she accompanied her verbal refusal with

physical resistance. Perhaps men perceived that if John's sexual advances had proceeded to the point that Mary felt it necessary to slap him, then she must have been leading him on initially and therefore "asking" to be raped. Thus, when a woman previously engages in behaviors high in sexual connotation, a "no," especially when accompanied by a slap, is even less likely to be accepted as "no."

Furthermore, perceptions of a woman as a tease and attributions of blame and responsibility to her covary. However, it isn't clear whether perceiving a woman as a tease led subjects to attribute more blame and responsibility to her or whether such perceptions followed from attributions of blame. For example, if these perceptions increase attributions to her and men perceived that the situation had advanced far enough that Mary felt the need to slap John (i.e., she was leading him on), they would be more likely to blame her and, thus, less likely to call the situation rape.

In support of this, when Mary was not forced to have sexual intercourse, subjects perceived that she was leading John on to a greater extent when she refused his advances by slapping him than when she did not make a refusal at all. Subjects also perceived John to be more sexually aroused when Mary slapped him than when she made no refusal or said no. In addition, strong correlations were obtained between subjects' perceptions of Mary as a tease and their tendency to attribute responsibility ($r = .57, p < .001$) and blame ($r = .58, p < .001$) to her.

The indirect relationship between Mary's refusal and subjects' perceptions of her suggests that rather than focusing solely on the magnitude of the refusal, one should examine the characterological inferences that subjects draw about a woman who refuses with a "no" and a woman who physically resists. People's schemas for appropriate sex-role behavior for women typically do not include physical violence and aggressiveness. Rather, women are stereotypically perceived to be passive and weak. Thus, when a woman does engage in physical resistance, subjects may draw other inferences about her character such as that she is unconventional, worldly, and fiesty. Interestingly, a significant negative correlation was obtained between Mary's nonverbal behaviors and perceptions of her conventionality ($r = -.45, p < .001$). The higher the sexual connotativeness of Mary's nonverbal behaviors, the less conventional subjects perceived her to be. The perception of Mary as unconventional connotes other inferences about her character that may have led subjects to make more negative attributions about Mary.

Furthermore, according to Shotland and Goodstein (1983), the timing of a woman's protest plays a central role in subjects' perceptions of the man's and the woman's role in the sexual encounter. When she has already allowed the sexual encounter to progress, subjects are more likely to infer that the woman really wants to have sex and subsequent advances or forced attempts by the man to obtain intercourse do nothing to alter their perception. In the present study, the timing of Mary's protests was not varied; particularly when

her nonverbal behaviors connoted a moderate or high interest in sex, she had signaled her sexual availability by the time she began to protest by saying no or accompanying her no with a slap.

Summary. Not surprisingly, subjects (particularly men) were more likely to infer consent for sexual intercourse when Mary did not refuse John's sexual advances than when she offered verbal or physical resistance. Interestingly, however, this effect did not vary directly with the level of Mary's refusal. For example, subjects perceived Mary to be more of a tease when she slapped John than when she did not refuse him. These results suggest that, under the circumstances outlined in the scenarios, if a woman resorts to slapping a man to stop his sexual advances, then men perceive that she has already allowed the situation to get out of hand, through some fault of her own. In addition, they may draw other inferences about a woman who physically resists that impedes their perception of the woman's purpose in resisting, i.e., to ward off her attacker. They apparently believe that by this time she had relinquished her right to say "no." On the other hand, to make no refusal at all implies her consent to sexual advances. However, previous research indicates that a simple "no" is not taken seriously by many men because it implies only token resistance and masks a woman's true sexual desires. Thus, women are left in a difficult position. The results suggest that, regardless of a woman's refusal or lack thereof, perceivers may draw unfavorable inferences about her.

The Effects of Nonverbal Cues

The prediction that subjects would perceive Mary as desiring sexual intercourse more as her nonverbal behaviors increased in the degree to which they connoted a desire for sex was unequivocally confirmed. Even when Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicated little if any interest in sex, men were more likely than women to impute sexual meaning to them. This pattern of results clarifies the issue of whether men misperceive women's friendly behaviors as sexual or whether women misperceive sexual behaviors as friendly (see Shotland, 1989). When the nonverbal behaviors connoted moderate or high interest in sex, men and women did not differ in their perceptions of Mary's desire for sex. There was no evidence to suggest that women perceived more sexually connotative behaviors in a more "friendly" manner than men. However, relative to women, men did perceive behaviors that were low in sexual connotation more sexually.

One of the more interesting effects obtained was that, although subjects perceived John to be more sexually aroused when Mary's behaviors connoted a strong desire for sex, he was more sexually attracted to her when her behaviors indicated little interest in sex. The more strongly Mary's behaviors reflected an interest in sex, the further away she was moving from the traditional role of women as the passive recipients of sex. Subjects may have thought that John would find this threatening and therefore perceived an inverse relationship between Mary's nonverbal behaviors and John's attraction to her. Indeed, a negative correlation ($r = -.29$, $p < .001$) was obtained

between subjects' perceptions of Mary's nonverbal behaviors and John's sexual attraction to her. Consistent with this, subjects perceived John to be more shy when Mary's nonverbal behaviors reflected a strong desire for sexual intercourse than when they indicated a low or moderate interest in sex.

Alternatively, if John made advances toward Mary when her nonverbal behaviors connoted little interest in sex, one can assume that he was sexually attracted to her. Indeed, even when Mary's behaviors connoted little interest in sex, subjects perceived John to be very sexually attracted to her. However, when her nonverbal behaviors were highly sexually connotative, more ambiguity surrounds John's attraction to her. In other words, the appropriate attribution to be made is unclear--were his advances a function of his attraction to her or a function of his sexual arousal?

The Interactive Effects of Verbal Refusal and Nonverbal Cue

Previous research has emphasized the heightened role that nonverbal communication plays relative to verbal messages in the communication of affect (Argyle, Alkema, & Gilmour, 1971; Depaulo et al., 1978; Mehrabian & Weiner, 1967). Mehrabian and Weiner (1967) argued that the greater weight assigned to nonverbal communications increases as the information conveyed verbally increasingly diverges in affect from that conveyed nonverbally. However, Depaulo et al. (1978) noted that this greater weight assigned to nonverbal communications was qualified by the extent to which the verbal and nonverbal messages were discrepant from one another. The more

inconsistent the verbal and nonverbal messages were, the less weight individuals would attach to the nonverbal communications. Furthermore, Argyle et al. (1971) contended that when a communicator conveys inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages, observers' perceptions of that communicator are subsequently affected. People perceive a communicator who delivers discrepant nonverbal and verbal messages as insincere and unstable.

