

8-27-2012

The effects of a sexual victimization history, sexual attitudes, and ethnicity on women's sexual assault scripts

Kari Leiting

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/psy_etds

Recommended Citation

Leiting, Kari. "The effects of a sexual victimization history, sexual attitudes, and ethnicity on women's sexual assault scripts." (2012). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/psy_etds/77

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Kari Leiting

Candidate

Psychology

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Elizabeth Yeater , Chairperson

Kamilla Venner

Steve Verney

**THE EFFECTS OF A SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION HISTORY,
SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND ETHNICITY ON WOMEN'S
SEXUAL ASSAULT SCRIPTS**

by

KARI A. LEITING

**B.A. PSYCHOLOGY, 2004-2007
TRINITY INTERNATIONAL UNIVERISTY
M.A. PSYCHOLOGY, 2007-2009
MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, MANKATO**

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Masters of Science
Psychology**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2012

ii

**THE EFFECTS OF A SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION HISTORY, SEXUAL
ATTITUDES, AND ETHNICITY ON WOMEN'S SEXUAL ASSAULT SCRIPTS**
by

Kari A. Leiting

B.A., Psychology, Trinity International University, 2007

M.A., Psychology, University of Minnesota, Mankato, 2009

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of a sexual victimization history, sexual attitudes, ethnicity, and proximity of past sexual assault on women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts. It also compared previously sexually victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts to their actual assault narratives. Two hundred forty-seven undergraduate women wrote hypothetical sexual assault scripts describing an unwanted sexual experience and completed measures assessing the individual differences variables of interest. Women who reported a victimization history then wrote about their assault experience while women who did not report such history wrote about a bad date or "hook-up" experience. A coding manual was developed and experts in the sexual violence research area coded the hypothetical scripts and assault narratives. Qualitative analysis revealed several important relationships between the individual differences variables and specific script characteristics. Specifically, victimization history had the most differences related to individual variables. Victimized women included alcohol, consensual kissing, and the context of a party in their hypothetical scripts more frequently than nonvictimized women. They described knowing the man for between one month and one year less frequently than nonvictimized women. Results also indicated distinct incongruence between women's hypothetical scripts and their actual assault narratives.

These results suggest that this relationship should be explored further to understand how women develop and make adjustments to their sexual assault scripts as it could inform the development of prevention programs as well as assist in identifying women at risk for victimization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Rape Script Research.....	3
Limitations of Past Research.....	8
Current Study.....	9
CHAPTER 2 METHODS	12
Measures.....	12
Procedure.....	14
Coding System.....	15
Data Analytic Strategy.....	16
CHAPTER 3 RESULTS	18
Preliminary Analyses.....	18
Individual Analyses.....	18
CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION	34
Discussion of Results.....	34
Future Directions & Limitations.....	41
APPENDICES	43
APPENDIX A DEMOGRAPHICS	43
APPENDIX B SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY	44
APPENDIX C SOCIOSEXUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE	48
APPENDIX D RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE	51
APPENDIX E SEX ROLE STEREOTYPING SCALE	54

APPENDIX F	SCRIPT INSTRUCTIONS	56
APPENDIX G	CODING MANUAL	57
REFERENCES		77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Contextual Features of Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts.....	19
Table 2. Contextual Features of Victimized and Nonvictimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts Narratives.....	21
Table 3. The Relationship between Sociosexuality and Women's Hypothetical Scripts..	23
Table 4. The Relationship between Rape Myth Acceptance and Women's Hypothetical Scripts.....	24
Table 5. The Relationship between Sex Role Acceptance and Women's Hypothetical Scripts.....	25
Table 6. The Relationship between Ethnicity and Women's Hypothetical Scripts.....	27
Table 7. The Relationship between Proximity and Women's Hypothetical Scripts.....	28
Table 8. Contextual Features of Victimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts and Assault Narratives.....	30
Table 9. Contextual Features of Nonvictimized Women's Assault Narratives and Bad Date/Hook-up Narratives.....	32

Chapter 1

Introduction

Sexual assault is an area of importance, especially for college-aged women as they are at greater risk for sexual victimization than women in the general population (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Sorenson, Stein, Seigel, Golding, & Burnam, 1987; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Approximately 50% of college women have experienced some type of sexual assault ranging from unwanted sexual contact to completed rape, which is nearly three times the rate of women in the general population (Koss et al., 1987). In addition, approximately 10% of women will be raped sometime during their college years (Fisher et al., 2000).

Due to the high prevalence of sexual assault, research has focused on identifying risk factors for victimization. One of the factors that research suggests may influence a woman's response to a risky sexual situation is her sexual scripts (Kahn, Mathie, & Torgler, 1994; Kahn & Mathie, 2000; Masters, Norris, Stoner, & George, 2006). Sexual scripts have been defined as "cognitive models that people use to guide and evaluate social and sexual interaction" (Rose & Frieze, 1993, p. 499). These scripts are learned over time and reinforced through the woman's social behavior.

How these scripts are developed and learned is something that has been explored by Firth and Kitzinger (2001). They put forth five cognitive processes developed from work with focus groups that they posit are used by women to develop their sexual scripts. They are (a) mentioning predictable stages such as the "beginning" stage which can include kissing or hugging, (b) referencing common knowledge like "usually", "always", or "what everyone knows", (c) creating congruent beliefs through collaborative speaking in which women accept other women's version of what sex is like, (d) using hypothetical instances when describing

refusal to participate in situations instead of their actual experiences, and (e) using “active voicing” which is when women put together how they think a conversation about refusal would take place, and which often leads to dialogue that is not true to the majority of women’s actual sexual experiences. All of these used together help the individual form scripts. Masters et al. (2006) suggest that these sexual scripts exist within individuals, transactional or interpersonal communications, and society or culture. In theory, each level plays a role or contributes factors in determining the individual’s behavior and each level influences the others.

There are several aspects of traditional sexual scripts that have been theorized to play a role in increasing women’s risk for sexual assault. One of these aspects is the belief that men are responsible for initiating sexual activity and will use multiple tactics to overcome women’s resistance (Metts & Spitzberg, 1996). Byers and Lewis (1988) examined how often this behavior was implemented by men. They found that, of college women who reported being in a situation when a man wanted to engage in a sexual activity they did not want to participate in, 8% reported that the man tried to persuade her and 7% reported that the man expressed displeasure or anger about the situation. Using a college sample, Muehlenhard, Andrews, and Beal (1996) found that over half of the men in their study would have continued trying to engage in sexual activity even after the woman refused to continue. This aspect of a transactional script about social interactions can play an important role for women and their expectations for a date or social experience. Their expectations for what behavior and situations are typical can be influenced by this belief concerning how the social experience is supposed to unfold.

Another aspect of traditional sexual scripts theorized to influence women’s risk is the social belief that an increase in sexual partners for a woman lowers her value, which can lead men to believe that her resistance is not real. Sociocultural scripts emphasizing women’s power

or resistance are not common and can lead women to be less likely to act in their own sexual self-interest (Fine, 1988). A woman who perceives the male's coercive or aggressive behavior as normative due to her script may be less likely to resist or do so effectively.

Rape Script Research

A rape script includes information about what the victim thinks transpires during a typical rape, as well as characteristics of the victim and perpetrator (Crome & McCabe, 2001). It has been estimated that less than half of the women who experience an assault meeting the legal definition of rape acknowledge their experience as such (Bondurant, 2001; Kahn et al., 1994; Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). A suggested reason for this is the incongruence of their experience with their rape scripts. Kahn et al. (1994) found that rape scripts for acknowledged and unacknowledged rape victims were not the same. These differences were not due to any demographic feature or actual rape experience. The scripts of unacknowledged victims involved more violence and a stranger, while the scripts for acknowledged victims were less violent and more likely to involve an acquaintance. Women also were asked to rate how similar their script was to their own experience. Acknowledged victims' scripts were more similar to their own victimization experiences. Kahn (1994) suggested that these similarities could be the result of acknowledged victims simply writing a description of their own nonconsensual sexual experience or at least including similar elements.

Similarly, Bondurant (2001) found that the possession of script elements congruent with a stranger rape rather than an acquaintance rape, and an experience involving less violence during their rape predicted whether or not women acknowledged a rape. That is, these individual scripts influenced whether or not women saw their experience for what it was and whether or not they decided to report their experience as rape.

Littleton, Axsom, and Yoder (2006) found that rape scripts may affect a woman's recovery after rape, including coping and disclosure of the experience. They found that women who do not acknowledge their experience as rape because of the incongruence with their rape script were more likely to call it something benign, such as miscommunication. They measured victimization history and assault characteristics along with post-experience coping. Being an unacknowledged victim was associated with greater use of avoidance and an increased likelihood of having to provide reasons for labeling their experience as a sexual assault.

One focus of research on rape script theory has been to identify what women see as a typical rape situation. This allows researchers to understand the content of the scripts as well as the correspondence between these scripts and what typically occurs during a sexual assault. In one of the first studies of rape scripts, Ryan (1988) found that most participants described a *blitz* attack when asked to describe a typical rape. This *blitz* attack involved a rape that was committed by a stranger, outdoors, and at night. Defining a typical rape as a blitz attack is incongruent with sexual assault statistics. Stranger rapes account for a small percentage of rapes, while the majority of rapes are committed by an acquaintance or date (Bondurant, 2001; Kahn et al., 1994; Koss, 1985). Typical assaults often involve a known male, no weapons, low levels of physical force and injury, occur inside, and often involve the use of alcohol by the victim and/or the perpetrator (Acierno et al., 2001). This is an area of concern, because if women define a typical rape as something that is actually atypical, this could affect their ability to detect risk in real life situations.

Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) also found that women were more concerned about the occurrence of stranger rape than acquaintance rape. As a consequence, they alter their behaviors to be more cautious in situations that could result in a stranger rape as opposed to an

acquaintance rape. They asked women to describe their fears about rape, their precautionary behaviors, and the situations in which they fear rape. Results demonstrated that women reported participating in more precautionary behavior because of fear of stranger rape than acquaintance rape. In addition, they generated more situations in which they feared stranger rape than acquaintance rape, regardless of their acknowledgement of acquaintance rape statistics and their history of acquaintance rape.

More recent studies have found a decrease in the number of women who hold to a stranger rape script. Littleton and Axsom (2003) asked participants to describe a typical rape. They found less evidence of *blitz* attack scripts. There were more acquaintance relationships, indoor settings, and the presence of alcohol in the scripts, all characteristics that are more congruent with recent sexual assault statistics. However, the scripts did not usually include dating relationships and often included violence by the perpetrator, which are incongruent with most sexual assaults.

Another area of interest within rape script theory is the relationship between belief in rape myths and rape scripts. Rape myths are widely accepted in society and are beliefs that rape is justifiable and women are responsible for rape. Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) examined two specific rape myths, how women define rape and putting blame on the victim. They found that women who accepted the myth, and whose experience was congruent with the myth, were less likely than other women to acknowledge their experience as rape. Women who are higher on rape myth acceptance may have rape scripts congruent with these beliefs, thereby making them more likely to make decisions based on their scripts instead of reality that could increase their victimization risk.

