

When is it rape? The role of rape and seduction scripts

Heather L. Littleton

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

in

Psychology

Danny Axsom, Chair

George Clum

Robert Stephens

April 27, 2001

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Rape, Seduction, Script theory, Unacknowledged rape

Copyright 2001, Heather L. Littleton

When is it rape? The role of rape and seduction scripts

Heather Littleton

Abstract

Accompanying the high prevalence of rape among college women is a high prevalence of unacknowledged rape, or women who have been raped who do not label it as such. The current studies explore one theory which may help account for unacknowledged rape, script theory. Specifically, it may be that individuals have scripts for rape and seduction which overlap on a number of dimensions, which may lead certain incidents of rape to be labeled seduction. Three studies were conducted to test the possible role of scripts in labeling an incident rape or not. In study 1, unique and overlapping elements of undergraduates' rape and seduction scripts were identified using a free-writing task and a questionnaire. In study 2, an ambiguous sexual scenario was developed. In study 3, script salience was manipulated by labeling the ambiguous scenario as either rape or seduction. This manipulation had little effect on participants' characterization of the scenario. However, results of internal analyses suggested that what script was activated affected participants' beliefs about the outcome of the scenario for the woman as well as their recall for the elements of the scenario. Implications of the results for the phenomenon of unacknowledged rape are discussed.

Table of Contents

Introduction and literature review	1 -13
Study one	13-19
Study two	19-22
Study three	22-31
General discussion	31-36
References	37-42
Acknowledgements	43
Tables	44-52
Appendices	53-62
Curriculum Vitae	63-65

When is it rape? The role of rape and seduction scripts

Research has shown that sexual violence against women is pervasive in our society. Young women in particular are often victims of rape and other sexual crimes. In an oft cited study, Koss (1988) found that 15.4% of a national sample of 3,187 college women had been the victim of rape and another 12.1% had been the victim of attempted rape. For this research, rape was operationalized in accordance with the legal definition of rape in Ohio, which defines rape as vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse where the perpetrator compels the other person to submit by force or threat of force or where the offender impairs the other person's judgment or control by administering a drug or intoxicant to the other person (Koss, 1988). While this definition implies that there are two types of rape- one involving physical force and one involving alcohol or drug use, both can, and do, occur together. Koss (1988) found that 55% of rapes involved alcohol or drug use by the victim, 64% involved the victim being held down, 9% involved the victim being struck by the perpetrator, and 5% involved the use of a weapon by the perpetrator.

Despite the violent nature of many rapes as well as the apparent impairment of the victim's ability to give consent, there is a vast under reporting of the crime of rape. Among college women, only 5% of rape victims had reported the crime to the police and only 5% had visited a crisis center (Koss, 1988). Traditionally it has been assumed that under reporting was a consequence of secondary victimization of women by law enforcement, the courts, and individuals in the victim's social group. While not discounting secondary victimization, the problem may also involve a more basic level.

Unacknowledged rape

One major reason for under reporting may be that many victims do not consider themselves to have been raped. A number of studies have examined this possibility by examining the responses of college women who have been raped. Among college women who have been raped,

it has been found that only between 12 and 57% consider themselves to have been the victim of rape, with most studies finding that approximately 25% of victims consider themselves to have been raped (Kahn, Mathie, & Togler, 1994; Koss, 1985; Koss, 1988; Layman, Gidycz, & Lynn, 1996; Schwartz & Leggett, 1999). In other words, between 43 and 82% of all rape victims are unacknowledged victims.

A number of studies have examined what factors differentiate acknowledged from unacknowledged victims. One difference which has emerged is the acquaintance level of the victim and perpetrator. Unacknowledged victims tend to be more highly acquainted with their perpetrator. Koss (1985) found that 76% of unacknowledged victims were romantically involved with their attacker compared to 31% of acknowledged victims. The victims of unacknowledged rape also describe the rape as involving less use of physical force and more use of alcohol to prevent them from consenting (Kahn, et al., 1994; Layman, et al., 1996; Schwartz & Legett, 1999). In addition, unacknowledged victims were less likely to report that they made it very clear to the attacker that they did not want sex and were less likely to have resisted during the attack (Layman, et al.). Finally, unacknowledged victims have been found to have a higher level of previous intimacy with the perpetrator (Koss, 1985). While it does appear from these studies that unacknowledged rapes differ from acknowledged rapes on a number of situational factors, no individual differences between unacknowledged and acknowledged victims have been observed (Koss, 1985).

Attribution literature

A large body of research has examined attributions about rape by others. These studies are relevant to the problem of unacknowledged rape for two reasons. First, similar processes may be involved in rape acknowledgment and rape attribution because both involve making judgements about whether a situation has the elements of a rape. Second, in choosing whether to acknowledge rape, victims may be swayed by the opinions or perceived opinions of others. Victims may internalize the beliefs of others that the incident was not rape or may fear the stigma

of being labeled a rape victim. Supporting these contentions, attribution research has found results that partially parallel the findings among unacknowledged victims. These studies generally involve having participants (usually college students) read a vignette about a hypothetical rape and make judgements regarding it. The factors found to affect rape attributions in these studies include situational factors, the sexual connotativeness of the victim's behavior, and several individual difference variables.

Situational factors. Similar to the results of studies of unacknowledged victims, a number of situational factors have been found to affect attributions individuals make about rape. One such factor is acquaintance level between the victim and perpetrator. For example, Tetreault and Barnett (1987) found that college women were less certain an incident was rape if the perpetrator was a classmate whom the victim had dated previously versus a man she had never seen before. Similarly, Bridges (1991) found that forced intercourse with a first date or steady dating partner was characterized less as rape than forced intercourse with a stranger.

Also paralleling findings among unacknowledged victims, resistance on the part of the victim has been found to affect rape attributions. For example, Krulewitz and Nash (1978) found that individuals viewed a stranger assault more as rape the more strongly the victim resisted. Another study had college students choose the best term to characterize an incident of forced intercourse between acquaintances and found that the percentage choosing the term rape increased as resistance on the part of the victim increased. Specifically, only 6% of the participants labeled the incident rape if the victim did not resist, 25% if the victim resisted verbally, and 53% if the victim resisted physically (Hannon, Kuntz, Van Laar, Williams, & Hall, 1996). Similarly, the amount of force used by the assailant has been found to affect rape attributions. Proite, Dannells, and Benton (1993) found that participants perceived a date rape more as rape if the attacker threatened the victim and covered her mouth in addition to ignoring her protests to stop.

Alcohol use by the victim also affects rape attributions. For example, Schuller and Wall (1998) found that participants perceived a hypothetical defendant as less guilty of sexual assault in an

acquaintance rape scenario if the victim was moderately intoxicated during the attack. While other studies did not evaluate rape attributions per se., they found that if the victim had been drinking before the attack, she is blamed more (Stormo, Lang, & Stritzke, 1997) and seen as more responsible for the attack (Hammock & Richardson, 1997; Richardson & Campbell, 1982)

Sexual connotativeness of victim's behavior. Similar to the finding that unacknowledged victims are more likely to have engaged in prior intimate activity with the perpetrator, the sexual connotativeness of the victim's behavior has been found to affect attributions of rape. These studies suggest that if the woman acts in a way that suggests her sexual availability and interest, observers' construal of the situation will be altered to play up the victim's role in the attack and downplay the role of the perpetrator. This could include engaging in consensual activity with the perpetrator, previous intimacy with the perpetrator, or allowing the perpetrator to pay for the date. Supporting this contention, Shotland and Goodstein (1983) found that if the woman had engaged in consensual sex with the perpetrator in the past, then the event was viewed less as rape. In addition, a study by Jenkins and Dambrot (1987) found that females rated an assault less as rape if the man paid for the date, compared to a date where both partners paid an equal percentage. Similarly, examining women's actual dating experiences, Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) found that dates where sexual aggression occurred, compared to other dates, more often involved potentially sexually connotative behaviors on the part of the woman. For example, they were more likely to involve the man paying for the entire date, going to a secluded location to engage in intimate behavior, and the woman dressing at least somewhat suggestively.