However, interestingly, an examination of the importance of both verbal and nonverbal communications on subjects' perceptions of individuals has never been examined within the context of research on sexual assault. Indeed, the present results provided strong confirmation that, the consistency or inconsistency of Mary's verbal and nonverbal communications did affect subjects' perceptions not only of her behavior but also of John's behavior. However, this interactive effect of verbal and nonverbal messages on subjects' perceptions of John and Mary were only obtained on the items examining subjects' general impressions of John and Mary.

The data suggest that, consistent with previous research, subjects were sensitive to the degree of discrepancy between Mary's verbal and nonverbal communications. As her verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors became more inconsistent, subjects perceived Mary to be less likeable, less competent, and less powerful.

Furthermore, the consistency between Mary's verbal statements and her nonverbal behaviors also appeared to affect subjects' overall

impressions of John. For example, the more consistent Mary's verbal statements and her nonverbal behaviors, the more favorable the ratings that subjects assigned to John. Apparently, subjects drew inferences about John based upon what they knew about Mary and the fact that he was involved with her. Often, people look to aspects of an individual's immediate environment to aid them in drawing inferences about that individual. Specifically, others may draw certain conclusions about an individual based on what they know of the people with whom that individual interacts.

One point should be emphasized in comparing the present study with those conducted previously. Although the results obtained in this study demonstrated the impact of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal communications on subjects' perceptions of individuals, they do not address the respective weight that subjects assigned to Mary's verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors in forming their general impressions of Mary and John.

Summary. The data obtained in this study strongly support the suggestion that consistency between a person's verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors affect others' perceptions of an individual. The more consistent the verbal and nonverbal communications, the more positive inferences others draw not only about the individual delivering the communications but also about others with whom the individual interacts.

Gender Differences

Previous research has been consistent in the finding that, relative to women, men impute more sexual meaning to behaviors. Because of this, men frequently perceive that a woman's behavior implies an interest in sex when the woman did not intend to give that impression (Abbey, 1982, 1987; Abbey & Melby, 1985; Muehlenhard, 1988; Saal, Johnson, & Weber, 1989). Although this miscommunication can frequently be resolved through discussion, more severe consequences may result in which the man may push the woman to engage in sexual intercourse because he perceived that she was sexually responsive. Thus, men in this study were expected to impute more sexual meaning to Mary's behaviors than women and to attribute more blame and responsibility for the sexual encounter to Mary than women. The data were unequivocal in their support for these hypotheses.

First, men perceived Mary to desire sexual intercourse more than women. However, the interaction of nonverbal cue and sex of subject obtained on the control scenarios revealed that this difference was obtained only when Mary's nonverbal behaviors were low in the extent to which they connoted sexual interest. Although the means were in the expected direction, men and women did not differ in their perceptions of Mary's interest in sexual intercourse when her behavior indicated a moderate or high interest in sex.

These results replicate the findings obtained in the pilot study in which men indicated that Mary's behaviors reflected a greater

desire for sex than women, regardless of how little the behaviors may have actually reflected an interest in sex. Furthermore, these findings directly parallel the findings of Abbey (1982). Abbey concluded that men misinterpret women's cues because their behavior stems from a generalized tendency to perceive the world in sexual terms. This supports the contention made by Deaux (1976) that, when provided with limited information about an individual or individuals, people make causal attributions on the basis of their categorical expectancies of how particular individuals are to behave. For example, people have expectations regarding how men and women should behave that are based on their stereotypical assumptions of the categories of male and female.

The suggestion that men perceive behaviors more sexually than women was also reflected in subjects' perceptions of the frequency with which Mary had had sexual intercourse as well as their ratings of Mary's flirtatiousness, sexiness, and promiscuousness. When Mary's behavior showed little interest in sexual intercourse, relative to women, men perceived that she had had intercourse more frequently. In addition, data obtained on the control scenarios revealed that men perceived Mary to be more flirtatious, sexy, and promiscuous than women, but only when her nonverbal behaviors were low in the extent to which they indicated a desire for sex.

All of these findings suggest that when a woman's behavior is relatively unambiguous in its sexual connotations (i.e., moderate and

high cues), men and women do not hold differential perceptions of the sexual connotativeness of the behavior. However, behaviors that a woman may intend as friendly gestures (i.e., low cues) may be construed by men as reflections of sexual interest. Men may perceive that the woman is hiding her true sexual desires behind her female role of sexual conservatism. Thus, regardless of how little her behaviors may connote a desire for sex, men may perceive that the desire is nevertheless present.

Previous research has indicated that because men attach sexual meaning to a woman's display of friendliness, they report feeling led on by women (Abbey, 1982). This perception leads them to feel more justified in using force to obtain sex (Giarrusso, Johnson, Goodchilds, & Zellman, 1979; McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986). The results obtained in this study precisely reflected these findings. Relative to women, men perceived Mary to be leading John on to a greater extent, attributed more blame and responsibility to Mary for the sexual encounter, were more likely to say that a man was justified in forcing a woman to have sexual intercourse, and were less likely to perceive a woman to be justified in saying no to a man's sexual advances. Krulewitz and Nash (1979) explained similar findings in terms of the greater identification of women than men with the victim of sexual assault. Because of differences among men and women in the extent to which they identify with the victim, they perceive the victim's behavior very differently.

Summary. The results obtained in this study unequivocally support previous findings that, relative to women, men impute more sexual meaning to a woman's behavior. Because of this, they report feeling led on by women and more justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman.