Researchers also have examined the differences between women's seduction scripts and rape scripts to better understand similarities and differences between them, as both scenarios could occur in similar contexts but have distinctly different outcomes. Ryan (1988) asked students to describe a typical rape and a typical seduction. The results suggested that some areas of overlap exist between the two scripts; that is, the situations that could lead to a sexual assault or a seduction can be similar. For example, both instances were male-initiated and involved strangers or new acquaintances. Littleton and Axsom (2003) conducted a similar study first asking students to describe a typical seduction or rape and secondly asking them to rate how typical they believed a number of elements were to either a rape or seduction. Similar to Ryan (1988), they found that both scripts involved either strangers or new acquaintances. However, they also found that the use of coercive/persuasive behaviors by the man were present in both scripts. Additionally, both scripts involved the woman engaging in sexual activity she was not comfortable with and alcohol was rated as equally typical for both scripts.

Additionally, research has examined the differences between rape and bad hook-ups, defined as a spontaneous sexual encounter between two individuals with no prior relationship. The reason for this interest is similar to the reasons for researching the differences between seduction and rape scripts; that is, the contexts could be very similar yet produce very different outcomes. Research has demonstrated that college students today are more likely to find themselves in a bad hook-up situation than previously, and that a bad hook-up situation could be similar to a rape situation. For instance, Littleton, Tabernik, Canales, and Backstrom (2009) examined college students' bad hook-up and rape scripts to see if there were areas of overlap, as hook-ups often occur in high risk situations for sexual assault. They found that hook-up scripts

did not include sexual assault and often focused on psychological consequences (e.g., shame), while rape scripts did not occur in the context of casual sexual encounters.

Understanding how various levels of alcohol intoxication influence women's sexual assault scripts also has been examined recently. Masters et al. (2006) examined the role of alcohol on sex scripts by having participants respond to a hypothetical attempted sexual assault vignette under the influence of alcohol. Women received a high-dose alcohol, low-dose alcohol, placebo, or control drink and then wrote their own endings to a hypothetical attempted sexual assault situation. They found that verbal and physical assertiveness were the actions most often described by all participants. When they compared groups, they found that alcohol shapes resistance and leads to less assertiveness. Alcohol consumption was found to be associated with fewer mentions of verbal and physical assertiveness. The same trend was found when comparing the high alcohol group to the low alcohol group.

Examining ethnic differences and how they relate to rape scripts has been another area of interest. Muehlenhard and MacNaughton (1988) found that Latina women were more likely than European American women to adhere to stereotypical beliefs about rape. They also held more traditional beliefs about gender roles and sexual behavior. Littleton, Breitkopf, and Berenson (2007) also examined the differences between low-income European American and Latina women and found that Latinas rated date and acquaintance rapes as significantly less typical than European Americans. To date, these are the only studies that have explored the relationship between ethnicity and rape scripts.

Using women's rape scripts to predict sexual victimization also has been an area of interest because it could facilitate the development of screening measures to identify those at risk for sexual assault. Turchik, Probst, Irvin, Chau, and Gidycz (2009) asked college women to write

about a hypothetical unwanted sexual experience with an acquaintance and then examined whether specific characteristics of these scripts predicted victimization at an 8-week follow-up. They found that women whose scripts included nonforceful resistance, less control over the outcome, outdoor assault, severe assault, and not knowing the perpetrator for a long period of time were more likely to report sexual victimization at follow-up.

Limitations of Past Research

There are several areas still to be explored within the topic of rape scripts. Research has focused on examining what type of scripts women use for various situations and if future victimization can be predicted from them; however, research has yet to investigate fully whether there are individual difference variables other than victimization history that predict characteristics of rape scripts. Therefore, it is unclear if there are additional personal factors that could be used to predict characteristics that women include in their rape scripts.

Sexual attitudes, other than rape myth acceptance, have been shown to influence how women perceive risk in hypothetical situations and how they respond to these situations (Yeater, Treat, Viken, & McFall, in press; Yeater, Viken, McFall, & Wagner, 2006; Yeater, Viken, Hoyt, & Dolan, 2009; Nason & Yeater, 2010). For instance, women who reported more liberal sexual attitudes rated vignettes as less risky than women with more conservative sexual attitudes. Thus, it may be informative to investigate the relationship between related sexual attitudes and specific rape script characteristics.

Ethnicity is another variable that has been demonstrated to influence women's rape myth acceptance and their perception of rape. Littleton et al. (2006) found that diverse women have a higher rape myth acceptance than White women. Additionally, diverse women have a higher acceptance of traditional sex roles; however, how this relationship would impact women's rape

scripts has yet to be explored. While ethnicity is hypothesized to influence these areas, how it pertains to what a woman includes in her rape script has yet to be examined fully. Ethnicity might be related to specific script details that could differ across ethnic groups. These details could reflect important group differences in beliefs about sexual assault and risk for future victimization.

Current Study

Research has demonstrated that specific script characteristics can be used to predict future victimization (Turchik et al., 2009); thus, if script characteristics are identified, they can be used to help identify women at risk for future victimization. Moreover, identifying the relationship between individual difference variables and specific sexual assault script characteristics could influence the development of prevention programs. Qualitative work is particularly well suited for examining specific characteristics that women include in their sexual assault scripts and for understanding events in context. The proposed study will attempt to address past limitations by measuring victimization history, sexual attitudes, and ethnicity and examining the relationship between these variables and specific script characteristics. While previous research has investigated the differences between victimized and nonvictimized women's hypothetical scripts, these findings deserve replication, as the methods and instructional sets used to investigate these scripts have varied considerably across studies. The proposed study extends research in this area by utilizing instructional sets for the scripts that allow for both stranger and acquaintance relationships with the man, by asking about the broader category of sexual assault instead of only including rape, and by eliciting specific contextual details of the situation.

In addition, past research has been focused on women's hypothetical scripts, which is the most common way to understand women's views. However, research has yet to explore whether or not women's sexual assault scripts are congruent with their own assault narratives by asking them to write about them. Differences between these two could be associated with any of the individual difference variables mentioned above, and how they are related has not been explored previously. Littleton et al. (2006) found that acknowledged victims' assaults tended to be less recent, suggesting that perhaps victims who initially do not acknowledge their assault may do so later. Thus, specific script characteristics victimized women include in their scripts may be different depending on the recency of their assault. Research has shown that characteristics within a women's rape script can predict if she will acknowledge her assault or not (Kahn et al., 1994) but not if her narrative is similar to her script. Research has yet to investigate whether the proximity of a woman's sexual assault, meaning how recent her sexual assault experience was, is related to differences between victimized women's scripts. The proposed study attempted to address these concerns by examining victimized women's hypothetical rape scripts, as well as their assault narratives.

Furthermore, while there has been some research exploring differences between sexual assault scripts and hook-up scripts (Littleton et al, 2009), research has not explored the relationship between women's assault experiences and their actual bad date/hook-up experiences. Littleton et al (2009) found some differences between what women included based on whether they were writing about a sexual assault or a hook-up. This suggests that there could be differences between women's assault experiences and their hook-up experiences. The proposed study attempted to examine this relationship by comparing victimized women's sexual assault narratives to nonvictimized women's bad date/hook-up narratives.

Goals of the Study

The goals of the proposed study were (a) to determine whether sexual attitudes, ethnicity, rape myth acceptance, and sex role acceptance were related to specific characteristics in a women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts, (b) to evaluate differences between victimized and nonvictimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts, (c) to evaluate the differences between victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts and their assault narratives, (d) to determine whether differences in the proximity of the assault influence victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts, and (e) to evaluate differences between victimized women's assault narratives and nonvictimized women's bad date/hook-up narratives.

Specific Hypotheses

Based on the previous research, it was hypothesized that (a) women with more liberal sexual attitudes and higher rape myth acceptance will include characteristics in their hypothetical scripts less congruent with a typical sexual assault (e.g., outdoors, violence by the perpetrator, a stranger) than women with more conservative sexual attitudes and women lower in rape myth acceptance, (b) Hispanic women will include characteristics in their hypothetical scripts less congruent with a typical sexual assault than White women and (c) victimized women will include characteristics in their hypothetical scripts less congruent with a typical sexual assault than nonvictimized women. Because prior research has not examined the relationship between assault proximity and script characteristics, the relationship between characteristics of victimized women's hypothetical scripts and their assault narratives, and the relationship between victimized women's assault narratives and nonvictimized women's bad date/hook up narratives, these analyses will be exploratory in nature.

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Participants were 247 undergraduate women enrolled in psychology courses at the University of New Mexico. They were recruited through the psychology research website and received course credit for their participation in the study. Women between the ages of 18 and 24 are at the highest risk for victimization (BJS, 1984); thus, participants outside of this age range were excluded from participation. Participants' mean age was 19.28 ($SD = 1.45$). The majority of them were single (89%, $n = 220$) and either freshman (51%, $n = 126$) or sophomores (22%, $n = 54$). The sample was ethnically diverse, including 48.2% Hispanic ($n = 119$), 37.2% White ($n = 92$), 4.5% African American ($n = 11$), 4% Asian ($n = 10$), 3.6% Native American ($n = 9$), and 2.4% "other" ($n = 6$).

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire (See Appendix A). This self-report measure assessed for participants' age, marital status, sexual orientation, ethnic membership, academic status.

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987) (See Appendix B). The SES is a 10-item self-report questionnaire developed to measure degrees of severity of sexual victimization (unwanted sexual contact to completed rape) since the age of 14. Koss and Gidycz (1985) reported that the SES had an internal consistency of $\alpha = .74$, a one-week test-retest reliability of $r = .93$, and a correlation of $r = .73$ with interview responses. The SES uses specific definitions of sexual assault and asks participants to indicate whether or not the event occurred (i.e., no or yes). The SES score was used to assign participants to a severity category based on their most severe victimization experience since the age of 14. Additionally,

participants were asked to specify what the date was when the events occurred or to provide their best estimate if they did not remember the exact date. This question was used to examine whether the proximity of victimization experiences influenced women's scripts.

The SES describes four types of unwanted sexual experiences with increasing levels of severity: (a) unwanted sexual contact, as defined by unwanted sex play; (b) sexual coercion, as defined by sexual intercourse that is a result of continued arguments or pressure or the use of authority; (c) attempted rape, as defined as attempted sexual intercourse that is the result of threatening to use or using physical force or drugs; (d) rape, as defined by oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse that is a result of threatening to use or using physical force or drugs. For this study, women were categorized by their most severe victimization experience since the age of 14 (unwanted sexual assault, coercion, attempted rape, or rape) and the proximity of the most recent victimization experience. With respect to frequency of victimization, 33.6% of participants reported no victimization, 26.3% reported unwanted sexual contact, 21.5% reported sexual coercion, 2% reported attempted rape, and 16.6% reported completed rape.