Other attributions affected. In addition, rapes involving these situational factors and more sexual connotativeness on the part of the victim have been found to affect other attributions about the rape. These include the amount of responsibility attributed to the victim (Hammock & Richardson, 1997; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Kowalski, 1992; Richardson & Campbell, 1982; Tetreault & Barnett, 1987), the amount the victim is blamed (Bell, Kurloff, & Lottes, 1994; Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Kanekar & Seksaria, 1993; Kopper, 1996; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Snell & Godwin, 1993; Stormo, Lang, & Stritzke, 1997), the victim's

perceived sexual desire (Kowalski, 1992; Proite, Dannells, & Benton, 1993; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983), and the amount of perceived harm to the victim (Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1998; Szymanski, et al., 1993; Willis & Wrightsman, 1995). These factors also affect the responsibility attributed to the perpetrator (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Kowalski, 1992; Szymanski, et al.), the excusableness of his behavior (Freetly & Kane, 1995; Sheldon-Keller, Lloyd-McGarvey, West, & Canterbury, 1994), and the length of imprisonment individuals feel he should receive (Kanekar, Shaherwalla, Franco, Kunjo, & Pinto, 1991; Szymanski, et al.; Willis, 1992; Willis & Wrightsman, 1995). Finally, these factors affect the perceived justifiableness of the rape (Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas, 1985) and the morality and credibility of the victim (Richardson & Campbell, 1982; Schuller & Wall, 1998). These attributions illustrate some of the stigma that victims of rape may face if they acknowledge the rape. They may be blamed or held responsible for the attack or even viewed as deserving their fate.

Individual difference variables. Finally, in contrast to the rape acknowledgment literature, some studies have found individual difference variables which affect rape attributions. One factor which has emerged as affecting rape attributions is gender. Males relative to females have been generally found to characterize a situation less as rape (Bridges, 1991; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Simonson & Subich, 1999), see the victim as more responsible and to blame for the incident (Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Grant, Folger, & Hornak, 1993; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977; Simonson & Subich, 1999), and see her as wanting sex more (Bridges, 1991; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Muehlenhard, 1988; Proite, et al., 1993). Males relative to females also blame the rapist less (Selby, et al., 1977), view the rape as more justifiable (Muehlenhard, 1988), and believe that the rapist should receive a lighter sentence (Gerdes, et al., 1988; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981). However, a number of other studies have not found evidence for significant gender effects for rape attributions (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Kahn, et al., 1977; Kanekar & Seksaria, 1993; Krahe, 1988; Richardson & Campbell, 1982; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Stormo, Lang, & Stritzke, 1997). Overall, though, these results do seem to suggest that males

and females tend to differ on some variables which affect rape attributions.

Another individual difference variable which has been examined in relationship to rape attributions is rape myth acceptance or RMA. RMA is made up of a number of erroneous beliefs about rape, such as the belief that women can effectively resist rape and that women have an unconscious desire to be raped (Burt, 1980). Individuals high in rape myth acceptance have been found to view an attack less as rape (Burt & Albin, 1981; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Norris & Cubbins, 1992), blame the victim more (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Kopper, 1996; Stormo et al., 1997), see her as more responsible for the attack (Krahe, 1988; Norris & Cubbins, 1992; Stormo et al.), and view her as wanting sex more (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Norris & Cubbins, 1992). They also blame the perpetrator less (Kopper, 1996; Stormo et al.) and see him as less responsible (Stormo, et al.). RMA may help explain some of the gender differences in rape attributions, as males have been found to have higher rape myth acceptance in some studies (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Kopper, 1996; Schuller & Wall, 1998).

Another individual difference variable examined by a number of researchers is gender role traditionality, particularly traditional views toward women's gender role. These studies have found that individuals with more traditional views toward gender roles consider rape to be more justifiable (Muelenhard, 1988), view the victim as more responsible and to blame for the assault (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Howells, et al., 1984; Proite et al., 1993; Snell & Godwin, 1993; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Willis, 1992), view her as desiring sex more (Proite et al.; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983), view her as less damaged by the assault (Howells, et al.; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Willis, 1992), and view the rapist as less responsible (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Howells, et al.; Snell & Godwin, 1993).

To summarize, the findings from the attribution literature partially parallel the findings among unacknowledged victims. Certain situational factors have also been found to affect attributions, such as the level of acquaintance between the victim and the perpetrator and the level of force used in the attack. Also, if the victim acts in a way that makes it appear she would be open to

being seduced, attributions are affected. However, unlike the findings among unacknowledged victims, certain individual difference variables such as gender, rape myth acceptance, and gender role traditionality have been found to affect attributions.

The role of theory

One major problem with the rape acknowledgment and attribution literatures is the lack of a clear theoretical framework to guide the research. Much of the research has been conducted with little theoretical rationale given regarding which factors will affect attributions. When a theoretical explanation is given, it is often a circular explanation. An example would be the assertion that individuals regard acquaintance rape as less serious because the relationship between the rapist and victim induces individuals to regard the rape as less serious (Kanekar, et al., 1991). Of the organized theoretical frameworks which do exist, two have predominated. These two models are just world theory and sex role socialization theory.

Just world theory

According to just world theory, individuals are inclined to believe in a world where individuals get what they deserve (Lerner, 1980). For this reason, when something bad, such as rape, happens to an individual, others are motivated to find a reason why the person deserved the misfortune (Kahn, et al., 1977). This motivation is enhanced if the attack of an innocent victim could potentially make the observer feel vulnerable to attack (Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981). Therefore, if an innocent victim is attacked, she will be blamed for the attack to maintain the individual's belief in a just world (Kahn, et al., 1977). According to this theory, respectable victims should be blamed more to preserve the observers' belief in a just world. This should occur because respectable victims are viewed as more similar to the observer and so highlight the observers' vulnerability to attack. Respectable victims are also viewed as less deserving of such a fate due to having character flaws, and so observers blame the victim for her behavior to maintain their belief that victims deserve their fate. In addition, according to this theory, women

should blame victims more because rape is more of a threat to a woman's belief in her invulnerability.

Research results, however, have not always supported this theory. For example, respectable victims have not always been found to be considered more at fault for the crime or more to blame overall (Heaven, Connors, & Pretorius, 1998; Kahn, et al., 1977). In addition, men have been found to blame victims more, which is in opposition to the predictions of just world theory (Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Gerdes, et al., 1988; Grant, et al., 1993; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977; Simonson & Subich, 1999).