The Effects of Outcome

Perceptions of Mary. Surprisingly, subjects in the present study who were informed that John forced Mary to have sexual intercourse displayed little, if any, victim derogation in comparison to subjects told that John stopped his sexual advances. However, there were two exceptions. First, subjects rated Mary as more of a tease when she did not refuse John's sexual advances and was forced by John to have sex than when she was not forced. The second exception to the general impact of outcome was for women's ratings of Mary's promiscuity. When Mary did not refuse John's sexual advances, women perceived Mary to be more promiscuous when John forced her to have intercourse relative to when he stopped his sexual advances. Two possible explanations can account for these findings. On the one hand, because Mary did not refuse John's advances, subjects may have been less likely to perceive the forced-sex situation as rape. They may have perceived forced sex as simply a more aggressive attempt to obtain sex by John. In addition, because John was forceful in his advances, they may have inferred that Mary must have led him on to a greater extent than when

he did not use force. On the other hand, perhaps subjects simply adopted the rape supportive myth that, since she didn't refuse John's advances, Mary wanted to have sex, and, since John used force, she must have been leading him on. From the subjects' perspective he clearly was not using force to overcome her resistance.

Contrary to previous research, attributions of blame and responsibility to Mary did not vary as a function of whether or not Mary was forced to have intercourse. Rather, relative to mean ratings obtained from the control scenarios, subjects who received one of the treatment scenarios perceived Mary to be less responsible across both levels of outcome when her nonverbal behaviors connoted a moderate interest in sex, as well as when her nonverbals were highly sexually connotative and she was not forced to have sex. When Mary's nonverbal behaviors were high in sexual connotation and she was forced to have sex, Dunnett's test revealed no significant differences between treatment and control means.

Furthermore, subjects were also more likely to think that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior when she was not forced to have sexual intercourse than when she was. Perhaps, subjects assumed that Mary warded off the attack because they perceived that she could foresee the consequences. This finding completely contradicts previous research on the hindsight phenomenon, but is consistent with the unwillingness of subjects to derogate Mary

in the present study. Importantly, subjects who participated in this study were required as a part of their freshman orientation to participate in a rape awareness program. Perhaps, they had a keener awareness of the extent to which women are frequently incorrectly blamed for their victimization or they were more sensitive to demand characteristics that might have been operative within the experiment, though these demand characteristics did not appear to affect other ratings of John and Mary. In addition, some of the studies that have found evidence for the hindsight phenomenon have failed to use a control condition in which there was no forced sexual encounter. Therefore, results obtained are suspect because they point to victim derogation while including no baseline control. Furthermore, perhaps in an attempt to find evidence for the hindsight phenomenon, past research has focused too much attention on perceptions of a victim when a sexual assault has occurred rather than examining more closely subjects' perceptions of a woman who was not forced to have sex.

Studies that have examined victim derogation have also noted differences in the degree to which men and women blame the victim. However, the results have been equivocal. Some researchers (Calhoun, Selby, & Warring, 1976; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977; Shaver, 1970) have suggested that women are less likely than men to blame the victim of a forced sexual assault because they are more similar to her and therefore identify with her. Men are more likely to make a

dispositional attribution to the victim for facilitating the forced sexual encounter. On the other hand, researchers adopting a just world hypothesis have suggested that women are more likely than men to blame the victim because by so doing, they can protect themselves from the thought that a similar forced sexual encounter could happen to them. The finding in the present study that men were more likely to attribute blame and responsibility to Mary than were women, supports the suggestion of Calhoun, Selby, & Warring (1976) and Selby, Calhoun, & Brock (1977) that women identify with the victim and are less likely to attribute fault to her for a forced sexual encounter.

Perceptions of John. Surprisingly, subjects attributed more responsibility for the sexual encounter to John when he did not force Mary to have sex than when he did. When there was not a forced sexual encounter, subjects may have perceived that John possessed a high degree of self-control (i.e., he was able to stop his sexual advances). Thus, the salience of John's self-control may have heightened subjects' attributions of responsibility to John when they were asked to imagine that John actually had forced Mary to have sex. Conversely, subjects informed that John did force Mary to have sex (forced sex outcome) were not sensitized to consider the amount of self-control John may have had.

The finding that subjects attributed more responsibility to a man when he did not force a woman to have sex than when he did is not

unique to this study. Krulewitz and Nash (1979) had subjects read scenarios in which a man forced or did not force a woman to engage in sexual intercourse. They found that, although subjects perceived the man to be more at fault than the woman across all conditions, the magnitude of this effect was qualified by the outcome. Although their subjects perceived the victim to be more responsible when the man forced the woman to have sex, the man was perceived to be more responsible when there was no forced sex. Krulewitz and Nash explained these findings by suggesting that when a man does not force a woman to engage in sexual intercourse, she must not have behaved in a way that encouraged his advances. The victim is perceived to have thwarted the assailant's advances through whatever means, implying a lack of consent, and therefore leading subjects to attribute more responsibility to the assailant. Similarly, Bridges and McGrail (1989) suggested that attributions of fault for a forced sexual encounter stem from sex-role expectations. They argue that, because, traditionally, the woman is supposed to limit the man's advances, when she fails to do this and is raped, fault is attributed to her.

Summary

The present study clearly demonstrated that men and women differentially perceive what may be intended by a woman as displays of friendliness, with men perceiving the behaviors more sexually than women. Oftentimes when there is miscommunication between men and

women the issue can be easily resolved through discussion. However, in more extreme instances, a man imputing sexual meaning to a woman's display of friendliness may lead him to make sexual advances towards her. Perceptions of her behavior as sexual, coupled with the idea that women must offer token resistance because they are expected to fulfill the feminine sex-role expectations, may lead men to force a woman to engage in sexual intercourse against her will.

Furthermore, based on the results obtained in this study, more resistance is not necessarily better, at least from the perspective of observers. Rather, the more forceful the resistance applied by Mary to thwart John's sexual advances the more likely subjects were to draw negative inferences about her. This may stem from their perception that the necessity to resort to physical violence implied that Mary had played some role in allowing the situation to advance too far. Alternatively, verbal refusal accompanied by physical resistance may represent a qualitatively different type of resistance than verbal refusal alone, leading observers to draw inferences about the woman that affect their perceptions of her.

Importantly, strong evidence was obtained to support the suggestion that subjects make more positive inferences about an individual when that individual's nonverbal behaviors are consistent with his or her verbal statements. To the extent that a woman's verbal statements and nonverbal behaviors are inconsistent, observers

are less likely to perceive her as knowing what she wants, leading them to attribute more blame and responsibility to her for a forced sexual encounter. This tendency could, in part, contribute to the self-perpetuating nature of the rape myths that pervade society.