Sociosexuality Scale (SS; Bailey, Kirk, Zhu, Dunne & Martin, 2000) (See Appendix C). The SS is a 15-item self-report measure used to assess participants' sexual attitudes and their willingness to engage in sexual activity. The SS is a measure made up of items from the Sociosexuality Orientation Inventory (SOI; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991) and items from Eysenck's (1976) study of the genetics of sexual behavior. Higher scores on the SS indicate greater acceptance of liberal sexual beliefs and behaviors. The items included on the SS have been shown to correlate highly with the SOI (.89); overall the SS has shown greater internal consistency than the SOI. Among women, the SS has an alpha coefficient of .85 whereas the alpha coefficient associated with the SOI is .70 (Kirk, Zhu, Dunne & Martin, 2000). The

reliability for this sample was $r = .88$. For this study, participants indicated on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree), the extent to which they hold these beliefs. Items were summed to provide a total score.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS; Burt, 1980) (See Appendix D). The RMAS is an 11-item scale used to assess participants' acceptance of false information about rape. Higher scores on the RMAS indicate greater rape myth acceptance. The RMAS has a Cronbach's alpha of .88 (Burt, 1980). The reliability for this sample was $r = .80$. The scale uses a 7-point Likert scale ("strongly agree" to "strongly disagree") to measure agreement with each statement. Items were summed to provide a total score.

Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (SRSS; Burt, 1980) (See Appendix E). The SRSS is a nine-item scale used to assess participants' acceptance of traditional sex roles. Higher scores on the SRSS indicate greater sex role stereotyping. The SRSS has a Cronbach's alpha of .80 (Burt, 1980). The reliability for this sample was $r = .78$. The scale uses a 7-point Likert scale ("strongly agree" to "strongly disagree") to measure agreement with each statement. It was summed to provide a total score.

Procedure

Upon arriving at the lab, research participants were met by a research assistant that gave them information about the study and obtained informed consent. Participants were asked if they had questions and made aware that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Participants first were given the hypothetical unwanted sexual experience instructional set (See Appendix F). A hypothetical unwanted sexual experience was defined as a situation in which the participant imagines being verbally or physically coerced by a man into a sexual

experience. They were asked to describe specific details of the experience, such as their relationship with the man, the activities going on around them, and what they are feeling. Participants were told they had 20 minutes to complete the script and answer all the questions. After they completed the script, they were given the questionnaires inquiring about demographics, sexual victimization history, and sexual attitudes. Upon completion of the questionnaires, participants then were given the instructional set for the sexual victimization experience narrative and the bad date/hook-up. They were instructed to fill out the sexual experience narrative if they answered “yes” to any of the items on the SES. If they answered “yes” to more than one item on the SES, they were asked to write about the highest numbered item they reported experiencing. If they did not answer “yes” to any of the items on the SES, they were instructed to write about a bad date/bad hook-up they had experienced. They were told they have 20 minutes to complete the narrative and answer all the questions.

After all participants’ responses had been collected, content analysis was used to identify themes in the scripts. A coding system was developed through this analysis, after which instructor and graduate student raters were trained to use the coding system. Raters were assigned randomly a subset of scripts, such that at least two raters coded each of the narratives for each participant. The raters reviewed the participants’ scripts and noted the presence or absence of specific aspects of the participants’ scripts. The raters in this study were an associate professor who has published extensively in the sexual violence research area and five students working with that professor and trained by her. Raters were blind to participants’ victimization status when reading the hypothetical scripts and did not have access to the self-report data obtained by the written measures.

Coding System

The coding system used in this study was created deductively; that is, categories were derived from specific information in the scripts and narratives as well as information requested by the instructional set, which included content from several broad categories. They were examined to identify additional categories and codes to include under each general category. Thirteen broad categories were identified: (a) alcohol use, (b) drug use, (c) location of the event, (d) relationship with perpetrator, (e) previous consensual sexual contact, (f) woman's active resistance, (g) woman's passive resistance, (h) verbal coercion by the man, (i) physical coercion by the man, (j) context of situation, (k) time that the woman knew the man, (l) victimization severity, and (m) negative psychological effects. Specific codes were identified within each general category. For example, "party" is a specific code within the general category "context of situation." The coding manual is presented in Appendix G.

Coder Training

To assess interrater reliability, six coders were trained to use the coding system. Each coder independently coded the scripts and narratives. After reading the manual, coders had a one hour session in which the codes were described and the rating form was explained. Coders then coded a set of practice narratives, created by this author that included features which corresponded to the codes in the manual. Once coders reached a kappa value above .70 on the practice narratives, they then coded the actual scripts and narratives. This author served as the criterion coder and coded all the scripts and narratives (247 scripts and 247 narratives). The other five coders independently coded a randomly assigned subset of the narratives, which included fifty hypothetical scripts and fifty actual (assault and bad date/hook up) narratives.

Data Analytic Strategy

Kappa was calculated to assess interrater agreement. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the frequencies for each code within each category. When possible, chi-square analyses then were used to examine whether there were significant associations between the individual difference variables (e.g., victimization history, sexual attitudes) and the script and narrative features. Sociosexuality (SS), rape myth acceptance (RMA), and sex role acceptance (SRA) were continuous measures; thus, blocking was done to separate groups into participants who were high and low on each measure. For SS, there were 71 participants high in SS and 78 low in SS; for RMA, there were 74 participants high in RMA and 83 participants low in RMA; for SRA, there were 73 participants high in SRA and 80 participants low in SRA.

When writing their actual experience, if women did not indicate a victimization experience, but their narrative was coded as one, they were recoded as sexually victimized. This happened for 15 women. There were 7 women who indicated a victimization experience but their experience was not coded as such and they were removed from the analyses as they did not describe an actual sexual assault experience. For the purposes of statistical analyses, severity of victimization history was collapsed into a dichotomous variable – victimized or nonvictimized, which resulted in 163 victimized women and 77 nonvictimized women. The number of months since the assault was used as a measure of proximity. Four groups were created: (a) 0-12 months since assault ($n = 28$), (b) 13-24 months since assault ($n = 37$), (c) 25-36 months since assault ($n = 27$), (d) 37 and more months since assault ($n = 50$).

Chapter 3

Results

Interrater Reliability

Kappa was used to assess pairwise interrater agreement with the criterion coder. Kappa values ranged from .79 to .87, with a mean value of .85. Since all kappa values were above .70, the coding system was judged to have satisfactory interrater reliability.

Preliminary Analyses

Correlations were used to examine whether any of the individual differences variables were associated with each other. SRA was significantly correlated with RMAS ($r = .439$) and SS ($r = -.280$), with women higher in sex role acceptance often also higher in rape myth acceptance and lower in sociosexuality. SS also was correlated with ethnicity ($r = -.171$), with Hispanic women often being lower in sociosexuality. Victimization history was correlated with SS ($r = .252$), with more severely victimized women being higher in sociosexuality.

Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Table 1 presents a summary of descriptive information given by the entire sample for their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. The majority of women (56.3%) did not include alcohol in their scripts, and when they did it was most commonly that both the woman and the man were drinking (23.5%). Drugs were rarely included in their scripts (5.7%). The most common location in women's scripts was a friend's residence (24.3%) or the man's residence (22.3%). The woman's residence (12.6%) was included as frequently as the assault occurring outdoors (12.6%). Women described the relationship to the man as an acquaintance (27.1%) most frequently, followed by stranger (15.8%),

Table 1

Contextual Features of Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Category	Code	Percentage
Alcohol	Not mentioned	56.3%
	Both	23.5%
Drugs	Not mentioned	94.3%
Location	Friend's residence	24.3%
	Man's residence	22.3%
	Woman's residence	12.6%
	Outdoors	12.1%
Relationship	Acquaintance	27.1%
	Stranger	15.8%
	Just Met	15.4%
Consensual Kissing	Present	26.3%
Active Resistance	Physically resist	30.4%
	Absent	22.3%
	Acquiesce	18.2%
Passive Resistance	Say no	37.7%
	Absent	37.2%
	Acquiesce	15.4%
Verbal Coercion	None described	47.4%
	Plead/Argue	36%
Physical Coercion	Restrain	36.4%
	Grab/Touch	27.9%
Context	Party	27.1%
	Stranger	15%
	Date	15%
Time Known	Less than 1 week	42.1%
Victimization	Completed rape	36%
	Unwanted sexual contact	33.6%
Negative Psychological Effects	Absent	69.6%
	Feels bad/guilty/regret	13%

and just met (15.4%). Approximately one-quarter of women (26.3%) included consensual kissing in their script prior to the assault. Women included resistance tactics relatively frequently. For active resistance, they included “physically resist” most frequently (30.4%) and for passive resistance, they included “saying no” most often (37.7%). The majority of women (52.6%) included some type of verbal coercion by the man in their script; with plead/argue being the most common (36%). In addition, they also included some type of physical coercion by the man, with restrain (36.4%) being the most common, followed by grab/touch (27.9%). The most common context for women to describe the situation occurring within was a party (27%), followed by a stranger (15%) and a date (15%). The majority of women described knowing the man in their script for less than one week (42%). Women wrote about the assault being a completed rape (36%) almost as frequently as unwanted sexual contact (33.6%).

Victimized and Nonvictimized Women’s Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Table 2 presents a summary of the information given by victimized and nonvictimized women in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. There were several significant differences between groups with respect to characteristics that they included in their hypothetical scripts. First, victimized women included alcohol use by both the man and the woman more often (31%) in their scripts than nonvictimized women (9%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 12.1, p < .001$. Second, victimized women (32%) more often included consensual kissing prior to the assault in their script than nonvictimized women (18%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 3.92, p = .047$. Third, nonvictimized women (18%) described knowing the man in the script between one month and one year more frequently than victimized women did (8%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 3.846, p = .049$. Finally, victimized women (33%)

Table 2

Contextual Features of Victimized and Nonvictimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts Narratives

Category	Code	Victimized (<i>n</i> = 163)	Nonvictimized (<i>n</i> = 77)	X^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	ϕ
Alcohol Use	Both	31%	9%	12.1	1, <i>n</i> = 240	<.001	.22
Relationship	Acquaintance	30%	20%	2.0	1, <i>n</i> = 240	>.05	.09
	Established	35%	49%	2.33	1, <i>n</i> = 240	>.05	.10
Kissing	Present	32%	18%	3.92	1, <i>n</i> = 240	.047	.13
Passive Resistance	Present	50%	37%	1.94	1, <i>n</i> = 240	>.05	.09
Time Known	1 month – 1 year	8%	18%	3.85	1, <i>n</i> = 240	.049	.13
Context	Party	33%	18%	4.41	1, <i>n</i> = 240	.035	.14

described the context of the situation as a party more often than nonvictimized women (18%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 4.412, p = .035$.

Sociosexuality

Table 3 presents a summary of the information given by women high and low in sociosexuality in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. There were several significant differences between groups with respect to characteristics that they included in their hypothetical scripts. First, women higher in sociosexuality (55%) included alcohol in their script more frequently than women lower in sociosexuality (28%), $X^2(1, n = 149) = 8.783, p = .003$. Second, women higher in sociosexuality (27%) acquiesced more often in their script instead of describing passive resistance than women lower in sociosexuality (10%), $X^2(1, n = 149) = 7.811, p = .005$. Third, women with more higher in sociosexuality (15%) described knowing the man for longer than one month less often than women lower in sociosexuality (28%), $X^2(1, n = 149) = 3.93, p = .047$.