While this theory has not addressed rape acknowledgment per se, it does posit that engaging in cognitive reconstruction is a way to restore one's belief in a just world- such as by blaming one's character or one's behavior leading up to the event or viewing the event as less serious (Lerner, 1980). Therefore, according to this theory, not acknowledging rape would represent one way to restore one's belief in a just world by minimizing the seriousness of the event. It is worth reemphasizing that this theory deals with the motivational component of rape acknowledgment, as opposed to other theories regarding rape acknowledgment which are more cognitive in nature. According to this theory, the experience of rape disturbs women's belief in a just world and creates an aversive state which women would be highly motivated to reduce perhaps by not acknowledging the rape. However, in opposition to the predictions of this theory, acknowledged as opposed to unacknowledged victims have been found to have significantly better adjustment following rape (Botta & Pingree, 1997). Similarly, engaging in both behavioral (Frazier, 1990) and characterological self-blame (Arata & Burkhart, 1995, 1998; Frazier, 1990) has been associated with significantly more symptomology following rape.. Most importantly, this theory does not predict under which conditions women would not acknowledge the rape to restore their belief in a just world.

Sex role socialization theory

Another theory developed to explain rape attributions is sex role socialization theory. According to this theory, rape, in particular acquaintance rape, is viewed as an extreme form of normal sexual interactions. Males are generally socialized to be the initiators in sexual interactions and females are socialized to be more passive (Bridges, 1991). As part of this socialization, women are expected to show little interest in sex and initially resist sexual advances and men are expected to be dominant and initiate sexual overtures (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). According to this theory, rape among dating partners should be regarded less as rape since it is seen more as a part of normal sexual interactions. The research does support this assertion (Bridges, 1991; Szymanski, et al., 1993; Willis & Wrightsman, 1995).

However, the theory has certain weaknesses. Namely, the theory may be too general to explain a number of the factors that affect attributions. For example, it does not explain why force and resistance show a linear relationship with rape attributions. The general finding has been that as force and resistance increase the likelihood that an incident will be characterized as rape increases (Shotland & Goodstein, 1983), whereas this theory would claim that a moderate amount of force and resistance would be considered a normal part of sexual interactions and so the incident would not be characterized as rape. This theory also does not explain why factors such as alcohol use by the perpetrator would affect rape attributions. Most importantly, however, this theory does not explain the process that individuals go through in making the decision about whether an incident is rape or not. For example, the theory does not make clear how a victim decides whether an event was a normal sexual interaction or rape- i.e. does the victim have two categories for interactions, normal sex or rape, and if so, what distinguishes these two categories.

Script theory

Another theory which may in part account for the process involved in rape acknowledgement and rape attribution that has not been investigated to as large an extent is script theory. A script is a type of schema, where a schema is a cognitive structure that represents organized knowledge

about a given domain (Schank & Abelson, 1977). Individuals have schema about themselves, others, and events. Information in schema includes information about the attributes of a domain and the relationships among those attributes. Schema often operate unconsciously and are highly resistant to change (Demorest, 1995). Schema have been found to influence cognitive processing in several ways. For example, schema influence recall. Individuals' recall for schema-consistent information is usually better than for schema-inconsistent information (Baldwin, 1992). Schema are also used to organize information. For example, individuals will falsely recognize words if they fit with the schema being described (Baldwin, 1992). Finally, schema aid in the interpretation of ambiguous information. For example, Zadney and Gerard (1974) found that participants' interpretation of an ambiguous scene of two individuals walking around a room and picking up objects was affected by whether they were told the individuals were waiting, searching for drugs, or searching for objects to steal.

Schema vary in their accessibility. Accessibility refers to how easily a given schema is invoked in a situation (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Those schema which are most accessible in a given situation will influence interpretation of information, particularly ambiguous information (Bargh & Pietromonaco, 1982; Higgins, Bargh, & Lombardi, 1985). A number of factors influence schema accessibility. These include frequency of use (Bargh, Lombardi, & Higgins, 1988), recency of use (Higgins, Rholes, & Jones, 1977), and mood (Bower, 1981). One way to alter the accessibility of a given schema is through priming. Priming can be accomplished in a number of ways. Some techniques which have been used include subliminal exposure to schema-related words (Erdley & D' Agostino, 1988), exposure to a vivid stimulus associated with a given schema (McKenzie-Mohr & Zanna, 1990), or exposure to schema-related words and concepts under a condition of distraction (Sawchuk, Lohr, Lee, & Tolin, 1999).

A script is a schema about a particular type of event. Scripts contain information about props, roles, and rules regarding the sequence of events within the script (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). For example, most individuals have a script regarding what happens on a date. If asked, individuals can describe the props involved in a date (flowers, nice clothing, etc.), the roles of the individuals

on the date (the man initiates, etc.), and the sequence of events that occur on a date (first he picks her up, then they drive to the restaurant, etc.). They can also make judgements regarding whether a particular element is part of a typical date, that is, if it is an element of their dating script.

Similarly, individuals may have a script for what happens during a rape. If an incident deviates from that script, it is less likely to be labeled as rape. Supporting this theory, Kahn, Mathie, and Torgler (1994) examined the rape scripts of acknowledged and unacknowledged rape victims. They found that the two groups had very different rape scripts. The rape scripts of unacknowledged victims involved a violent, stranger attack, while the rape scripts of acknowledged victims were less violent and generally involved an acquaintance rape. In essence, those individuals whose rape script matched their rape experience acknowledged the rape, while those whose script did not match their rape experience were unacknowledged. However, this finding must be interpreted with caution, as it is possible that the rape experience itself may have altered the individuals' rape scripts. Another study supporting this theory was conducted by Krahe (1991). In this study, police officers were asked to describe their scripts for several different types of rape. This study found that police officers had a script for a typical rape that involved a moderate degree of force, a stranger assailant, and an outdoor attack. Further, a rape that deviated to a large extent from this script was regarded as dubious or false. So, for example, the officers considered a dubious or false rape to involve less violence, acquaintance between the victim and assailant, and to have occurred at the victim's or assailant's apartment. Again, as this research was non-experimental in nature the findings are subject to alternative explanations. For example, as all the participants were asked to describe all three types of rape it is possible that they intentionally highlighted the differences between a typical rape and a dubious or false rape.

If certain incidents of rape deviate from individuals' rape scripts and so are not labeled rape, the question remains as to how these incidents are labeled. One possibility is that individuals also have a seduction script, and that certain rape incidents are labeled seduction. Supporting this theory, Ryan (1988) asked a group of students to describe a typical rape and typical seduction. She found several similarities between the two scripts, as well as a number of differences. For

example, rape scripts were described as more violent, more likely to involve a stranger attack, less likely to involve alcohol use, and less likely to involve verbal coercion. However, both scripts involved a male instigator, and for males, both involved low resistance on the part of the female. Further supporting this theory, Lewin (1985) asked college women to describe how they would feel and how they believed the man would feel about them if they agreed to unwanted intercourse. She found that about half of the women claimed they would feel pleased after unwanted intercourse and expected that the man would respect them and possibly fall in love with them. This finding seems to show that a number of women construe coerced intercourse as a normal, and even positive, event.

Script theory helps explain a number of the findings from the attribution literature. For example, this theory would explain why rapes containing potentially seduction-related elements such as a high degree of acquaintance between the victim and perpetrator, a low level of force, and alcohol use, would be less likely to be labeled rape. Similarly, if the victim acted in a manner which suggested she was open to being seduced, such as letting the man pay for the date, going to his apartment, engaging in sex play, etc., then the incident may fit more with individuals' seduction script and so would be less likely to be considered rape. Finally, differences in seduction scripts and the salience of these scripts may explain why men and women differ in their attributions about rape. Research has shown that men see the world in more sexual terms and are more likely to interpret women's friendly behavior as sexual behaviors (Abbey, 1982; Kowalski, 1993). For this reason, males may be more apt to interpret the woman's behavior as inviting seduction and so consider a rape incident to be seduction.