Limitations and Ideas for Future Research

One limitation of this study concerns the relative weight that subjects assigned to Mary's verbal statements and her nonverbal behaviors in forming their impressions of both Mary and John. The results strongly supported the suggestion in previous research that inconsistency between these two channels of communication affects subjects' subsequent ratings. However, no conclusions can be made in the present study regarding the relative weight that subjects imputed to the nonverbal behaviors or the verbal statements in forming their impressions. One could speculate that, because of the importance of the nonverbal behaviors presented alone in the control scenarios in affecting subjects' attributions of blame and responsibility to Mary, subjects may have relied more on the nonverbal communications than the verbal communications in creating their perceptions of Mary. Furthermore, because "actions often speak louder than words," subjects may have placed more weight on Mary's nonverbal behaviors than her verbal statements in drawing inferences about her.

Furthermore, because of the importance that previous research has placed on the role of sex-role stereotyping in perceptions of sexual

encounters, information on the extent to which people endorse traditional sex-roles could offer a more complete explanation for many of the findings obtained. For example, the attribution of greater responsibility to John when he did not force Mary to have sex relative to when he did replicated the findings of Krulewitz and Nash (1979). However, the role of sex-role stereotyping in facilitating this effect can only be speculated in the present study.

In addition, further research is needed on the effects of the woman's verbal refusal on subjects' impressions of her. The data obtained in the present study were not as clearcut as those obtained in previous research. In addition, because there was no variation in the timing of the onset of the refusal, perhaps a primacy effect was operating in which subjects were cued to Mary's sexual availability before her refusal. Thus, any type of refusal, no matter how forceful would have had very little impact on their perceptions of Mary and John.

Finally, research is needed to investigate subjects' perceptions of a woman's fear in response to a man's sexual advances as well as their perceptions of a woman's uncertainty regarding her desires, particularly as reflected by inconsistent verbal and nonverbal communications. Included within this framework would be an examination of motivating factors to explain why a woman might engage in behaviors connoting a strong interest in sex when, in fact, she was not interested in sexual intercourse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830-838.
- Abbey, A. (1987). Misperceptions of friendly behavior as sexual interest: A survey of naturally occurring incidents. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 173-194.
- Abbey, A., & Melby, C. (1986). The effects of nonverbal cues on gender differences in perceptions of sexual intent. Sex Roles, 15, 283-298.
- Abbey, A., Cozzarelli, C., McLaughlin, K., & Harnish, R. J. (1987). The effects of clothing and dyad sex composition on perceptions of sexual intent: Do women and men evaluate these cues differently? Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 108-126.
- Archer, D., & Akert, R. M. (1977). Words and everything else: Verbal and nonverbal cues in social interpretation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 443-449.
- Argyle, M. (1969). Social interaction. New York: Atherton Press.
- Argyle, M., Alkema, F., & Gilmour, R. (1971). The communication of friendly and hostile attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. European Journal of Social Psychology, 1, 385-402.

- Argyle, M., Salter, V., Nicholson, H., Williams, M., & Burgess, P. (1970). The communication of inferior and superior attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9, 222-231.
- Beneke, T. (1982). Men on rape. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Berger, R. J., Searles, P., Salem, R. G., & Pierce, B. A. (1986). Sexual assault in a college community. Sociological Focus, 19, 1-26.
- Bridges, J. S., & McGrail, C. A. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for date and stranger rape. Sex Roles, 21, 273-286.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men, women, and rape. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Burkhart, B. R., & Stanton, A. L. (1988). Sexual aggression in acquaintance relationships. In G. W. Russell (Ed.), Violence in intimate relationships (pp. 43-63). New York: PMA Publishing Corp.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
- Burt, M. R., & Albin, R. S. (1981). Rape myths, rape definitions, and probability of conviction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11, 212-230.
- Calhoun, L. G., Selby, J. W., & Warring, L. J. (1976). Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. Human Relations, 29, 517-526.

- Check, J. V. P., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 344-356.
- Coates, D., Wortman, C. B., & Abbey, A. (1979). Reactions to victims. In I. H. Frieze, D. Bar-tal, & J. S. Carroll (Eds.), New approaches to social problems (pp. 21-52). San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Costin, F. (1985). Beliefs about rape and women's social roles. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14, 319-325.
- Deaux, K. (1976). Sex: A perspective on the attribution process. In J. H. Harvey, W. J. Ickes, & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research (pp. 335-352). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Deitz, S. R., Littman, M., & Bentley, B. J. (1984). Attribution of responsibility for rape: The influence of observer empathy, victim resistance, and victim attractiveness. Sex Roles, 10, 261-280.
- DePaulo, B. M., Rosenthal, R., Eisenstat, R. A., Rogers, P. L., & Finkelstein, S. (1978). Decoding discrepant nonverbal cues. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 313-323.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 124-129.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1975). Unmasking the face. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellis, L., & Beattie, C. (1983). The feminist explanation for rape: An empirical test. Journal of Sex Research, 19, 74-93.

- Feild, H. S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 156-179.
- Giarrusso, R., Johnson, P., Goodchilds, J., & Zellman, G. (1979). Adolescents' cues and signals: Sex and assault. In P. Johnson (Chair), Acquaintance rape and adolescent sexuality. Symposium presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego.
- Goodchilds, J., Zellman, G., Johnson, P., & Giarrusso, R. (1988). Adolescents and their perceptions of sexual interactions. In A. W. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault (Vol. II). New York: Garland.
- Gross, A. E. (1978). The male role and heterosocial behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 34, 87-107.
- Groth, A. N. (1979). Men who rape: The psychology of the offender. New York: Plenum.
- Hall, J. A. (1978). Gender effects in decoding nonverbal cues. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 845-857.
- Hegeman, N., & Meikle, S. (1980). Motives and attitudes of rapists. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 12, 359-372.
- Henley, N. M. (1977). Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1798-1809.

- Janoff-Bulman, R., Timko, C., & Carli, L. L. (1985). Cognitive biases in blaming the victim. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21, 161-177.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. (1973). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 415-419.
- Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. New York: General Learning Press.
- Kanin, E. J. (1969). Selected dyadic aspects of males' sex aggression. Journal of Sex Research, 5, 12-28.
- Kirkpatrick, C., & Kanin, E. (1957). Male sex aggression on a university campus. American Sociological Review, 22, 52-58.
- Klemmack, S. H., & Klemmack, D. L. (1976). The social definition of rape. In M. J. Walker & S. L. Brodsky (Eds.), Sexual assault (pp. 135-147). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Koss, M. P., & Burkhardt, B. R. (1989). A conceptual analysis of rape victimization. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13, 27-40.
- 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., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 455-457.