Rape Myth Acceptance

Table 4 presents a summary of the information given by women high and low in RMA in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. There were no significant differences between groups with respect to their hypothetical sexual assault scripts.

Sex Role Acceptance

Table 5 presents a summary of the information given by women high and low in SRA in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. There was only one significant difference between groups with respect to characteristics that they included in their hypothetical scripts. The context of the situation was described as a “hook-up/hang-out”

Table 3

The Relationship between Sociosexuality and Women's Hypothetical Scripts

Category	Code	High (<i>n</i> = 71)	Low (<i>n</i> = 78)	X^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	ϕ
Alcohol	Both	55%	28%	8.78	1, <i>n</i> = 149	.003	.24
Relationship	Just Met	21%	11%	3.125	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.14
	Established	37%	47%	1.19	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.09
Passive Resistance	Acquiesce	27%	10%	7.81	1, <i>n</i> = 149	.005	.23
Time Known	More than 1 Month	15%	28%	3.93	1, <i>n</i> = 149	.047	.16

Table 4

The Relationship between Rape Myth Acceptance and Women's Hypothetical Scripts

Category	Code	High (<i>n</i> = 74)	Low (<i>n</i> = 83)	X^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	ϕ
Location	Outside	16%	9%	1.96	1, <i>n</i> = 157	>.05	.11
Relationship	Stranger	20%	12%	2.0	1, <i>n</i> = 157	>.05	.11
	Established	35%	43%	0.82	1, <i>n</i> = 157	>.05	.07
Physical Coercion	Restrain	43%	29%	2.72	1, <i>n</i> = 157	>.05	.13
	Grab/Pull	35%	50%	2.65	1, <i>n</i> = 157	>.05	.13
Context	Stranger	20%	10%	3.33	1, <i>n</i> = 157	.06	.15

Table 5

The Relationship between Sex Role Acceptance and Women's Hypothetical Scripts

Category	Code	High (<i>n</i> = 73)	Low (<i>n</i> = 80)	X^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	ϕ
Alcohol	Both	46%	31%	2.92	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.14
Relationship	Stranger	20%	13%	1.49	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.10
	Just Met	18%	11%	1.69	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.11
Active Resistance	Present	53%	43%	1.04	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.08
	Acquiesce	24%	16%	1.6	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.10
Context	Hookup/Hangout	20%	9%	3.52	1, <i>n</i> = 149	.041	.15
	Stranger	21%	14%	1.4	1, <i>n</i> = 149	>.05	.10

more often by women with low SRA (20%) than women with high SRA (9%), $X^2 (1, n = 149) = 3.522, p = .041$.

White and Hispanic Women

Table 6 presents a summary of the information given by White and Hispanic women in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. There were no significant differences between groups with respect to their hypothetical sexual assault script characteristics.

Proximity

Table 7 presents a summary of the information given by victimized women in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts with respect to the proximity of their assault experience. There were several significant differences between groups with respect to characteristics that they included in their hypothetical scripts. Women who experienced their assault within one year (32%) defined the relationship to the man in their scripts as just met more often than any other group of women (13-24 months = 16%, 25-36 months = 12%, 37+ months = 12%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 15.111, p = .002$. These women, who experienced their assault within a year, more frequently described acquiescing (41%) instead of using active resistance than women in any of the other proximity groups (13-24 months = 24%, 25-36 months = 15%, 37+ months = 22%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 17.3, p = .010$. In contrast, women who experienced their assault 25-36 months ago (70%), included active resistance more frequently than any other proximity group (0-12 months = 36%, 13-24 months = 51%, 37+ months = 50%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 14.314, p = .002$. Women who experienced their assault either 25-36 months ago (14%) or more than 37 months ago (11%) included a more severe level of physical coercion by the man, specifically, hit/use weapon, than the other two proximity groups (0-12 months, 13-24

Table 6

The Relationship between Ethnicity and Women's Hypothetical Scripts

Category	Code	White (<i>n</i> = 92)	Hispanic (<i>n</i> = 119)	X^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	ϕ
Relationship	Just Met	20%	11%	2.61	1, <i>n</i> = 211	>.05	.11
	Acquaintance	25%	32%	0.86	1, <i>n</i> = 211	>.05	.06
Active Resistance	Acquiesce	17%	29%	3.13	1, <i>n</i> = 211	>.05	.12
Verbal Coercion	Plead/Insult	46%	37%	0.98	1, <i>n</i> = 211	>.05	.07
	Threaten	5%	13%	3.56	1, <i>n</i> = 211	.059	.13
Context	Party	24%	32%	1.14	1, <i>n</i> = 211	>.05	.07

Table 7

The Relationship between Proximity and Women's Hypothetical Scripts

Category	Code	0-12 months (n = 28)	13-24 months (n = 37)	25-36 months (n = 27)	37+ months (n = 50)	X^2	df	p	ϕ
Relationship	Just Met	32%	16%	12%	12%	15.11	3, n = 141	.002	.33
Active	Acquiesce	41%	24%	15%	22%	17.3	3, n = 141	.010	.35
Resistance	Present	36%	51%	70%	50%	14.31	3, n = 141	.002	.32
Physical	Hit/Weapon	4%	3%	14%	11%	10.75	3, n = 141	.013	.28
Coercion									
Time Known	> 1 week	50%	49%	35%	38%	4.05	3, n = 141	>.05	.17
Context	Date	4%	11%	15%	24%	15.48	3, n = 141	.001	.33
Negative Effects	Bad/guilty/regret	29%	13%	19%	6%	17.0	3, n = 141	<.001	.35

months) of women (4%, 3%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 10.75, p = .013$. Women who experienced their assault more than 37 months ago (24%) included a context of a date in their script more often than any other proximity group (0-12 months = 4%, 13-24 months = 11%, 25-36 months = 15%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 15.481, p = .001$. Women who had experienced their assault within a year (29%) described feeling bad/guilty/regret more often than women in any other proximity group (13-24 months = 13%, 25-36 months = 19%, 37+ months = 6%), $X^2 (3, n = 141) = 17.0, p < .001$.

Victimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts and Assault Narratives

Table 8 presents a summary of the information given by victimized women in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts and actual assault narratives. There were several significant differences with respect to congruence between the characteristics included in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts and actual assault narratives. First, victimized women included alcohol use by one or both individuals in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts (49%) more often than in their assault narratives (30%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 4.57, p = .032$. Second, victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts (35%) described the relationship to the man as an established relationship less often than the relationship in their assault narrative (70%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 11.667, p < .001$. Third, victimized included verbal coercion (plead/insult) in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts (40%) less frequently than it occurred in their assault narratives (55%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 3.75, p = .053$. Fourth, victimized women included more severe physical coercion by the man in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts (8%) than they did in their assault narratives (1%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 5.444, p = .019$. Fifth, victimized women described knowing the man for less than a week more frequently in their hypothetical sexual assault

Table 8

Contextual Features of Victimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts and Assault Narratives

Category	Code	Hypothetical	Actual	X^2	df	p	ϕ
Alcohol	Present	49%	30%	4.57	1, $n = 163$.032	.17
Relationship	Established	35%	70%	11.67	1, $n = 163$	<.001	.27
Kissing	Present	31%	45%	2.58	1, $n = 163$	>.05	.13
Verbal Coercion	Plead/Insult	40%	55%	3.75	1, $n = 163$.053	.15
Physical Coercion	Hit/Weapon	8%	1%	5.44	1, $n = 163$.019	.18
Time Known	> 1 week	44%	10%	21.41	1, $n = 163$	<.001	.36
Victimization	Sexual Coercion	13%	33%	8.70	1, $n = 163$.003	.23
Negative Effects	Bad/guilty/regret	15%	25%	2.50	1, $n = 163$	>.05	.12
Context	Party	33%	11%	11.0	1, $n = 163$.001	.26
	Hookup/Hangout	14%	27%	4.12	1, $n = 163$.042	.16
	Stranger	14%	2%	9.0	1, $n = 163$.003	.23
	Relationship	1%	20%	17.17	1, $n = 163$	<.001	.32

scripts (44%) than occurred in their assault narratives (10%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 21.407, p < .001$. Sixth, when detailing the type of victimization that occurred, victimized women described sexual coercion (13%) less often in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts than it occurred in their assault narratives (33%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 8.696, p = .003$. Finally, the most common contexts described in victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts was party (33%), which occurred much less frequently in their assault narratives (11%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 11.0, p = .001$. The second most common context described in the hypothetical sexual assault scripts was stranger (14%), which was described in their assault narratives much less often (2%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 9.0, p = .003$. The most common context described in women's assault narratives was hook-up/hang-out (27%), which was described less frequently in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts (14%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 4.122, p = .042$. The second most common context described in women's assault narratives was relationship (20%), which was rarely included in women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts (1%), $X^2 (1, n = 163) = 17.17, p < .001$.

Victimized Assault Narratives and Nonvictimized Women's Bad Date/Hook-up Narratives

Table 9 presents a summary of the information given by victimized women in their actual assault narratives and nonvictimized women for their actual bad date or hook-up narratives. There were several significant differences between groups with respect to congruence between the characteristics included in their narratives. First, sexual assault narratives included active and passive resistance more often than bad date/hook-up narratives in their narratives, (42% vs. 31%), $X^2 (1, n = 240) = 4.592, p = .032$; (47% vs. 23%), $X^2 (1, n = 240) = 8.229, p = .004$, respectively. Second, assault narratives

Table 9

Contextual Features of Nonvictimized Women's Assault Narratives and Bad Date/Hook-up Narratives

Category	Code	Assault Narratives	Bad Date Narratives	X^2	df	p	ϕ
Active Resistance	Present	42%	31%	4.59	1, $n = 240$.032	.14
Passive Resistance	Present	31%	23%	8.23	1, $n = 240$.004	.19
Verbal Coercion	Present	55%	8%	35.03	1, $n = 240$	<.001	.38
Physical Coercion	Present	76%	35%	28.0	1, $n = 240$	<.001	.34
Time Known	> 1 week	10%	25%	6.43	1, $n = 240$.011	.16
	1 month – 1 year	21%	12%	2.46	1, $n = 240$	>.05	.10
Context	Hookup/Hangout	27%	19%	1.39	1, $n = 240$	>.05	.08
	Relationship	20%	3%	12.57	1, $n = 240$	<.001	.23
	Date	10%	27%	7.81	1, $n = 240$.005	.18
	Party	12%	24%	4.0	1, $n = 240$.045	.13

described both verbal and physical coercion by the man more frequently than bad date/hook-up narratives, (55% vs. 8%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 35.063, p < .001$; (76% vs. 35%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 28.0, p < .001$, respectively. Third, there were differences in the amount of time that the woman knew the man. Bad date/hook-up narratives (25%) described knowing the man for less than one week more often than did the assault narratives (10%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 6.429, p = .011$. Fourth, assault narratives (20%) described the context as a relationship more often than did the bad date/hook-up narratives (3%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 12.565, p < .001$, and bad date/hook-up narratives described the situation as a date or party more than did the assault narratives (27% vs. 10%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 7.811, p = .005$; (24% vs. 12%), $X^2(1, n = 240) = 4.0, p = .045$, respectively.