Goals of the present investigation

While previous research is suggestive regarding the role of scripts in interpreting rape, it is limited by its reliance on correlational methods. Therefore, the primary goal of the investigation was to test script theory in a more definitive manner. This was accomplished by manipulating the salience of individuals' rape and seduction scripts to determine the effect of these scripts on

rape attributions. This represents a new step in testing the role of scripts in rape attribution and rape acknowledgment. If individuals have rape and seduction scripts, then it would be expected that making one of these scripts more salient, or accessible, through priming would affect how individuals perceive an ambiguous sexual scenario.

To study whether script salience affects attributions, it was first necessary to gather information regarding the nature of individuals' rape and seduction scripts. This was accomplished through one two-part study. For the first part, undergraduates were randomly assigned to write about either a typical rape or seduction. Based on the results of this part of the study, a questionnaire consisting of a number of potential rape and seduction-related elements was constructed. A second group of undergraduates were then randomly assigned to rate how much they felt these elements are part of a typical rape or seduction. Determination of these elements was necessary for construction of an ambiguous sexual scenario for use in the final study. Thus, the first step in the present investigation was to identify the elements of students' rape and seduction scripts.

Study One

Overview

The goal of this study was to determine the elements of college students' rape and seduction scripts as well as to identify any featural overlap between the two scripts. It was expected that there would be some degree of overlap between these two scripts if indeed certain instances of rape are viewed as seduction. Gender differences in script elements were also examined. As males overall have been found to rate ambiguous scenarios less as rape, it was expected that males would rate ambiguous elements less typical of rape and more typical of seduction relative to females.

Method

Participants. Forty-two female and 8 male undergraduates recruited from the introductory

psychology subject pool participated in the first part of the study. For the second part of the study, a power analysis was conducted to determine desired sample size. For this analysis, the alpha level was set at .05, power was set at .8, and the desired effect size to detect was .5, a medium-sized effect. Based on the power analysis it was determined that the necessary sample size for each experimental group (rape and seduction) was 65. Therefore, an additional group of 130 undergraduates from the subject pool- 97 female and 33 male, were recruited for the second part of the study. Participants in each part received one hour of extra credit for their participation.

Procedures. Participants were recruited to participate in a study about how individuals characterize events, including negative and sexual events. Due to the sensitive nature of the research and the possibility that individuals, in particular females, could be uncomfortable with providing this type of information, certain precautions were taken. Each participant arrived separately and filled-out the questionnaires in a private booth. Each participant was also greeted by a female experimenter, either a graduate student in clinical psychology or an upper-level, trained undergraduate. Participants were also provided with the telephone number of the university counseling center on the consent form they received.

Participants in the first part of the study were randomly assigned to write about either a “typical” rape or seduction (Appendix A). The responses were then coded by two independent raters, the investigator and a trained undergraduate, using a standard coding sheet containing a number of possible rape or seduction-related elements to determine which elements occurred frequently in these scripts. This coding sheet was developed by examining previous research on the topic (e.g. Ryan, 1988) as well as by a preliminary perusal of the scripts. Initial reliability between raters was low due to raters using a liberal interpretation of inclusion, particularly regarding the emotions experienced by the individuals in the scripts. However, adoption of a more stringent coding method where elements were only included if they exactly matched the element on the coding sheet increased reliability to 96%. Any discrepancies were examined by the investigator and resolved through examination of the scripts and, if necessary, conferral with the other coder.

Based on the results from part one of the study, a 51 item questionnaire was then constructed containing a number of elements which could be part of individuals' rape or seduction script (Appendix B). These items consisted of elements that appeared in participants' rape and seduction scripts. As the goal of the study was to identify as many elements of the scripts as possible, elements that appeared in any script in the free-writing tasks were included in the questionnaire. Participants were randomly assigned to either rate how much they felt these elements were part of a "typical" rape or a "typical" seduction on a seven point Likert scale bounded by (1) "not at all" and (7) "completely."

In order to test whether elements were part of participants' scripts, t-tests were conducted to determine if each element was rated significantly above the midpoint in either condition (rape and seduction). Due to the possibility that there may be differences in the script elements of males and females, the responses of both genders were analyzed separately. Those elements which were not rated as significantly above the midpoint in either condition by either gender were considered to not be elements of either script and were dropped from further analyses. Responses were then compared across experimental condition to determine which elements were rape-related (rated significantly more typical of rape), seduction-related (rated significantly more typical of seduction), and ambiguous (not rated significantly more typical of rape or seduction) through the use of t-tests. Gender differences in ratings were also examined.

Results and Discussion

Part one

Based on the responses of participants in the first part of the study, a large pool of potential rape-related, seduction-related, and ambiguous elements was identified. To identify elements most likely to constitute individuals' rape and seduction scripts, those which appeared in at least four scripts, or 16% of the scripts, in either condition were considered to be potential elements. The percentage of scripts which contained these elements are summarized by experimental condition

in Table One.

Examining the elements reveals some differences compared to previous research. For example, there was a lower percentage of scripts involving strangers (20% of rapes and 8% of seductions). However, the relationship between the man and woman in the scenario was generally quite casual with the individuals most often described as acquaintances or having met that night. As expected, there was a great deal of similarity in the two scripts. Both often involved a “hook-up” situation where the man and woman engage in sexual activity after meeting and flirting at a bar or party. Both also involved some consensual activity such as kissing and the man using verbal persuasion to get the woman to leave with him or have sex with him. What appeared to most often differentiate the two scripts was the use of force on the part of the male, resistance on the part of the female and more negative outcomes for the female afterward.

Additionally, binomial tests were conducted to determine which elements appeared in a significantly larger proportion of scripts. For these tests, $p < .01$ was used to correct for the large number of tests conducted. A number of elements were found to occur significantly more frequently in rape scripts: the man using physical force or threats, the woman resisting physically or verbally, the woman feeling afraid, and the man feeling powerful or in control. Notably, most elements were not found to differ significantly in their proportion in either script, though this finding should be interpreted with caution given the small sample size.

Part two

Items in the questionnaire were first examined to determine if they were potential elements of either script. T-tests were conducted separately for male and female participants to determine if each element's mean rating was significantly above the mid-point of the scale (4) using $p < .01$ for females' ratings and $p < .05$ for males' ratings due to the small number of male participants. Those elements that were not rated as significantly above the mid-point in either condition for men or women were dropped from further analyses. It should be noted that women identified

more elements as being a part of either script, particularly in the seduction condition. All elements identified as part of either script by males were also identified by females. Following this process, a total of 19 elements were eliminated as not a significant element of either script for either gender. The means and standard deviations for the remaining elements are summarized in Table Two.

The next step in the analysis was to determine if there were gender differences in the Likert responses to any of the elements in either the rape or seduction conditions. Before conducting these analyses, a Pearson chi-square test was conducted to determine if the experimental design was balanced by gender. This test was non-significant (rape 21.5% male; seduction 29.2% male), ($\chi^2 = 1.02$, ns); thus, there did not appear to be meaningful differences in the proportion of males and females in the rape and seduction conditions.