- Krulewitz, J. E., & Nash, J. E. (1979). Effects of rape victim resistance, assault outcome, and sex of observer on attributions about rape. Journal of Personality, 47, 557-574.
- Krulewitz, J. E., & Payne, E. J. (1978). Attributions about rape: Effects of rapist force, observer sex, and sex role attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8, 291-305.
- Lerner, M. J. (September, 1966). The unjust consequences of the need to believe in a just world. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). Observers' reaction to the innocent victim: Compassion or rejection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 203-210.
- Lipton, D. N., McDonel, E. C., & McFall, R. M. (1987). Heterosocial perception in rapists. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 17-21.
- Luginbuhl, J., & Mullin, C. (1981). Rape and responsibility: How and how much is the victim blamed? Sex Roles, 7, 547-559.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1983). Feminism, marxism, method, and the state: Toward feminist jurisprudence. Signs, 8, 635-658.
- Major, B., & Heslin, R. (1982). Perceptions of cross-sex and same-sex nonreciprocal touch: It is better to give than to receive. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 6, 148-162.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. Journal of Social Issues, 37, 138-157.

- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Stewart, R. A. (1986). One on one: The foundations of interpersonal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mehrabian, A., & Wiener, M. (1967). Decoding of inconsistent communications. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 109-114.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6, 20-37.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Friedman, D. E., & Thomas, C. M. (1985). Is date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 297-310.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Miller, C. L., & Burdick, C. A. (1983). Are high-frequency daters better cue readers? Men's interpretations of women's cues as a function of dating frequency and SHI scores. Behavior Therapy, 14, 626-636.
- Pearson, J. C. (1985). Gender and communication. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Quackenbush, R. L. (1989). A comparison of androgynous, masculine sex-typed, and undifferentiated males on dimensions of attitudes toward rape. Journal of Research in Personality, 23, 318-342.
- Rapaport, K., & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 216-221.

- Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., DiMatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. (1979). Sensitivity in nonverbal communication: The PONS test. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Russell, D. (1984). Sexual exploitation: Rape, child sexual abuse, and sexual harassment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Saal, F. E., Johnson, C. B., & Weber, N. (1989). Friendly or sexy? It may depend on whom you ask. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13, 263-276.
- Scroggs, J. R. (1976). Penalties for rape as a function of victim provocativeness, damage, and resistance. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6, 360-368.
- Selby, J. W., Calhoun, L. G., & Brock, T. A. (1977). Sex differences in the social perception of rape victims. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 412-415.
- Shaver, K. G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 101-113.
- Shaver, K. G. (1985). The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility, and blameworthiness. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Shotland, R. L. (1989). A model of the causes of date rape in developing and close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), Close relationships (pp. 247-270). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Shotland, R. L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean its rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46, 220-232.

- Thompson, D. F., & Meltzer, L. (1964). Communication of emotional intent by facial expression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, 129-135.
- Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.
- Warshaw, R. (1988). I never called it rape. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- White, J., & Humphrey, J. (in press). Young people's attitudes toward acquaintance rape. In A. Parrot & L. Bechhofer (Eds.), Hidden rape: Sexual assault among acquaintances, friends, and intimates. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Yegidis, B. L. (1986). Date rape and other forced sexual encounters among college students. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 12, 51-54.
- Yescavage, K. (1989). Relinquishing the right to refuse: Sexually aggressive and nonaggressive males' perceptions of date rape. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.
- Zellman, G. L., & Goodchilds, J. D. (1983). Becoming sexual in adolescence. In E. A. Allgeier & N. B. McCormick (Eds.), Changing boundaries: Gender roles and sexual behavior (pp. 49-63). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Appendix A

Heterosocial Cues

APPENDIX A

HETEROSOCIAL CUES

Sex: ___ Male ___ Female

First letter of last name _____

Social Security # _____

In this section, we are interested in how people interpret certain social cues in dating situations. Imagine a man and a woman on a date. For each behavior below, indicate (using the scale provided) the degree to which you think the behavior indicates that the woman wants to have sexual intercourse with the man.

- 1 = This indicates that she has no interest in having sex.
 2 = This indicates that she has a slight interest in having sex.
 3 = This indicates that she has a moderate interest in having sex.
 4 = This indicates that she has a strong interest in having sex.
 5 = This indicates that she has an intense interest in having sex.

- ___ She asked him out on the date.
 ___ She goes to his apartment.
 ___ She touches his genitals.
 ___ She passionately kisses him.
 ___ She has dinner with him.
 ___ She wears revealing tight pants.
 ___ She invites the man to her apartment.
 ___ She maintains eye contact with him.
 ___ She allows him to pay for the date.
 ___ She undresses him.
 ___ She accompanies him to a movie.
 ___ She places her hand on his thigh.
 ___ She smiles at him.
 ___ She allows him to touch her bare breasts.
 ___ She accepts an invitation from him for a date.
 ___ She slow dances with him.
 ___ She has a drink with him.

Appendix A, cont.

- _____ She attends a party with him.
- _____ She removes her blouse.
- _____ She plays romantic music on the stereo.
- _____ She lies beside him on the couch.
- _____ She compliments him.
- _____ She leans her head on his shoulder.
- _____ She offers to rub his back.
- _____ She holds his hand.
- _____ She "slips into something more comfortable."
- _____ She asks him to spend the night.

Appendix B
Scenarios

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 1

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. Then he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 2

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 3

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 4

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued

Scenario 2, cont.

to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 5

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 6

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove the rest of her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 7

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. After a while Mary removed her blouse and undressed John. Then she began to touch John's genitals.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 8

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Then he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 9

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 10

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 11

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 12

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal

Scenario 12, cont.

John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 13

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal

Scenario 13, cont.

John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 14

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh and offered to give him a back rub. Then she leaned over to John and began to passionately kiss him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 15

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Then he stopped.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 16

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 17

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 18

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, I don't want to do this." He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 19

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. And so he stopped.

APPENDIX B
SCENARIO 20

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John. John pulled Mary to him and began to remove her clothes. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do this." Ignoring her refusal John continued

Scenario 20, cont.

to remove her clothing. Again, Mary responded, "No, stop, I don't want to do this" and she slapped John again. He then forced Mary against her will to have intercourse with him.