Chapter 4

Discussion

Several interesting findings emerged from this study. There was considerable variation in the specific characteristics that women included in their hypothetical scripts in relation to victimization history, sociosexuality and proximity. There were also considerable differences found between victimized women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts and assault narratives with respect to the contextual features included; as well as differences between victimized women's assault experiences and nonvictimized women's bad date/hook-up experiences. These findings are discussed below.

Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Overall, women included characteristics in their hypothetical sexual assault scripts that are congruent with a typical sexual assault (e.g., indoors, knowing the perpetrator). This is consistent with recent literature finding that women have changed their scripts in the last twenty years to be more consistent with actual sexual assault (Littleton & Axom, 2003). A representative example from women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts follows:

A man who I have known for a few months, only hung out with a few times invited me over to his house to watch a movie. We started watch a movie and he began kissing me. The man is thinking he wants to have sex, I am thinking I want him to stop and watch the movie. He then begins trying to take my clothes off as I try to stop him he does it anyway. Then he gets on top of me and tries to have sex with me. I tell him no but he continues to try. After trying to tell him no and to get him off me, I finally gave up and had sex with him. After he was happy and I felt dirty and upset that I let it happen. I left almost right after it happened, home.

However, some scripts included characteristics that are not consistent with typical sexual assaults (e.g., knowing the perpetrator a short period of time, physical coercion by the man). An example of a hypothetical script that includes characteristics incongruent with a typical sexual assault follows:

A situation in which I imagine being physically coerced into a sexual experience is by a random man I have never met before. I imagine this would take place late at night in a parking garage. I got off late at work and I am walking to my car which is the only one there. The man is older than me, maybe 40 and unattractive. He is hiding next to my car and hops out as I get closer. He has a knife held to my throat and tells me to undress and not to scream or he will kill me. I am thinking about running or jerking away. The man is thinking about how he has done this before. After I am undressed the man forces me into my car where he ties me up with duct tape. The worst possible thing happens and there are no police or help around. The man rapes me vaginally and anally repeatedly until there are headlights coming around the corner. He quickly gets dressed and flees into a stairwell, leaving me tied up until someone finds me the next morning.

This example illustrates that while most women have changed their scripts to be more congruent with statistically typical sexual assaults, some women still adhere to stereotypical ideas about sexual assault. There could be several explanations for why some women have not adjusted their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. One possible explanation is that there are individual difference variables that influence how women construct their hypothetical sexual assault scripts. Several individual difference variables and their influence on women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts are discussed next.

Victimization and Nonvictimized Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Victimized and nonvictimized women differed in the types of characteristics they included in their narratives. One of the current study's hypotheses was that victimized

women would include more stereotypical characteristics in their hypothetical scripts. This was supported, as victimized women included alcohol use, physical coercion by the man, and the context of a party in their scripts more frequently than nonvictimized women. However, victimized women also included several characteristics more often than nonvictimized women that were less expected; such as consensual kissing, an acquaintance relationship, and both passive and active resistance by the woman. This is different from previous literature (Ryan, 1988) where victimized women included more characteristics in their narratives that were congruent with stereotypical assaults. It appears that victimized women are closing the gap that has been seen previously between them and nonvictimized women with respect to writing about a stranger rape when asked to write about a hypothetical sexual assault. That is, victimized women appear to be including characteristics in their scripts that are much more representative of sexual assaults.

Sexual Attitudes and Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

Sexual Attitudes (Sociosexuality, RMA, SRA) were associated with some of the script characteristics such as alcohol use, acquiescence, amount of time the woman knew the man, and the context of the situation. The rest of the comparisons were nonsignificant. However, the associations that were found were in the direction predicted.

In examining high or low sociosexuality, women who were high in sociosexuality were more likely to include alcohol in their hypothetical scripts. This was not surprising given other literature on sexual attitudes (Yeater et al, 2009) that has found that women high in sociosexuality rated vignettes of dating and social situations, including situations with alcohol, as less risky than women low in sociosexuality. Additionally, while the

sociosexuality measure did not ask directly about beliefs concerning alcohol the SRA measure asked a question about whether it was worse for a woman to be drunk than a man, as well as a question stating there was nothing wrong with a woman going to a bar alone. Women high in sociosexuality disagreed with the first question and agreed with the second question more than women low in sociosexuality, $t(150) = 2.14, p = .034$; $t(150) = 2.40, p = .018$, respectively, indicating that women high in sociosexuality are more comfortable with alcohol than women low in sociosexuality.

The current study did not ask about the number of sexual experiences women have had prior to the study; however, the Sociosexuality measure asked a question concerning being comfortable and enjoying casual sex with different partners, as well as a question about whether sex without love is okay. Women with high SRA agreed with both questions significantly less than women with low SRA.

Furthermore, women who had more liberal sexual attitudes were more likely to describe knowing the man for less than one week. This is supported by specific items on the measure that ask about beliefs regarding one night stands and the length of relationships, indicating that women with liberal sexual attitudes are more comfortable with short term relationships.

Despite the prediction that women's RMA would be related to constructing their hypothetical scripts, there were no statistically significant relationships between RMA and the inclusion of specific script characteristics. One possible explanation for this could be that the sample was skewed towards low RMA ($M = 26.55, SD = 8.72$). The low RMA group covered a smaller range of scores (11-22) on the measure than the high RMA group (30-59); thus, the high RMA group could have more variation in their scripts given

their variation on RMA. Consequently, the restricted range in the low RMA group could have made it more difficult to find consistent differences between what characteristics women included in their scripts.

There was only one statistically significant relationship between SRA and script characteristics, and it was related to the context of the situation. Women with low acceptance of traditional sex roles wrote about a hook-up/hang-out situation more than women with high acceptance, which is not surprising based on the measure. This difference is consistent with acceptance of sex roles and the responsibilities placed on women for their experiences. The current study did not ask about the number of sexual experiences women have had prior to the study; however, the Sociosexuality measure asked a question concerning being comfortable and enjoying casual sex with different partners, as well as a question about whether sex without love is okay. Women with high SRA agreed with both questions significantly less than women with low SRA, $t(157) = 2.32, p = .021$; $t(157) = 3.91, p < .001$, respectively.

Ethnicity and Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

White and Hispanic women had no statistically significant differences concerning what they included in their hypothetical scripts, despite previous literature (Meuhlenhard & MacNaughton, 1988; Littleton et al, 2007) suggesting that White and Hispanic women have different beliefs about rape. The only differences found trended toward significance: Hispanic women included more severe verbal coercion by the man and described acquiescing more often than White women. Previous research (Meuhlenhard & MacNaughton, 1988; Littleton et al, 2007) that examined ethnicity and rape scripts has used community samples; the current study is the first to use a college sample. This may

account for the difficulty in replicating previous findings comparing White and Hispanic women. There could be differences between women from a community sample and women from a college sample. One possible explanation for these differences could be differing levels of acculturation. Exploring the role of acculturation on women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts could be an interesting avenue for future research.

Proximity and Women's Hypothetical Sexual Assault Scripts

To this author's knowledge, this is the first study to explore the relationship between the proximity of a woman's assault experience, and the characteristics she includes in her hypothetical script. Women who experienced their assault within the past year described the relationship in their script as just met and described knowing the man for a short period of time. These characteristics are less congruent with typical sexual assaults, as research indicates the perpetrator is typically an acquaintance or date (Bondurant, 2001). In contrast, women who experienced their assault less recently were more likely to write a narrative that was congruent with a typical sexual assault. These women more often included established relationships, knowing the man for longer, and dating situations. This was an unexpected finding. Instead of women who were more recently assaulted writing hypothetical sexual assault scripts more consistent with an actual assault, it was women who were less recently assaulted. This could be related to how women who do not acknowledge their experience as an assault immediately, do so over time (Kahn et al., 1994). They could be recognizing their experience as an assault later and then making adjustments to their hypothetical scripts. Women who were less recently assaulted were also the least likely to describe feeling bad in their hypothetical

scripts. In fact the percentage of woman that included feeling bad in their hypothetical script decreased with each year as assault experiences were more temporally distant.

These interesting differences suggest that this could be an area of future examination. The relationship that women who experienced their assault less recently wrote scripts that were more consistent with a typical sexual assault than women who experienced their assault more recently could be explained that as women get further from their experience temporally, they adjust certain characteristics of their hypothetical scripts. However, this relationship needs further exploration to understand it and how it interacts with the time of victimization experiences.

Victimized Women's Hypothetical Scripts and Assault Narratives

This study explores the relationship between victimized women's hypothetical scripts and their assault narratives, which, to this author's knowledge, is a novel comparison. There were several areas of incongruence. Of particular interest was that victimized women commonly experienced assault while in an established relationship (i.e. they have been in for a significant period of time), and that the specific type of victimization was often sexual coercion. When they are asked to write about a hypothetical sexual assault, they included those characteristics much less often. In fact, there was disagreement on more of the categories than there was congruence. This could be due to a number of different factors. For example, women may be using a representativeness heuristic when thinking about unwanted sexual experiences, in that they are thinking of more stereotypical versions of sexual assault. This could make it difficult to shift cognitively from real to hypothetical scenarios. Also, it could be that women have been in these situations many times, but they do not typically end in assault;

suggesting that many of these script characteristics are congruent with their normal dating situations. Whatever the reason, it is particularly interesting that victimized women are not adjusting their hypothetical script to be more congruent with their assault experience. Since previous research (Turchik et al., 2009) has demonstrated that the script characteristics that women include can predict future victimization, the fact that victimized women do not adjust their scripts could be one reason they are at continued risk for future victimization. They may have problems detecting risk in future situations.

Future Directions and Limitations

The qualitative methodology used in this study allowed for the collection of a variety of contextual features that have not been examined frequently in the literature: level of verbal or physical coercion by the man, the context of the situation, the different relationships to the man, and the negative psychological effects women describe. In addition, the instructional set defined sexual assault in behavioral terms which allowed women to write about what they first thought of instead of restricting the range of responses by using the words *sexual assault* or *rape* in the instructions. The instructions were left open to interpretation, allowing for greater variation in the kinds of victimization women could describe in their narratives. While this allowed for the collection of very rich information, it limited the viability of comparisons between this project and others in the literature. In addition, the instructional set limited the number of actual rape scripts that were created, as not all women wrote about rape; instead, many wrote about other types of sexual assault. Given the number of coding categories, future research should be done to replicate the relationships found between the individual difference factors and script characteristics.

In addition, this study only examined victimized women as one group instead of examining the influence of the severity of their victimization experience on their hypothetical scripts. Since this study demonstrated differences between victimized and nonvictimized women's scripts the findings suggests that exploring the influence of the severity of the victimization experience could be related to differences in women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts and their assault narratives.

Although ethnicity was not a significant predictor in this study, it is still an important area for future research given that diverse women are at increased risk for victimization (Arroyo, Simpson, & Aragon, 1997). Hispanic women have shown to have higher rates of attempted rape than other ethnic groups (Kalof, 2000). As previously mentioned, acculturation could play a role in understanding the relationship between ethnicity and women's hypothetical sexual assault scripts.