To test for possible gender differences in rating of elements, 2 x 2 ANOVAS were conducted on each item, with study condition (rape/ seduction) and gender of respondent as between-subject factors. The results of these ANOVAS were generally non-significant in regard to gender. However, for four of the elements there was a gender main effect, specifically, males rated these elements as less characteristic of either script. These elements were: the man ignores the woman afterward, the man tries to persuade the woman to have sex with him, the woman showers afterward, and the man enjoys controlling others. Interestingly, three of these elements relate to the behavior of the man in the rape or seduction. One interpretation of this finding is that men tend to downplay the man's role in rape and seduction and attribute less exploitative motives to his behavior.

While few significant gender differences emerged when conducting the ANOVAS, further examination of the data suggested a tendency for males to rate elements as less characteristic of either rape or seduction relative to females. To determine if this was a significant trend, Wilcoxon sign rank tests were conducted on the data in both conditions. Results indicated a significant trend for males to rate elements as less characteristic of rape, with their ratings being

lower for 21 out of 34 elements, $z = 3.25$, $p < .01$, and seduction, with their ratings being lower for 31 out of 34 elements, $z = 4.83$, $p < .01$, compared to females. While this trend was significant, the pattern of responses appeared to be similar across gender, therefore, data were collapsed across gender for further analyses.

To determine which elements fit into either script, t-tests (using $p < .01$) were then conducted to determine if the mean ratings of the elements were significantly different in the rape and seduction conditions. Elements with a mean rating that was significantly higher in the rape condition were considered to be rape-related elements. Similarly, those with a mean rating that was significantly higher in the seduction condition were considered to be seduction-related elements. Elements where the mean rating was not significantly different in either condition and in both conditions the mean rating was significantly above the mid-point were classified as highly ambiguous elements. Finally, elements where the mean rating was not significantly different in either condition and in only one condition was the mean rating significantly above the mid-point were classified as moderately ambiguous. These results are summarized in Table Three.

Results from both parts of the study illustrate some of the key differences between college students' rape and seduction scripts. In both the free-writing and questionnaire rating tasks, rape was described as more violent and involving more negative outcomes for the woman. Rape was characterized as involving more physical force, resistance, threats, and injury. The woman was described more as feeling depressed, guilty, dirty, losing esteem, and afraid of men after rape. Rape also was viewed as more often involving alcohol use, particularly on the part of the man. Alcohol use, then, may be viewed as a disinhibiting factor- making it more likely that a man would commit rape intentionally or unintentionally. Seduction, on the other hand, was viewed as involving more self-confidence on the part of the male, going to the man's apartment, as well as more of a desire to be liked on the part of the female.

Most importantly, results highlight the featural overlap between rape and seduction. Rape and

seduction were both seen as involving sexually connotative behavior on the part of the woman. These include such behaviors as the woman flirting, drinking, and engaging in consensual kissing. Both scripts also involved the man engaging in behaviors to try to get the woman to have sex with him. These include such behaviors as picking out a particular woman from a crowd, complimenting the woman, and using persuasive techniques to get her to have sex with him. These results also suggest that the true “typical” college rape contains a number of ambiguous elements and thus may be perceived as ambiguous at best. For example, in Koss’s (1988) national survey of college women, she found that about half of the rapes occurred at the woman’s apartment, 55% involved alcohol use on the part of the victim, and an average level of mutual intimacy of petting above the waist.

The results also suggest that the elements of both scripts identified by this study appear to be slightly more representative of females’ rape and seduction scripts than males’ scripts. Several possible explanations for this finding exist. One is that males have somewhat different scripts from females and the questionnaire constructed did not tap the elements of males’ scripts as well due to the small number of males in the first part of the study. It is also possible that males’ scripts may be less well-defined, perhaps because the distinction between rape and seduction is less relevant to males as they most likely do not see themselves as a victim or perpetrator of rape. Another possibility is that males may have been more uncomfortable with the task and thus responded more towards the midpoint of the scale.

Study 2

Overview

The goal of this study was to develop a sexual scenario that was ambiguous in regards to whether it was rape or seduction for use in study 3. Development of such a scenario was necessary to test whether manipulating salience of script affects perception of an ambiguous sexual situation.

Method

Development. The ambiguous scenario was a modified version of one developed by Shotland and Goodstein. This scenario was modified to make it more contemporary as well as to incorporate more seduction-related and ambiguous elements based on the results from study 1. The scenario was then piloted on a small group of undergraduates. Results of this pilot data suggested that the scenario was perceived as more rape-related. Therefore, further modifications were made to the scenario including reducing the level of the female's resistance and adding more ambiguous elements. Following these modifications, the scenario was again piloted on a small group of undergraduates and appeared to be rated as more ambiguous and thus, this version of the scenario was retained for the current study.

Participants. Twenty male and 50 female undergraduates recruited from the introductory psychology subject pool participated in this study; participants received one hour of extra credit for their participation.

Procedures. As in the previous study, participants were recruited to participate in a study about how individuals characterize events, including negative and sexual events. Each participant arrived separately and was seated in a private booth. Each participant was greeted by a female experimenter, either a graduate student in clinical psychology or an upper-level, trained undergraduate.

Participants read an ambiguous scenario (Appendix C) constructed based on the results from study 1 and modeled after Shotland and Goodstein (1992). Participants were asked to make a rating of this scenario on a seven point bipolar scale anchored by rape (1) and seduction (7). As the scenario was intended to be highly ambiguous, its mean rating was expected to be at the midpoint of the scale. To determine if the scenario was viewed as equally ambiguous by both males and females, gender differences in ratings were also examined. Given the sensitive nature of this study, participants were also provided with the telephone number of the university counseling center on the consent form they received.

Results and Discussion

Frequencies of ratings of the scenario are summarized in Table 4. These results show that the majority of participants (62.9%) rated the scenario either at the midpoint or one point above or below the midpoint. To test whether the mean rating of the scenario ($M = 4.0$) differed significantly from the midpoint of the scale (4), a one sample t-test was conducted; it indicated that the mean rating of this scenario was not significantly different from the midpoint, $t = .193$, *ns*. Gender differences were also examined. The mean rating of the scenario for males, ($M = 3.9$), was not significantly different than the mean rating of the scenario for females, ($M = 4.0$), using an independent samples t-test, $t = .46$, *ns*. Additionally, neither males' nor females' ratings of the scenario differed significantly from the midpoint, $t = .271$, *ns*, for males, $t = .418$, *ns*, for females. Therefore, it appears that males and females perceived the ambiguous scenario similarly.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that the scenario is largely perceived as ambiguous. However, the results also suggest that there is some variability in how the scenario is perceived, with 17.1% of participants rating the scenario at the rape end (1 to 3) and 18.5% rating the scenario at the seduction end (5 to 7). This may be due to certain cues in the scenario being more salient than others for some participants. It also could be due to variability in the scripts of participants. For example, for some participants, some resistance on the part of the female could be viewed as part of seduction whereas for others any form of resistance is viewed as non-consent. This variability in perception is important because it suggests that while the scenario is ambiguous, it also can be perceived differently depending on the salience of some of the cues in the scenario. According to script theory, perception of ambiguous stimuli depends greatly on the particular schema invoked in a situation, which affects salience and recall for certain elements of the situation (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). The next step in the investigation was to empirically test if a manipulation of script salience affected perception of the ambiguous scenario developed in the current study.