APPENDIX B

SCENARIO 21

John and Mary were both students at a university. Although they had seen each other around campus, they became acquainted when they enrolled in the same class. Because they sat next to each other in class, they talked on occasions and borrowed notes from each other when they have had to miss a class. Halfway through the semester, John asked Mary out for the following Friday night. After he picked her up, she suggested that they have dinner and then go see a movie she had been wanting to see for a long time. Over dinner, they discussed their classes and the friends that they had in common. They continued this conversation while they were waiting in line for the movie. John paid for the tickets and they went inside.

Following the movie, John and Mary were walking hand in hand to the car trying to decide on something else to do. Mary suggested that she had just bought a new stereo system and that they could go to her apartment and listen to music. Upon arriving at the apartment, Mary turned on the stereo and they sat on the couch listening to music and talking. Mary maintained eye contact with John throughout the conversation. Then, Mary slow danced with John.

Appendix C
Informed Consent

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT

Should you agree to participate in this study, your participation will occur as follows. After signing an informed consent form, you will be asked to read a story describing a couple on a date. After reading the story, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire on which you will indicate your perceptions of the man and the woman portrayed in the story. In addition, you will rate both of these individuals on a number of adjectives.

We do not anticipate that there will be any risks involved in participating in this study. Further, your responses will be kept strictly confidential; any identifying information will be removed from your answers before data analysis.

You are under no pressure to participate in this study if you do not wish to participate. Also, you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. You will not be penalized if you do not wish to participate or wish to withdraw before the conclusion of the session.

Finally, the researcher will answer all questions at the end of the study. This study will take no more than half an hour to complete.

Your signature below indicates that you have read these instructions and freely agree to participate. Any questions that you have may be addressed to Robin Kowalski, Department of Psychology, Office 24E (759-6134).

Signature: _____

Social Security Number: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D

Experimental Questionnaire -- Control

APPENDIX D

EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- CONTROL

Answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible by placing an "X" anywhere on the line under each question.

1. How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

2. How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Very Somewhat Neither certain Somewhat Very
 uncertain uncertain nor uncertain certain certain

3. To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely
 a tease a tease a tease a tease a tease

4. To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

5. To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

6. To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

Appendix D, cont.

7. How sexually attracted was Mary to John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

8. How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

9. How sexy do you think Mary is?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

10. How promiscuous do you think Mary is?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

11. Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Much Less Slightly less Average Slightly more Much more
 than average than average than average than average

12. Although you have limited information on MARY, use the information that you have to rate your perception of MARY on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive
well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere

Appendix D, cont.

shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

13. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would Mary be for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . .

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

14. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would Mary be for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person (1) is judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . .

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

Appendix D, cont.

15. How sexually attracted was John to Mary?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

16. How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

17. How justified would John be in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

18. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would he be for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

19. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would he be for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person is (1) judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

20. Although you have limited information on JOHN, use the information that you have to rate your perception of JOHN on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive

Appendix D, cont.

well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere
shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

21. Which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date: (Check only one)

- a. _____ John went home
- b. _____ Nothing
- c. _____ John forced Mary to have sexual intercourse
- d. _____ John stopped his sexual advances
- e. _____ John spent the night at Mary's apartment
- f. _____ Mary agreed to have sexual intercourse with John
- g. _____ It wasn't specified in the story

Appendix D, cont.

22. Which of the following behaviors does the story say that Mary performed:
(Check all that apply)

- a. Mary maintained eye contact with John
- b. Mary touched John's genitals
- c. Mary offered to give John a back rub
- d. Mary passionately kissed John
- e. Mary held John's hand
- f. Mary slow danced with John
- g. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh
- h. Mary undressed John
- i. Mary removed her blouse

23. To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman?

: . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .

Under no circumstances in which he wishes sex	Under few circumstances in which he wishes sex	Under some circumstances in which he wishes sex	Under many circumstances in which he wishes sex	Under all circumstances in which he wishes sex
--	---	--	--	---

24. To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse?

: . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .

Under no circumstances	Under few circumstances	Under some circumstances	Under many circumstances	Under all circumstances
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

25. In the story above, if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse against her will, how likely would you be to say that John raped Mary?

: . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .

Not at all likely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------	---------------------

Appendix D, cont.

26. Based on what you read in the story, how likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely
likely likely likely likely likely

Appendix E

Experimental Questionnaire -- No Outcome

APPENDIX E

EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- NO OUTCOME

Answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible by placing an "X" anywhere on the line under each question.

1. How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

2. How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Very Somewhat Neither certain Somewhat Very
 uncertain uncertain nor uncertain certain certain

3. To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely
 a tease a tease a tease a tease a tease

4. To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

5. To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

6. To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

Appendix E, cont.

7. How sexually attracted was Mary to John?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

8. How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

9. How sexy do you think Mary is?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

10. How promiscuous do you think Mary is?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

11. Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse?

Much Less Slightly less Average Slightly more Much more
than average than average than average than average

12. Although you have limited information on MARY, use the information that you have to rate your perception of MARY on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive
well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere

Appendix E, cont.

shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

13. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would Mary be for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

14. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would Mary be for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person (1) is judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

Appendix E, cont.

15. How sexually attracted was John to Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

16. How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

17. How justified would John be in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

18. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how responsible would he be for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

19. If John had proceeded to force Mary to engage in sexual intercourse, how much to blame would he be for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person is (1) judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

20. Although you have limited information on JOHN, use the information that you have to rate your perception of JOHN on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive

Appendix E, cont.

sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive
well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere
shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

21. Which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date: (Check only one)

- a. _____ John went home
- b. _____ Nothing
- c. _____ John forced Mary to have sexual intercourse
- d. _____ John stopped his sexual advances
- e. _____ John spent the night at Mary's apartment
- f. _____ Mary agreed to have sexual intercourse with John
- g. _____ It wasn't specified in the story

Appendix E, cont.

22. Which of the following behaviors does the story say that Mary performed:
(Check all that apply)

- a. Mary maintained eye contact with John
- b. Mary touched John's genitals
- c. Mary offered to give John a back rub
- d. Mary passionately kissed John
- e. Mary held John's hand
- f. Mary slow danced with John
- g. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh
- h. Mary undressed John
- i. Mary removed her blouse

23. Which of the following did Mary do in response to John's sexual advances?

- a. Mary said nothing.
- b. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do that."
- c. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do that."