This study examined the relationship between women's hypothetical narratives and actual experiences. Given the relationship between script characteristics and risk for future victimization, this work needs to be furthered to better understand how women construct their hypothetical narratives and how they make adjustments to them. Understanding this relationship more completely could inform the development of intervention programs or prevention programs by assisting in identifying women at risk for victimization.

Appendix A

Demographics Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the questions below, either fill in the blank or place an “✓” in the appropriate box.

1. Age _____

2. Marital Status

Single

Divorced

Married

Living Together

Separated

Widowed

3. Sexual Orientation

Heterosexual

Homosexual

Bisexual

4. Race

Asian

Cuban

White/Caucasian

Dominican

African American

Native American

Hispanic/Latino

Other _____

Mexican

5. Year in College

Freshman

Senior

Sophomore

Graduate Special

Junior

Graduate Student

Appendix B Sexual Experiences Survey (SES)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please place an “✓” or fill in the blank for each of the following questions. Please read each question carefully. The following questions are ONLY about sexual experiences you may have had **SINCE YOU WERE FOURTEEN YEARS OLD**.

1. Have you ever given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #2)**
[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

[] 1 [] 2-4 [] 5-7 [] 8-10 [] 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

2. Have you ever had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man used his authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #3)**
[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

[] 1 [] 2-4 [] 5-7 [] 8-10 [] 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

3. Have you had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #4)**
[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

[] 1 [] 2-4 [] 5-7 [] 8-10 [] 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

***The following questions are about sexual intercourse. By sexual intercourse, we mean penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis. Ejaculation is not required. Whenever you see the words sexual intercourse, please use this definition.*

4. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments or pressure? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #7)**

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

[] 1 [] 2-4 [] 5-7 [] 8-10 [] 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

5. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor)? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #8)**

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

[] 1 [] 2-4 [] 5-7 [] 8-10 [] 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

6. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you and insert his penis) when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) but intercourse did not occur? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No **(If no, skip directly to question #5)**

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

1 2-4 5-7 8-10 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

7. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you and insert his penis) by giving you alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur? (**Since you were fourteen**)

[01] No (**If no, skip directly to question #6**)

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

1 2-4 5-7 8-10 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

8. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man gave you alcohol or drugs? (**Since you were fourteen**)

[01] No (**If no, skip directly to question #9**)

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

1 2-4 5-7 8-10 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

9. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you? (**Since you were fourteen**)

[01] No (**If no, skip directly to question #10**)

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

1 2-4 5-7 8-10 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

10. Have you had sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)? **(Since you were fourteen)**

[01] No

[02] Yes

How many times have you had this experience since you were fourteen years old?

1 2-4 5-7 8-10 11 or more

When did this even occur? (If you cannot remember the exact date, please estimate).

_____Month _____Day _____Year

Appendix C Sociosexuality Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the statements below, circle the number that best represents your beliefs or opinions. Feel free to be honest when answering. There are no “right” answers. Please make sure to read the scale correctly.

1. It is better not to have sexual relations until you are married.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

2. Virginity is a girl’s most valuable possession.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

3. Sex without love (impersonal sex) is highly unsatisfactory.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

4. I believe in taking my pleasures where I can find them.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

5. Absolute faithfulness to one’s partner throughout life is nearly as silly as celibacy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

6. Sometimes sexual feelings overpower me.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

7. Group sex appeals to me.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

8. If I were invited to take part in an orgy, I would accept.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

9. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

10. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

11. It would be difficult for me to enjoy having sex with someone I did not know very well.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

12. I could enjoy having sex with someone I was attracted to, even if I didn't feel anything emotionally for him or her.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

13. The thought of an illicit sex affair excited me.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

14. Sex without love is ok.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

15. The thought of a sex orgy is disgusting to me.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4

16. During your entire life, how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual contact with? _____

17. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year? _____

18. With how many partners of the opposite sex do you foresee having sexual intercourse during the next five years? _____

19. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse with on one and only one occasion?

20. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current dating partner/spouse? _____

Appendix D RMAS

1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						
agree	strongly					
	disagree					

2. Any female can get raped.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						
agree	strongly					
	disagree					

3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						
agree	strongly					
	disagree					

4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						
agree	strongly					
	disagree					

5. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						
agree	strongly					
	disagree					

6. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

7. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

8. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

9. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

10. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
strongly

agree

disagree

11. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.

1
strongly

2
strongly

3

4

5

6

7

agree

disagree

Appendix E
Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (SRSS)

1. A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

2. It is acceptable for the woman to pay for the date.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

3. A woman should be a virgin when she marries.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

4. There is something wrong with a woman who doesn't want to marry and raise a family.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

5. A wife should never contradict her husband in public.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree strongly
disagree

6. It is better for a woman to use her feminine charm to get what she wants rather than ask for it outright.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree
strongly
disagree

7. It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree
strongly
disagree

8. It looks worse for a woman to be drunk than for a man to be drunk.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree
strongly
disagree

9. There is nothing wrong with a woman going to a bar alone.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly
agree
strongly
disagree

Appendix F

Script Instructions

Hypothetical Script

Please use the next 15-20 minutes to write a description of a situation in which you imagine being verbally or physically coerced by a man into a sexual experience. This should not be an actual incident that has occurred but a hypothetical one. Please describe what happens before, during, and after the situation. In addition, please answer the following questions: Who is the man? How long have you known him? What is your relationship to him? Describe where you are and what you are doing. What are you and the man thinking? What activities will you be engaging in? What types of sexual activity is occurring? How does the situation end?

Actual Victimization

Please use the next 15-20 minutes to describe the item that corresponds to the highest numbered item you said yes to on the Sexual Experiences Survey (pages ___ to ___). Do not describe an event that involved a family member or took place before the age of 14. If that event happened to you more than once, write about the one that was most severe. Please describe what happens before, during, and after the situation and in addition, please answer the following questions: Who is the man? How long did you know him? What was your relationship to him? Describe where you were and what you were doing. What were you and the man thinking? What activities were you engaged in? What types of sexual activity occurred? How did the situation end?

Bad Date

Please use the next 15-20 minutes to write about a bad date (planned social activity) or bad hook-up (unplanned/last minute social activity) that you have had. Please describe what happens before, during, and after the situation and in addition, please answer the following questions: Who is the man? How long did you know him? What was your relationship to him? Describe where you were and what you were doing. What were you and the man thinking? What activities were you engaged in? What types of sexual activity occurred? How did the situation end?

Appendix G

**CODING MANUAL
FOR HYPOTHETICAL ASSAULT, ACTUAL ASSAULT, & BAD
DATE/HOOK-UP NARRATIVES**

**TRAUMA RESEARCH LAB
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO**

**KARI A. LEITING, M.A.
JENNY K. RINEHART, M.S.
ELIZABETH A. YEATER, PH.D.**

FEBRUARY 2012

INTRODUCTION

The information provided in this coding manual will assist you in “coding”, or placing into defined categories, narratives collected from undergraduate women. In the study, participants were asked to write about a situation in which they imagined being verbally or physically coerced by a man into a sexual experience. They were also asked to about their sexual victimization history. If they endorsed past victimization, they also wrote a narrative detailing their assault. If they did not endorse past victimization, they wrote a narrative describing a bad date or bad hook-up. They were also asked to include a number of specific characteristics, such as relationship to the perpetrator, alcohol use, the situation, and the nature of sexual victimization.

After reviewing the narratives, several codes were developed to describe and categorize features of the narratives. These codes seek both to distinguish these narratives from each other and to find the similarities between different experiences.

The purpose of this manual is to explain each of the codes and describe how to use them to categorize each narrative. The directions for coding are found on the following pages. Before you begin coding, you must read this manual in detail so that you understand the codes. You will also be given several example narratives to code to make sure that the codes are clear. Because the purpose of the codes is to reduce subjectivity as much as possible, it is very important that all of the coders understand the codes in the same way. This will increase the reliability of the coding.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CODING

It is easiest to understand the coding system if you think of it in an outline form or as a concept tree. The categories become more and more specific as you move down the outline (or out to the branches of the tree). First you will have the main category (e.g. Alcohol use), then you will have more descriptive categories (e.g. present, absent, or N.E.I.). Within each of these more descriptive categories are the most detailed codes (e.g. man, woman, or both). Your goal is to find the most specific code for a narrative by moving through the larger categories into the most detailed categories.

One very important thing to understand when coding the narratives is that the first step of coding structure is determining whether information regarding the concept you are investigating is in the narrative at all. There is one main code that is present in each of the categories: Not Enough Information (N.E.I.). This category means that there is not enough information in the narrative to place it into one of the more specific codes with reasonable certainty. This is perhaps the most difficult category to place narratives in, since it will be your instinct to want to put them in a category that provides more information. It is important however to eliminate guess work as much as possible, and this code provides a way to do this. If you are not reasonably sure where to put a narrative, you may place it in under this code. Do **NOT** infer from extremely limited information in the narrative. However, that said, you should only code as N.E.I. after examining the narrative in detail. There is often information hidden within the narrative that takes some effort to find.

If there is information regarding the broad category you are examining, then the next step is to move your way through the categories into the most detailed code that fits

the narrative. In order to best understand how this works, first read all of the definitions for the codes provided on the following pages, then read the example following the definitions. The codes are organized in outline form, with the broadest categories at the left and the more detailed codes moving towards the right. In certain cases (which will be denoted with “**SCALE**”), the codes are organized on a spectrum, so it is important to place the narrative at the most advanced end of the spectrum appropriate for the narrative. For example, responses in Verbal Coercion by the Man are organized with the behaviors becoming more pronounced and aggressive as the outline progresses, with Plead/Argue at the mildest end of the spectrum and Threat of Death at the most severe end of the spectrum. If a woman describes more than one response, code the one that is most severe. The same principle applies to other categories denoted “**SCALE**”.

An example coding sheet follows the definitions of the codes. You will complete one of these for every narrative you code. An explanation of how to use the sheet will follow the example. Finally, there will be a fictional narrative with a few explanations of how to code so you can understand how to move through the codes in an organized manner.

LIST OF CODES AND DEFINITIONS

I. Alcohol Use*:

A. Present: there is mention of alcohol use in the narrative. This code should be used if anyone is using alcohol.

1. Man – just the man used alcohol
2. Woman – just the woman used alcohol
3. Both – both used alcohol

B. Absent: the narrative explicitly states that there was no alcohol use. If there is any indication of alcohol use on the part of either person, do NOT use this code.

C. Not Enough Information (N.E.I.): the narrative doesn't provide enough information to determine whether there was alcohol use.

II. Drug Use*:

A. Present: there is mention of drug use in the narrative. This code should be used if anyone is using drugs.

1. Man – just the man used drugs
2. Woman – just the woman used drugs
3. Both – both used drugs

B. Absent: the narrative explicitly states that there was no drug use. If there is any indication of drug use on the part of either person, do NOT use this code.

C. Not Enough Information (N.E.I.): the narrative doesn't provide enough information to determine whether there was drug use.

* For drug and alcohol use, if at least one person is using drugs/alcohol, the situation must be placed somewhere within drugs/alcohol present, even if the other person was NOT using drugs/alcohol.
Ex: "He was drunk, but I hadn't had anything to drink." The code for this is Present, man.