Study 3

Overview

If indeed individuals have rape and seduction scripts, then the differential salience of these scripts should affect the inferences that individuals make, as has been found in previous schema research. The goal of the final study was to test for the effects of these scripts on perceptions of, and recall for, an ambiguous scenario through manipulation of the salience of these scripts. In this study, salience was manipulated by labeling the scenario from study 2 as being about either a rape or seduction.

It was expected that individuals whose rape script was primed by the scenario label would rate the characters in the scenario as higher on rape-related thoughts and actions and lower on seduction-related thoughts and actions, as defined by the results of study one, compared to individuals whose seduction script was primed. Conversely, it was expected that individuals whose seduction script was primed would rate the characters as higher on seduction-related thoughts and actions and lower on rape-related thoughts and actions. In addition, it was expected that salience would affect recall. Individuals whose rape script was primed were expected to recall more rape-related and less seduction-related details and individuals whose seduction script was primed were expected to show the opposite pattern.

Method

Participants. Fifty-eight female and 27 male undergraduates were recruited from the introductory subject pool; each received 1 hour of extra credit.

Procedures. As in the previous studies, participants were recruited to participate in a study about how individuals characterize events, including negative sexual events. Each participant arrived separately and was seated in a private booth. Each participant was greeted by a single experimenter, either a graduate student in clinical psychology or an upper-level, trained undergraduate, either female, 66%, or male, 34%. Participants were also questioned regarding

their emotional state following the study and were provided with information about the university counseling center following their participation.

Participants were instructed to read the ambiguous scenario from study two one time. Script salience was manipulated by the instructions preceding the scenario. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. In the rape condition, instructions asked participants to read the following scenario about a rape and in the seduction condition, instructions asked participants to read the following scenario about a seduction. Scenarios were placed in sealed envelopes to ensure that the experimenter was blind to experimental condition.

After reading the scenario, participants were given fifteen minutes to complete several measures regarding the scenario as well as to recall as many details as they could remember from the scenario. They were first asked to rate the scenario as rape or seduction using the same seven-point bipolar scale as in study two anchored by rape (1) and seduction (7). They were also asked to make a number of inference ratings about “Diane” and “Lee’s” thoughts and behaviors on a seven point Likert scale anchored by “not at all”(1) and “completely” (7) (see Appendix D). For example, they were asked to rate how dirty Diane felt afterward. Several of these thoughts and behaviors were more rape-related and some were more seduction-related based on the results from study one. Finally, to assess participants’ recall for the scenario, they were asked to recall as many details as possible from the scenario on a sheet of lined paper, placing one detail from the scenario per line.

Recall details were coded by the primary investigator, as well as a trained undergraduate, using a standard coding sheet containing 28 elements from the ambiguous scenario as well as two elements that represented distortions of the female characters’ level of resistance. These details are listed in Appendix E. The distortion details were included as they occurred often in participants’ recall and because they were regarded as meaningful distortions. Reliability of these ratings were examined and any discrepancies were resolved by the investigator by examination of the recall and, if necessary, conferral with the second coder. Overall reliability of

these ratings was quite high, 92.6%.

Results and Discussion

As this study involved several experimenters as well as an experimental manipulation, a 4 x 2 ANOVA was first conducted with experimenter and experimental condition as factors. Results of this ANOVA were non-significant regarding experimenter and experimenter by condition effects ($F_s < 2$, ns). Therefore, data were collapsed across experimenter for subsequent analyses.

Experimental effects

There was no evidence that participants in the rape ($M = 3.7$) or seduction ($M = 3.3$) conditions differed significantly in their rating of the scenario ($t = 1.20$, $p > .05$). In fact, there was a tendency for participants in the seduction condition to rate the scenario closer to the rape end of the scale as their mean rating was significantly below the midpoint of the scale ($t = 2.67$, $p < .05$). Participants' overall ratings of the scenario were found to be highly variable, with their overall rating of the scenario often being on the opposite side of the scale than the experimental condition to which they had been assigned (Table 5). The overall rating of the scenario ($M = 3.5$) was significantly below the scale midpoint, $t = 2.739$, $p < .01$ as well as significantly below the mean rating of the scenario in study 2, $t = 2.302$, $p < .05$. This suggests that the script characterization had some effect on participants' ratings of the scenario, even if it was not the intended effect. Also of note, few participants in either condition rated the scenario toward the extreme seduction end of the scale, which suggests that participants in the seduction condition's ratings of the scenario were not strongly influenced by the label. It also suggests that participants in the rape condition were not showing a strong contrast effect (ie. reacting strongly against the primed script). Finally, no participants in the seduction condition rated the scenario as ambiguous (4) which suggests that participants in this condition either assimilated to the label or showed a strong contrast effect to the label.

Next, participants' inference ratings (e.g. how depressed did they view the female character as feeling afterward) across condition were examined. It was found that participants in the seduction condition rated the male character as significantly more self-confident than participants in the rape condition, $t = 2.35$, $p < .05$. This difference was in the direction predicted, as self-confidence on the part of the man was found in study one to be a seduction-related detail. No other significant differences were found for the inference ratings.

Next, differences in recall of details of the scenario across condition were assessed using binomial tests (set at $p < .01$ due to the large number of tests conducted). Few significant differences in recall emerged. Participants in the rape condition were significantly less likely to recall that the characters had met the night before at a party (70% vs. 95%) and were significantly more likely to recall the female saying okay to the male following his reassurance (47% vs. 19%). Additionally, the proportion of participants recalling two other details approached significance at the more lenient standard of $p < .05$. Specifically, participants in the seduction condition were more likely to recall the date context of the scenario (100% vs. 91%) and participants in the rape condition were more likely to recall that the male removed the female character's underwear, a nonconsensual activity (37% vs. 19%). It should be noted that several of these effects were in the opposite direction as to what would have been predicted based on earlier studies and previous research. For example, given research suggesting that rape is regarded as less serious if it involves a steady dating partner as opposed to a first date (Bridges, 1991), it was expected that participants in the rape condition would be more likely to recall the fact that they had just met the night before and were therefore on a first date. It also was predicted that Diane saying okay, which could be interpreted as consent to intercourse, would be more likely to be recalled by participants in the seduction condition.

Examining the overall results suggest that the priming manipulation had little effect on participants' perception of the ambiguous scenario. In fact, some results were in the opposite direction from predictions based on earlier studies and previous research. One possible explanation for these findings is that a number of participants were showing a contrast, as

opposed to an assimilation effect, for the primed script. This effect appeared to be particularly strong for participants in the seduction condition, perhaps because more of the rape-related details were near the end of the scenario, which could have led to a recency effect. The possibility that participants may have been showing a contrast effect is also more likely given that the prime was presented at a conscious level. Previous research in social cognition has shown that contrast effects in judgment are more likely if a prime is conscious, with some suggesting that a conscious prime leads to more flexibility in processing such that some individuals will assimilate, some will show no effect, and some will show a contrast effect to the prime (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Lombardi, Higgins, & Bargh, 1987). Based on the possibility that such effects may have occurred in the current study, several internal analyses were performed to look at differences among individuals who showed an assimilation as opposed to contrast effect as well as to examine the overall effect of perceiving the scenario as rape or seduction. Such analyses are often used when experimental manipulations are not received as intended. These analyses involve re-classifying participants based on how they received the manipulation, rather than based on their experimental condition. While such analyses can be suggestive, results are correlational in nature as there is no longer random assignment of participants to groups and, thus, there is less basis for making causal inferences.