24. To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman?

:	:	:	:	:
Under no	Under few	Under some	Under many	Under all
circumstances	circumstances	circumstances	circumstances	circumstances
in which he	in which he	in which he	in which he	in which he
wishes sex	wishes sex	wishes sex	wishes sex	wishes sex

25. To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse?

:	:	:	:	:
Under no	Under few	Under some	Under many	Under all
circumstances	circumstances	circumstances	circumstances	circumstances

Appendix E, cont.

26. In the story above, if John had forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse against her will, how likely would you be to say that John raped Mary?

:	.	.	:	.	.	:	.	.	:
Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Extremely					
likely	likely	likely	likely	likely					

27. Based on what you read in the story, how likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior?

:	.	.	:	.	.	:	.	.	:
Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Extremely					
likely	likely	likely	likely	likely					

APPENDIX F

EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- FORCED SEX OUTCOME

APPENDIX F

EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE -- FORCED SEX OUTCOME

Answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible by placing an "X" anywhere on the line under each question.

1. How much do you think Mary wanted to have sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

2. How certain are you of your rating in question 1 regarding Mary's desire for sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Very Somewhat Neither certain Somewhat Very
 uncertain uncertain nor uncertain certain certain

3. To what extent was Mary leading John on, being a tease?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely
 a tease a tease a tease a tease a tease

4. To what extent did Mary's behavior indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

5. To what extent did Mary's verbal statements indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

6. To what extent did Mary's nonverbal behaviors indicate that she wanted to have sexual intercourse with John?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

Appendix F, cont.

7. How sexually attracted was Mary to John?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

8. How flirtatious do you perceive Mary to be?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

9. How sexy do you think Mary is?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

10. How promiscuous do you think Mary is?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

11. Relative to the average female college student, how often do you think Mary has had intercourse?

Much Less Slightly less Average Slightly more Much more
than average than average than average than average

12. Although you have limited information on MARY, use the information that you have to rate your perception of MARY on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive
well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere

Appendix F, cont.

shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

13. How responsible is Mary for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

14. How much is Mary to blame for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person (1) is judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

15. How sexually attracted was John to Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

Appendix F, cont.

16. How sexually aroused or "turned on" do you think John was at the time he began making his sexual advances toward Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

17. How justified was John in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very Extremely

18. How responsible was John for the sexual encounter? (Responsibility is attributed to a person who is judged as intending to cause an event, is perceived as knowing the consequences of their actions, and also has willingly engaged in the behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

19. How much to blame is John for the sexual encounter? (Blame is attributed to a person only if that person is (1) judged to be responsible for an action or behavior and (2) is not excused or justified for having engaged in such a behavior.)

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
 Not at all Slightly Moderately Very much Extremely

20. Although you have limited information on JOHN, use the information that you have to rate your perception of JOHN on a scale of 1 to 7.

aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not aggressive
unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sociable
strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	weak
incapable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	capable
sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insensitive
sophisticated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	naive
well-adjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	poorly-adjusted
likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not likeable
rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	emotional
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere

Appendix F, cont.

shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bold
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unconventional
unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intelligent
flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	inflexible
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
subtle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	obvious
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
physically unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	physically attractive
independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dependent
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	active
stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	meek
self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insecure
inferior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	superior
gullible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not gullible

21. Which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date: (Check only one)

- a. John went home
- b. Nothing
- c. John forced Mary to have sexual intercourse
- d. John stopped his sexual advances
- e. John spent the night at Mary's apartment
- f. Mary agreed to have sexual intercourse with John
- g. It wasn't specified in the story

Appendix F, cont.

22. Which of the following behaviors does the story say that Mary performed:
(Check all that apply)

- a. Mary maintained eye contact with John
- b. Mary touched John's genitals
- c. Mary offered to give John a back rub
- d. Mary passionately kissed John
- e. Mary held John's hand
- f. Mary slow danced with John
- g. Mary placed her hand on John's thigh
- h. Mary undressed John
- i. Mary removed her blouse

23. Which of the following did Mary do in response to John's sexual advances?

- a. Mary said nothing.
- b. Mary said, "No, I don't want to do that."
- c. Mary slapped John and said, "No, stop, I don't want to do that."

24. To what extent is a man justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with a woman?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
Under no Under few Under some Under many Under all
circumstances circumstances circumstances circumstances circumstances
in which he in which he in which he in which he in which he
wishes sex wishes sex wishes sex wishes sex wishes sex

25. To what extent is a woman justified in saying no to a man's attempt to obtain sexual intercourse?

: . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . : . . . :
Under no Under few Under some Under many Under all
circumstances circumstances circumstances circumstances circumstances

Appendix F. cont.

26. In the story above, John forced Mary to engage in sexual intercourse against her will. How likely are you to say that John raped Mary?

:	.	.	:	.	.	:	.	.	:
Not at all			Slightly			Moderately			Very
likely			likely			likely			likely
									Extremely
									likely

27. Based on what you read in the story, how likely is it that Mary could have foreseen the consequences of her behavior?

:	.	.	:	.	.	:	.	.	:
Not at all			Slightly			Moderately			Very
likely			likely			likely			likely
									Extremely
									likely

Appendix G

Debriefing

APPENDIX G

DEBRIEFING

Often in dating situations, men and women interpret the identical behaviors in different ways. Because of this what is intended by one person as simply a gesture of friendliness is interpreted by the other person as an indication of sexual desire. Men, particularly, appear to misinterpret a woman's behaviors in such a way that they feel that she has led them on. Acting on their perceptions of a woman's behavior men may begin making sexual advances to which the woman is not receptive. Because some men perceive that, despite their protests, some women really do want sex, they proceed to force her to have intercourse against her will. The purpose of the study in which you just participated was to examine in more detail specifically what behaviors appear to be particularly indicative of a desire for sex and how perceptions of these behaviors as indicants of sexual desire affect perceptions of the man and woman involved.

Appendix H
Supplemental Results

APPENDIX H
SUPPLEMENTAL RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

A chi-square performed on the item asking "Which of the following did Mary do in response to John's sexual advances?" revealed a significant effect of verbal refusal, $(4) = 832.97, p < .001$. Similarly, a chi-square performed on the item asking "Which of the following events happened at the end of Mary's and John's date?" showed a highly significant effect of the manipulation of outcome, $(6) = 449.53, p < .001$.