III. Location*:

A. Indoor

1. His Property:

- a) *The event occurred inside the man's place of residence.*
- b) *The event occurred inside the man's car.*
- c) *The event occurred inside the man's other property (i.e., cabin).*

2. Her Property:

- a) *Residence: the event occurred inside the woman's place of residence.*
- b) *Car: the event occurred inside the woman's car.*
- c) *Other: the event occurred inside the woman's other property (i.e., cabin).*

3. Their Property:

- a) *Residence: the event occurred inside a place of residence shared by the man and woman.*
- b) *Car: the event occurred inside a car shared by the man and woman.*
- c) *Other: the event occurred inside other property shared by the man and woman (i.e., cabin).*

4. Friend/Acquaintance's Property:

- a) *Residence: the event occurred inside a friend/acquaintance's place of residence.*
- b) *Car: the event occurred inside a friend/acquaintance's car.*
- c) *Other: the event occurred inside a friend/acquaintance's other property.*

5. Hotel/Motel – the event occurred within hotel/motel property.

B. Outdoor: the event occurred somewhere outside, e.g. camping, walking outside, etc.

C. N.E.I.: the narrative doesn't provide enough information to determine the location of the event.

* If the man in the scenario is described as a friend, and the event occurs at his house, the relationship code is friend, and the location code is inside the man's residence (NOT friend's house).

- * If the man drives the woman or takes the woman for a ride and there is no other information about location, code the location as the man's car.
- * If there is no specific information regarding the location of a party, the default code is Friend/Acquaintance's house.
- * If the event takes place on a vehicle, but not *inside* a vehicle, it should be coded as outdoors.
- * If the narrative mentions that they went back to his room at any point, it should be coded as man's residence.
- * Do not assume that information about relationship will inform location. For example, if the woman describes visiting a friend but does not mention where they hung out, do NOT assume they were at the friend's house. Code it as NEI.

IV. Relationship*:

A. Stranger: the woman has never met the man before the event and has no relationship with him.

B. Authority Figure: the man is in a position of authority over the woman (e.g., boss, professor, teacher, etc.).

C. Acquaintance: the woman is not close to the man (i.e. not a friend or boyfriend), but has some relationship with him, even if just briefly. One example is if the man was a friend of the woman's friend. Another example is if the man was the woman's friend's brother. While the woman has no deep connection with him, there is some link between the two of them.

D. Friend: the woman describes having a friendship with the man prior to the event. This is a platonic relationship.

E. Co-Worker: the woman describes working with the man or calls him a co-worker.

F. Dating: the woman has some sort of romantic interest in the man or there is potential for romantic interest (i.e. not a friend) and they spend time together doing pre-planned activities.

G. Hook-up: the woman engages in spontaneous, consensual sexual contact with a man she has no previous romantic relationship with (i.e. NOT dating or boyfriend). This code trumps all other non-romantic relationships (e.g. acquaintance or friend).

H. Boyfriend: the woman describes the man as her boyfriend or there is evidence of a long term relationship (e.g. living together or dating for an extended period of time (i.e. several months)).

I. Ex-Boyfriend: the woman describes the man as her ex-boyfriend or says that they used to date or be in a relationship but aren't any longer.

J. Family: the man is a member of the woman's family.

K. N.E.I.: the narrative does not provide enough information to discern the man's relationship to the woman.

* The hook-up code can only be used if consensual sexual activity is present.

V. Previous Consensual Sexual Contact*:

A. Kissing

1. Yes: The narrative describes kissing that is not unwanted by the woman.
2. No: The narrative explicitly states that there was no consensual kissing prior to the event
3. N.E.I.: The narrative does not provide enough information to determine whether previous consensual kissing was present.

B. Fondling:

1. Yes: The narrative describes fondling (i.e., touching her breasts) that is not unwanted by the woman.
2. No: The narrative explicitly states that there was no consensual fondling prior to the event.
3. N.E.I.: The narrative does not provide enough information to determine whether previous consensual fondling was present

C. Oral Sex:

1. Yes: The narrative describes oral sex that is not unwanted by the woman.
2. No: The narrative explicitly states that there was no consensual oral sex prior to the event.
3. N.E.I.: The narrative does not provide enough information to determine whether previous consensual oral sex was present.

D. Intercourse

1. Yes: The narrative describes intercourse that is not unwanted by the woman.
2. No: The narrative explicitly states that there was no consensual intercourse prior to the event.
3. N.E.I.: The narrative does not provide enough information to determine whether previous consensual intercourse was present

* There are four subcategories that will have to be coded separately (kissing, fondling, oral sex, & intercourse) as present or absent/N.E.I.

* If a woman describes not wanting to engage in an activity, being uncomfortable with it, doing it because she felt bad, etc. at any point in the scenario, than this event should be coded as non-consensual/NEI, even if she never expressed her feelings to the man in the situation and still engaged in the activity. If it is not clear which events are consensual and which are not, consider the event that directly precedes the woman saying no the nonconsensual event. For example, if she

says, “He kissed me and then took off my clothes, and I said no”, the removal of the clothes should be coded as nonconsensual, while the kissing should be coded as consensual.

VI. Woman's Active Reaction During the Event:

A. Present: the woman emits physical behavior to stop the event. **SCALE** (3 is most extreme)

1. Yell/Scream – the woman screams or yells in protest – this response is more adamant and forceful than just speaking no.
2. Physically resist – the woman physically resists her attacker. This can be a range of physical resistance, such as pushing him away, hitting, or arranging her body so as to prevent penetration.
3. Physically remove herself from the situation - such as running away.

B. Absent: the woman acquiesces to the man's attempts without providing physical resistance.

C. N.E.I.: the narrative does not provide enough information to determine the woman's response to the situation.

VII. Woman's Passive Reaction During the Event:

A. Present: the woman emits verbal behavior to stop the event. If the woman says no and then stops resisting later, the event falls under the active response "say no".
SCALE (3 is most extreme)

1. Say no – the woman verbally says no.
2. Crying – the woman cries in the narrative to try and dissuade the perpetrator.
3. Excuses – the woman tells the man excuses to try and dissuade him.

B. Absent: the woman acquiesces to the man's attempts without providing verbal resistance.

C. N.E.I.: the narrative doesn't provide enough information to determine the woman's verbal response to the situation.

VIII. Verbal Coercion by the Man:

A. Present: the narrative mentions the presence of verbal coercion in some form.

SCALE (*5 is most extreme*)

1. Plead/Argue: The man begs for sex or contradicts the woman's refusal with arguments as to why they should have sex. If the man coaxes the woman (i.e., "You know you want to have sex with me"), it would also be included in this category.
2. Insult: The man insults the woman for not consenting, e.g. calling her a bitch or a tease.
3. Non-physical threat: The man threatens some consequence other than physical violence for the woman's refusal to comply. One example of this would be threatening to break up with her if she doesn't sleep with him.
4. Threat of violence: The man threatens to injure the woman if she doesn't comply with his requests/demands for sex.
5. Threat of death: The man threatens to kill the woman if she doesn't comply with his requests/demands for sex.

B. Absent: the narrative explicitly states that there was no verbal coercion present.

C. N.E.I.: the narrative doesn't provide enough information to determine whether verbal coercion was present.

IX. Physical Coercion by the Man*:

A. Present: the narrative mentions the presence of physical coercion in some form.

SCALE (5 is most extreme)

1. Grab/touch: The man grabs or touches the woman in a manner which she either protests or which makes her uncomfortable.
2. Push/pull: The man either pushes or pulls the woman during the unwanted event, e.g. pushing her down onto the bed. This is a more temporary action than restrain – if he pushes her onto the bed but then somehow keeps her from leaving, it should be coded as restrain.
3. Restrain: The man prevents the woman from moving or escaping, e.g. by holding her down or laying on top of her. This does not necessarily need to involve physical contact – if he in some way keeps her from leaving by blocking her way, this would also be included. This is a more sustained action than push/pull.
4. Hit: The man hits the woman.
5. Weapons: The man uses weapons to either injure or threaten the woman.

B. Absent: The narrative explicitly states that there was no physical coercion present.

C. N.E.I.: The narrative does not provide enough information to determine whether there was physical coercion present

* If there is evidence of physical coercion, but it is not clear what type of coercion there was, code it as restrain. For example, if the woman says, “He forced me to have sex with him”, we’re not sure exactly how he did it, so the default code will be restrain.

* If the man takes off the woman’s clothes, and the woman clearly does not consent, this should be coded as touch/grab in physical coercion by the man.

X. Situation*:

- A. Date: one-on-one pre-planned event in which there is a potential for romantic interest.
- B. Hook-up/Hang-out: one-on-one spontaneous event in which there is a potential for romantic interest
- C. During Party: large gathering of people.
- D. After Party: remaining at the scene of a party after other party-goers have left.
- E. Small group get-together: group of a few to several people (approximately 3-7) together.
- F. Relationship: event is in the context of an ongoing romantic relationship.
- G. Platonic: one-on-one situation with male the woman has no romantic interest in (e.g. friend, co-worker, or acquaintance she is not interested in).
- H. Stranger situation: the woman is in an unfamiliar situation with total strangers (i.e. not a party situation)
- I. Family situation: event is in the context of a family relationship (i.e. molestation).
- J. Work: the woman is working at the time of the event.
- K. Online: the event occurs over the Internet.
- L. Bar/Club: the event occurs in a bar or club.
- M. N.E.I.: not enough information to determine the situation in which the event occurred.

* **The small group get-together, party, & after party codes all trump the date code.** If you can't tell with reasonable certainty how many people are present during the event, code it as NEI.

* **The date code trumps the relationship code.** The relationship code is intended to capture events that are non-specific and in the context of an ongoing relationship.

* If the woman describes the man as a date and doesn't give any information about the specific event, code the situation as a date.

XI. Time knew Perpetrator:

- A. Less than 1 week: the woman has known the perpetrator for less than 1 week.
- B. 1 week to 1 month: the woman has known the perpetrator between 1 week and 1 month.
- C. 1 month to 6 months: the woman has known the perpetrator between 1 and 6 months.
- D. 7 months to 1 year: the woman has known the perpetrator between 7 months and 1 year.
- E. More than 1 year: the woman has known the perpetrator for more than 1 year.
- F. N.E.I.: not enough information to determine the amount of time the woman has known the perpetrator.

XII. Sexual Victimization:

- A. None: no sexual victimization is described in the narrative.
- B. Unwanted Sexual Contact: the narrative describes unwanted fondling, kissing, or petting having occurred.
- C. Sexual Coercion: the narrative describes the woman giving into sexual intercourse (penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis) as a result of continued arguments and pressure or because a man used his position of authority.
- D. Attempted Rape: the narrative describes attempted sexual intercourse (penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis) but intercourse did not occur.
- E. Completed Rape: the narrative describes sexual intercourse (penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis) or sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis).
- F. N.E.I.: the narrative does not include enough information to determine the level of sexual victimization.