For the first two analyses, participants were divided into two groups: assimilation and no effect/contrast, based on their rating of the scenario as rape or seduction as compared to the experimental condition to which they had been assigned. Participants in the rape condition who rated the scenario between 1 and 3 were assigned to the assimilation group and participants who rated the scenario 4 or greater were assigned to the no effect/contrast group; participants in the seduction condition who rated the scenario between 5 and 7 were assigned to the assimilation group and participants who rated the scenario as 3 or less were assigned to the contrast group. Table 6 summarizes participants' responses to the inference items across experimental condition as well as assimilation versus contrast group and Table 7 summarizes their recall for the details of the scenario. It should be noted that two participants in the rape condition were excluded from further analysis as they did not rate the scenario as rape or seduction.

Participants' responses were first analyzed across experimental condition to examine the effects of the prime for participants in which the manipulation had the intended effect. If the manipulation was successful at invoking participants' script then this should effect their recall for details of the scenario as well as their inferences about the characters' thoughts and behavior.

Next, participants' who showed an assimilation versus no effect/contrast effect were examined within experimental condition. If the prime was successful at invoking the same script for all participants then it would be expected that there would be few differences in recall of the details of the scenario as priming has been found to affect encoding of information (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). However, if the scenario invoked different scripts for these two groups of participants then there should be differences in the recall of details of the scenario for these two groups.

Finally, participants were grouped according to how they rated the scenario regardless of experimental condition. If participants' rating of the scenario reflected which script was invoked then it would be expected that there would be differences in recall of the scenario between these two groups.

Assimilation effects across conditions

First, the responses of participants who assimilated to the prime were examined across experimental conditions. A total of 20 participants in the rape condition and 15 in the seduction condition assimilated to the primed category. Their responses to the inference items were first examined. It was found that participants in the rape condition rated the female character as feeling significantly more dirty afterward ($t = 2.05, p < .05$). Additionally, participants' ratings of how depressed the female character was afterward approached significance ($t = 1.95, p < .06$), with participants in the rape condition rating the female character as more depressed afterward. No other differences in ratings were significant.

Next, participants' recall of the scenario was compared using binomial tests. None of these details reached significance ($p < .01$), perhaps due to the small number of participants, particularly in the seduction group. However, two details did approach significance ($p < .05$). Specifically, participants in the seduction condition were more likely to recall the male character complimenting the female character (60% vs. 35%) and participants in the rape condition were more likely to distort the female's level of verbal resistance stating that she said no or stop (50% vs. 20%). Finally, for a number of other variables, there were sizable differences in the proportion (15 to 20%) of participants recalling a particular detail in the expected direction. For example, participants in the rape condition were more likely to recall the male character removing the female character's underwear without her consent and were less likely to recall the female character pressing her breasts against the male's body.

Assimilation versus contrast within condition

Next, participants who showed an assimilation versus no effect/ contrast effect were compared within each experimental condition. For the rape condition, the 20 participants who showed an assimilation effect were compared to the 21 participants who showed no effect or a contrast effect. Participants' responses to the inference items were first analyzed. Participants who showed an assimilation effect were found to rate the female as feeling significantly more dirty afterward ($t = 2.02$, $p < .05$). No other significant differences were found for the inference items.

Next, participants' recall for the scenario was compared between groups using binomial tests. It was found that participants who assimilated to the prime were significantly more likely to distort the female character's verbal protests, stating that she said no or stop (50% vs. 4%) ($p < .01$). While no other details reached significance, several details approached significance ($p < .05$). Participants who assimilated to the prime were more likely to mention the date context of the scenario (100% vs. 81%), as well as several male initiated and nonconsensual activities such as the male character unbuttoning the female character's dress and removing her underwear (80% vs 57% and 50% vs 19%), the male character removing his own pants or underwear without the

female's help (40% vs. 9%), and the male character lying on top of the female character without her consent (50% vs. 19%).

Next, the 15 participants who assimilated within the seduction condition were compared to the 27 participants who showed a contrast effect. Participants' responses to the inference items were first examined. It was found that individuals who assimilated to the prime rated the female as feeling significantly less dirty afterward ($t = 2.38, p < .05$) and significantly less depressed afterward ($t = 2.14, p < .05$). No other values for the inference items reached significance.

Participants' recall responses were then examined using binomial tests. While none of these values reached conventional levels of significance, perhaps due to the small number of participants who showed an assimilation effect, several approached significance in the expected direction ($p < .05$). For example, participants who assimilated to the prime were less likely to mention that the characters had just met (87% vs. 100%) and less likely to mention alcohol use (73% vs. 96%), which was found to be a rape-related detail in study one. However, they were more likely to mention several consensual and sexually connotative activities, such as the characters making eye contact and looking away (47% vs. 22%), the male character complimenting the female character (60% vs. 33%), the characters engaging in open mouth/French kissing (67% vs. 22%), and the female character unbuttoning the male character's shirt (53% vs. 30%).

Characterization effects

Finally, the 47 participants who characterized the scenario as rape were compared to the 36 participants who did not characterize the scenario as rape, that is as seduction or ambiguous. Table 8 summarizes participants' responses to the inference items across characterization groups and Table 9 summarizes their recall for the details of the scenario.

For the inference items, participants who characterized the scenario as rape were found to rate the

female character as feeling significantly more dirty afterward compared to participants who did not characterize the scenario as rape ($t = 3.14$, $p < .05$). Participants who characterized the scenario as rape were also found to rate the female character as feeling significantly more depressed afterward compared to participants who did not characterize the scenario as rape ($t = 2.38$, $p < .05$).

Binomial tests were then conducted comparing the recall of participants who characterized the scenario as rape to those who did not characterize the scenario as rape. Several details were found to differ significantly based on participants' characterization of the scenario. Specifically, participants who characterized the scenario as rape were significantly more likely to recall the date context of the scenario (100% vs. 89%), that the characters had just met the night before (91% vs 72%) and alcohol use by the characters in the scenario (91% vs 72%) ($p < .01$). Several other details also approached significance across characterizations ($p < .05$). Specifically, participants who characterized the scenario as rape were less likely to mention that the characters engaged in open mouth/French kissing, a consensual activity (38% vs 61%), more likely to distort the female characters' level of verbal protest stating that she said no or stop (32% vs 11%), and less likely to recall that the female character said okay, implying consent to intercourse (23% vs 44%).

Gender analyses

To test for possible gender effects, 2 x 2 ANOVAS were conducted on participants' rating of the scenario and inferences about the characters in the scenario with experimental condition and gender as factors. For the rating of the scenario as rape or seduction as well as the inference ratings, there were no significant gender main effects or interactions.