In addition, chi-square analyses revealed significant effects of the manipulation of nonverbal cue for each of the following cues: (a) Mary maintained eye contact with John, $(2) = 457.43, p < .001$; (b) Mary touched John's genitals, $(2) = 520.18, p < .001$; (c) Mary offered to give John a back rub, $(2) = 485.34, p < .001$; (d) Mary passionately kissed John, $(2) = 464.14, p < .001$; (e) Mary held John's hand, $(2) = 347.21, p < .001$; (f) Mary slow danced with John, $(2) = 502.51, p < .001$; (g) Mary placed her hand on John's thigh, $(2) = 486.06, p < .001$; (h) Mary undressed John, $(2) = 448.48, p < .001$; (i) Mary removed her blouse, $(2) = 485.43, p < .001$.

Perceptions of Mary's Verbal and Behavioral Indicators of Sexual Desire

A 3 (nonverbal cue: low/medium/high) x 3 (verbal refusal: absent/no/no with slap) x 2 (outcome: no rape/rape) x 2 (sex of

subject: male/female) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) conducted on these items revealed a significant multivariate interaction of outcome by verbal refusal, $F(14, 990) = 3.32, p < .001$, as well as multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(14, 990) = 12.56, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(14, 990) = 32.05, p < .001$, outcome, $F(7, 494) = 6.63, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(7, 494) = 4.87, p < .001$.

A 3 (nonverbal cue: low/medium/high) x 2 (sex of subject: male/female) MANOVA conducted on the three control scenarios revealed a significant multivariate interaction of nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $F(14, 154) = 2.84, p < .001$, as well as a significant multivariate effect of nonverbal cue, $F(14, 154) = 8.94, p < .001$.

Perceptions of Mary's Sexuality

A MANOVA conducted on these four items revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(8, 982) = 13.38, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(8, 982) = 39.97, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(4, 490) = 2.36, p < .05$, as well as significant multivariate interactions of verbal refusal by outcome by sex of subject, $F(8, 982) = 2.05, p < .04$, outcome by verbal refusal, $F(8, 982) = 3.11, p < .002$, and nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $F(8, 982) = 2.47, p < .01$.

A 3 (nonverbal) by 2 (sex of subject) MANOVA conducted on the three control scenarios revealed a multivariate interaction of nonverbal cue by sex of subject, $F(8, 160) = 2.41, p < .02$, as well as

multivariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(8, 160) = 9.35, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(4, 79) = 5.53, p < .001$.

Mary's Role in the Sexual Encounter

Multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(4, 1008) = 3.42, p < .009$, nonverbal cue, $F(4, 1008) = 36.37, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(2, 503) = 4.59, p < .01$, were obtained on the two items examining subjects' perceptions of the extent to which Mary was responsible for and to blame for the sexual encounter.

Univariate analyses revealed significant effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 504) = 5.53, p < .004$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 504) = 75.41, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 504) = 4.34, p < .04$, for the question assessing Mary's responsibility, and significant effects of verbal refusal, $F(2, 504) = 5.66, p < .004$, nonverbal cue, $F(2, 504) = 72.58, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(1, 504) = 9.15, p < .003$, for the question examining Mary's blame for the encounter.

The MANOVA performed on the control scenarios obtained a multivariate main effect of nonverbal cue, $F(4, 166) = 8.67, p < .001$.

General Impressions of Mary

A MANOVA conducted on the standardized factor scores for these four factors revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(8, 976) = 10.63, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(8, 976) = 34.87, p < .001$, outcome, $F(4, 487) = 24.97, p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(4, 487) = 3.68, p < .006$, in addition to significant multivariate interactions of verbal refusal, nonverbal cue, and

outcome, $F(16, 1960) = 1.81, p < .03$, and nonverbal cue by verbal refusal, $F(16, 1960) = 1.68, p < .04$.

John's Role in the Sexual Encounter

Significant multivariate effects of verbal refusal, $F(6, 1006) = 2.69, p < .02$, nonverbal cue, $F(6, 1006) = 11.43, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(3, 502) = 5.9, p < .001$, were obtained on the three questions examining John's blame, his responsibility, and the extent to which he was justified in using force to obtain sexual intercourse with Mary.

Multivariate analyses of the control scenarios revealed a multivariate main effect of nonverbal cue, $F(6, 162) = 6.29, p < .001$.

Perceptions of John's Arousal

A MANOVA conducted on subjects' perceptions of John's sexual arousal and his sexual attraction to Mary revealed a multivariate interaction of verbal refusal by outcome, $F(4, 1008) = 3.83, p < .004$, as well as significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(4, 1008) = 4.87, p < .001$, nonverbal cue, $F(4, 1008) = 12.48, p < .001$, and outcome, $F(2, 503) = 11.81, p < .000$.

Significant multivariate main effects of sex of subject, $F(2, 80) = 6.27, p < .003$, and of nonverbal cue, $F(4, 162) = 7.61, p < .001$, were obtained on the control scenarios.

General Impressions of John

A MANOVA performed on the four standardized factor scores revealed significant multivariate main effects of verbal refusal, $F(8,$

966) = 2.98, $p < .003$, nonverbal cue, $F(8, 966) = 13.04$, $p < .001$, outcome, $F(4, 482) = 103.51$, $p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(4, 482) = 3.06$, $p < .02$, in addition to significant interactions of verbal refusal and outcome, $F(8, 966) = 3.01$, $p < .002$, nonverbal cue and outcome, $F(8, 966) = 2.30$, $p < .02$, nonverbal cue by verbal refusal, $F(16, 1940) = 1.73$, $p < .04$, and nonverbal cue and sex of subject, $F(8, 966) = 2.59$, $p < .01$.

Justification and Foreseeability

A MANOVA conducted on these items revealed a significant multivariate interaction of verbal refusal, outcome, and sex of subject, $F(8, 1000) = 2.40$, $p < .014$, in addition to multivariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(8, 1000) = 24.29$, $p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(4, 499) = 12.31$, $p < .001$.

A MANOVA conducted on these items for the control scenarios showed significant multivariate main effects of nonverbal cue, $F(8, 164) = 4.89$, $p < .001$, and sex of subject, $F(4, 81) = 3.20$, $p < .02$.