XIII. Negative Psychological Effects:

A. Present: the narrative includes information on the woman's thoughts or feelings after the assault.

1. *Feeling dirty or disgusting: the woman describes feeling dirty or disgusting as a result of the assault.*
2. *Ashamed/Embarrassed: the woman feels ashamed/embarrassed as a result of the assault.*
3. *Blames self: the woman specifically blames herself for the assault.*
4. *Feeling bad/guilty: the woman describes feeling bad or guilty as a result of the assault.*
5. *Angry: the woman describes feeling angry as a result of the assault.*
6. *Numb: the woman describes feeling numb as a result of the assault.*

B. N.E.I.: the narrative does not include information about the thoughts or feelings of the woman afterwards.

EXAMPLE CODING SHEET

Coder _____

Narrative # _____

Category	Code
I. Alcohol Use	
II. Drug Use	
III. Location	
IV. Relationship	
V. Previous Consensual Sexual Contact A. B. C. D.	
VI. Woman's Active Reaction During the Event	
VII. Woman's Passive Reaction During the Event	
VIII. Verbal Coercion by the Man	
IX. Physical Coercion by the Man	
X. Situation	
XI. Time knew Perpetrator	
XII. Sexual Victimization	
XIII. Negative Psychological Effects	

HOW TO USE CODING SHEET

First you must write the number of the narrative as well as your coder ID number. Then you must decide which code is the most detailed code appropriate for the narrative at hand. For example, if the event occurs in a man's car, you would go to Location, Indoors (A), His Property (1), Car (b) using the outline. Each code (except for the large category code) has a letter or number preceding it. For example, Indoor is denoted using A, His Property is denoted using 1, and Car is denoted using b. Therefore, an event that takes place in a man's car would be coded A1b. This is the code you would place in the column next to the word Location, located next to the III in the third row.

Here is another example. What if the man in the narrative is using drugs but the woman is not? First, you would look at the Present category in the Drug section. Present is denoted using an A. Then you would look down at Both, which is denoted with 3. Then the code for this narrative would be A3, which you would write in the column next to Drug Use. In both this example and the example above, there is no need to write the Roman numeral for the largest code, since you are writing the code next to the label for that code (e.g. Location or Drug Use).

For another example, see the example coding sheet accompanying the example narrative on page 20.

Anything that happens after the event itself should NOT be coded as part of the event. For example, if the man insults her a couple of hours later, that should NOT be coded. We're only interested in the elements of the assault itself, not anything following it, with the exception of Negative Psychological Effects. Sometimes a code can be determined by process of elimination. It can be helpful to figure out what codes the situation clearly does NOT fit into first. Then, if there is only one remaining category that could work, the situation can be placed into that category, even if it isn't necessarily a perfect fit.

EXAMPLE NARRATIVE

Below is a fictional narrative to illustrate the coding process:

“I was about 15 years old. I was with this guy I had been dating for about 6 months. His parents weren't home, and we were watching a movie at his house. I had like 2 beers, but I wasn't even buzzed. He had a few beers, but I don't know how many. During the movie, we kissed a little. I was o.k. with that - we had done that before. After a while though, things started to get out of hand, and I told him I wasn't ready to have sex with him. He kept groping me even though I kept saying no. I finally yelled NO and he got the message and stopped. He was pissed afterwards and called me a bitch. I told him to just take me home”.

We'll code this narrative for alcohol use. First we need to determine whether there is enough information in the narrative to know if there was alcohol use or if it needs to go into N.E.I. There is clearly information regarding alcohol use, so we can continue. It is also clear that there was alcohol present, since she mentions drinking, so we can go look at the detailed codes under “Present”. Then we need to determine whether it was the man, the woman, or both using alcohol. The woman pretty clearly states that both she and the man were drinking, so we would code it under “both” (see the coding sheet below to see how to denote this code).

Now we'll code this for relationship. Again, the first step is to decide whether there is enough information to determine what the relationship was with some certainty. She mentions that she had been dating the man for about 6 months, so we know we shouldn't code this as N.E.I. When we look down the outline, which increases in levels of intimacy, we see two categories that might work at first glance: Dating & Boyfriend. Although the woman says that she was “dating” the man, we must read a little further and see that the relationship had lasted 6 months, which fits more readily into the Boyfriend category (see the coding sheet below to see how to denote this code).

Finally, we'll code this narrative for location. First, we must determine whether there's enough information about the location. It is clear that there is plenty of information about the setting, so we continue past N.E.I. Then we need to decide whether it was indoors or outdoors. She mentions being in a house, so we know it's inside. Then we look at the more detailed codes within Indoors. We see that there is a category for His, Hers, Theirs, etc. She clearly mentions that it is his house, so we then move into the category of His. Finally, we must determine what type of property it was. She is at his house, so we place it under Residence (see the coding sheet below to see how to denote this code).

Category	Code
I. Alcohol Use	A3
II. Drug Use	C
III. Location	A1a
IV. Relationship	H
V. Previous Consensual Sexual Contact	
A.	1
B.	3
C.	3
D.	2
VI. Woman's Active Reaction During the Event	1
VII. Woman's Passive Reaction During the Event	1
VIII. Verbal Coercion by the Man	2
IX. Physical Coercion by the Man	1
X. Situation	E
XI. Time knew Perpetrator	C
XII. Sexual Victimization	B
XIII. Negative Psychological Effects	B

Hopefully this example narratives help to illustrate how one should move through the codes to find the most detailed one that applies to the narratives. It is important to determine whether the information you need is present. If it is not, the narrative goes into N.E.I. If there is, then you must work your way through the codes until you find the most detailed code that fits the narrative you're working with.

Once you have become familiar with the codes and have successfully coded the example narratives, you will be given the real narratives to code. Make sure you do your best to use all of the information provided but don't infer anything that isn't in the narrative. If you are not sure where a narrative fits, or are unclear about information in the narrative, make sure to ask the Criterion Coder.

Often while coding, it is easy to become tired or bored. If this happens, make sure to take a quick break. It is important that you read the narratives at a level of detail above what you would usually use to read, and this requires a lot of concentration. It is easy to make mistakes and miss important information if you are tired or bored, so just take a break. If necessary, come back to the task another day. Finally, remember that there will be cases that aren't 100% clear. There will be fewer cases as you become more familiar with the coding system, but there will always be some. In these cases, just do your best with the information provided.

References

- Acierno, R., Gray, M., Best, C., Resnick, H., Kilpatrick, D., Saunders, B., & Brady, K. (2001). Rape and physical violence: Comparison of assault characteristics in older and younger adults in the national women's study. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 14*, 685-695.
- Arroyo, A., Simpson, T., Aragon, A. (1997). Childhood sexual abuse among Hispanic and non-Hispanic White college women. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 19*, 57-68.
- Bailey, B., Kirk, K. M., Zhu, G., Dunne, M. P. & Martin, N. G. (2000). Do individual differences in sociosexuality represent genetic or environmentally contingent strategies? Evidence from the Australian twin registry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 537-545.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1984). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 1982* (Publication No. NCJ-92820). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice
- Bondurant, B. (2001). University women's acknowledgment of rape: Individual, situational, and social factors. *Violence Against Women, 7*, 294-314.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217-230.
- Byers, E. S., & Lewis, K. (1988). Dating couples' disagreements over the desired level of sexual activity. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 15-29.
- Crome, S. A., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Adult rape scripting within a victimological perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*, 395-413.
- Firth, H. & Kitzinger, C. (2001). Reformulating sexual script theory: Developing a discursive psychology of sexual negotiation. *Theory Psychology, 11*, 209-232.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1976). *Sex and personality*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Fine, M. (1988). Sexuality, schooling, and adolescent females: The missing discourse of desire. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 29-53.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T. & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. National Institutes of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hickman, S.E. & Muehlenhard, C.L. (1997). College women's fears and precautionary behaviors relating to acquaintance rape and stranger rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 527-547.
- Kahn, A. S., Mathie, V. A., & Torgler, C. (1994). Rape scripts and rape acknowledgment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 53-66.
- Kahn, A. S., & Mathie, V. A. (2000). Understanding the unacknowledged rape victim. In C. B. Travis, & J. W. White (Eds.). *Sexuality, society, and feminism. Psychology of women* (pp. 377-403.). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kalof, L. (2000). Ethnic differences in female sexual victimization. *Sexuality and Culture, 4*, 75-98.
- Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.
- Koss, M. P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9*, 193-212.
- 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.

- Littleton, H. L., & Axsom, D. (2003). The rape and seduction scripts of university students: Implications for rape attributions and unacknowledged rape. *Sex Roles, 49*, 465–475.
- Littleton, H., Axsom, D., & Yoder, M. (2006). Priming of consensual and nonconsensual sexual scripts: An experimental test of the role of scripts in rape attributions. *Sex Roles, 54*, 557-563.
- Littleton, H., Breitkopf, C.R., & Berenson, A.B. (2007). Rape scripts of low-income European American and Latina women. *Sex Roles, 56*, 509-516.
- Littleton, H., Tabernik, H., Canales, E. J., and Backstrom, T. (2009). Risky situation or harmless fun? A qualitative examination of college women's bad hook-up and rape scripts. *Sex Roles, 60*, 793-804.
- Masters, N.T., Norris, J., Stoner, S.A., and George, W.H. (2006). How does it end? Women project the outcome of a sexual assault scenario. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 291-302.
- Metts, S., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1996). Sexual communication in interpersonal contexts: A script based approach. In B. R. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 19* (pp. 49–91). New Brunswick, NJ: International Communication Association.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & MacNaughton, J.S. (1988). Women's beliefs about women who 'lead men on.' *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7*, 65-79.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Andrews, S. L., & Beal, G. K. (1996). Beyond "just saying no": Dealing with men's unwanted sexual advances in heterosexual dating contexts. In E. S. Byers & L. F. Nason & Yeater. (2012). Sexual attitudes mediate the relationship between sexual victimization history and women's response effectiveness. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-17*.

- Nurius, P.S., Norris, J., Young, D.S., Graham, T.L., & Gaylord, J. (2000). Interpreting and defensively responding to threat: examining appraisals and coping with acquaintance sexual aggression. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 187-208.
- O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Sexual coercion in dating relationships* (pp. 141–168). New York: Haworth Press.
- Rose, S. & Frieze, I.H. (1993). Young singles' contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles, 28*, 499-509.
- Ryan, K. M. (1988). Rape and seduction scripts. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 237–245.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 870–883.
- Sorenson, S. B., Stein, J. A., Seigel, J. M., Golding, J. M., & Burnam, M. A. (1987). Prevalence of adult sexual assault, The Los Angeles epidemiologic catchment area study. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 126*, 1141-1164.
- Turchik, J. A., Probst, D. R., Irvin, C. R., Chau, M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2009). Prediction of sexual assault experiences in college women based on rape scripts: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 361-366.
- Yeater, E. A., Viken, R. J., McFall, R. M. & Wagner, L. R. (2006). Sexual attitudes and instructional set affect estimates of risk and response effectiveness. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 28*, 223-242.
- Yeater, E. A., Viken, R. J., Hoyt, T. & Dolan, J. L. (2009). Self-other perspective and sexual attitudes affect estimates of sexual risk. *Sex Roles, 61*, 110-119.