Chi-square tests of association were then conducted on the proportion of details recalled from the scenario by males and females in both experimental conditions. Only one of these tests reached significance, using $p < .01$ due to the large number of tests conducted. Specifically, a

significantly higher proportion of males (25% vs 0%) in the rape condition recalled mentioning of the male character's confidence ($\chi^2 = 8.33$, $p < .01$). In addition, recall of several other details approached significance ($p < .05$). A smaller proportion of males in the rape condition recalled the physical size of the male character (33% vs 71%) and that the characters had intercourse (58% vs 87%). However, a larger proportion of males recalled that the male character got on top of the female character (58% vs 26%). In the seduction condition, a larger proportion of males recalled the male character stroking the woman's shoulder (53% vs 19%), the characters engaging in open mouth/French kissing (67% vs 30%), and the male character stroking the female characters' thighs or genitals (80% vs 41%). However, they were also less likely to recall the female character saying okay, implying consent to intercourse (0% vs 30%). While these results are difficult to interpret, they seem to suggest that less rape-related details were recalled by males in the rape condition- i.e. intercourse and the large size differential of the male and female characters. Males in the rape condition were also significantly more likely to recall a seduction-related detail, the male character's confidence. Males in the seduction condition seemed more likely to recall details related to the physical/ sexual activities of the characters in the scenario and less likely to recall details related to the verbal activities of the characters.

General Discussion

Similarities and Differences between rape and seduction

Results of these studies illustrate that for most college students there are differences between rape and seduction. Rape is conceptualized as a more violent act involving physical force and threats on the part of the male, physical and verbal resistance on the part of the female, as well as injury to the female. It should be noted that these are exactly the elements that previous research has shown to differentiate acknowledged from unacknowledged rape. Additionally, rape is seen as involving more negative outcomes for the woman such as the woman feeling depressed, dirty, losing self-esteem, and being afraid of men. In contrast, seduction is viewed as involving more neutral or unclear outcomes for the woman, and, in some cases, positive outcomes for the

woman. This is consistent with Lewin's (1985) finding that many women would feel pleased following hypothetical unwanted, or coerced, intercourse. Rape also is viewed as more likely to involve alcohol use on the part of the man. This suggests that students may view alcohol as a disinhibiting factor for rape. Seduction, on the other hand, is viewed as involving such factors as going to the man's apartment, a high level of self-confidence on the part of a male, and a desire to be liked on the part of the female. It is obvious how the combination of these variables make it much more likely that the female would agree to have intercourse with the male, whether she truly desired it or not.

Most important to the current investigation are those variables which were rated as ambiguous by college students. These variables seemed to fall into two categories: sexually connotative behaviors on the part of the female and coercive/persuasive behaviors on the part of the male. These include such behaviors as the woman flirting with the man, consenting to kissing the man and the man complimenting the woman and using verbal persuasion to get her to have sex with him. Again, these variables are often present in unacknowledged rape as well as dates involving sexual aggression (Koss, 1985; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

The effects of priming on perceptions

While examining participants' overall responses to the priming manipulation used in the final study suggests little role of script salience in participants' interpretation of and recall for an ambiguous sexual scenario, breaking participants into assimilation and contrast groups reveals that script salience may indeed affect interpretation. Among participants who assimilated to the prime, those in the rape condition saw the event causing more negative outcomes for the woman afterward (i.e. feeling dirty or depressed). Additionally, they were more likely to recall a detail related to non-consensual activity- the male character removing the female character's underwear and to distort the level of the female characters' verbal resistance. In contrast, participants in the seduction condition who assimilated to the prime were more likely to recall the male character complimenting the female character and the female character pressing her breasts against the

male's body. This suggests that among those who assimilated, the prime did affect participants' encoding of the scenario. However, these results must be interpreted with caution given the lack of random assignment of participants to groups. For example, one possibility is that participants' recall of the scenario affected how they characterized the scenario.

Additionally, there were significant differences in recall between participants who characterized the scenario as rape as opposed to those who characterized it not as rape, both comparing those within experimental condition and the sample overall. This suggests that for these two groups, different scripts were invoked which affected their encoding of the scenario. This further suggests that there was flexibility in the script which was invoked among participants as the priming was at the conscious level (Lombardi, Higgins, & Bargh, 1987). However, as these data are correlational in nature there are other possible interpretations, for example, it is possible that participants intentionally distorted their recall to match their characterization of the scenario or that their recall of the scenario affected their characterization of the scenario as rape or seduction.

Weaknesses of current research and future directions

It is ironic that the use of a strong manipulation which was expected to produce large effects, actually produced very weak effects. In retrospect, however, this finding is not entirely unexpected given the use of an obvious, conscious prime to manipulate script salience. Previous research has shown that perceiving a prime at a conscious level leads to more flexible processing of the prime where some individuals assimilate to the prime and others do not assimilate, or show a contrast effect (Lombardi, Higgins, & Bargh, 1987). This appears especially likely given the subject matter of the experiment.

As the manipulation of script salience employed in the present research was not highly successful at invoking participants' rape and seduction scripts, this suggests that future research should employ a more subtle manipulation of script salience to more definitively determine if salience affects perception of ambiguous sexual events. Just such a study is currently being

conducted by the investigator. In this study, script salience is manipulated through use of a Stroop task where 25% of the words in this task are either related to rape or seduction. Following completing this Stroop task, participants are then asked to read the ambiguous scenario and complete the same measure as in the less subtle manipulation of salience.

The studies also involved a fairly homogenous sample. Participants were mainly Caucasian, female college students and it is unclear whether the scripts of the individuals in the current sample would generalize to other age groups or ethnicities. Expansion of this research to other ethnicities appears essential given the wide range of rape prevalence among different ethnic groups. For example, while 7% of Asian women reported being the victim of rape, 40% of Native American reported being victimized (Koss, 1988). Whether such ethnic differences are due to differences in individuals' scripts regarding what types of behavior constitute rape should be explored. Additionally, research among younger men and women also appears essential. On average, women report being a victim of rape at the age of 18 (Koss, 1985). One possibility is that individuals of this age have less differentiated rape and seduction scripts, making women more vulnerable to rape and men more likely to perpetrate rape. For example, women with less differentiated scripts may be less able to recognize rape-related cues in a situation, more confused regarding the motives of the male's behavior as well as the appropriateness of his behavior, and have more positive expectations regarding engaging in unwanted intercourse. Additionally, having less differentiated scripts has clear implications regarding the sexually aggressive behavior of males. Men with less differentiated scripts may regard sexually aggressive behavior as more appropriate as well as interpret the woman's behavior as more sexually connotative.

While the current studies focused on the role of cognitive factors in rape acknowledgment, future research should also focus on the motivational component of rape acknowledgment. Specifically, this research should focus on whether not acknowledging rape has an adaptive function. One possible function of unacknowledged rape is that it may protect women from stigmatization by peers and secondary victimization by the medical and justice systems. Not

acknowledging rape may also reduce self-blame and negative affect associated with the attack. Additionally, not acknowledging rape may be a temporary coping strategy which women employ when they do not have the resources to deal effectively with the event. However, most research suggests that not acknowledging rape is not adaptive. For example, not acknowledging rape may place women at risk for being victimized again by continued contact with the perpetrator (Koss, 1988) as well as by preventing script change regarding what constitutes rape (Kahn, Mathie, and Torgler, 1994). There is also evidence that not acknowledging rape negatively impacts a woman's psychological health (Botta & Pingree, 1997), perhaps by preventing her from seeking out assistance in coping with the attack or by preventing the woman from consciously allocating coping resources to cope with the attack.

Social factors of rape acknowledgment should also be explored. It is possible that women may not acknowledge rape due to a perceived lack of social acceptance for her interpretation of her experience as rape. There is certainly a great deal of evidence illustrating that similar situational factors affect the attributions made by non-victims about rape and rape acknowledgment.

Women may also choose not to acknowledge the rape for fear of negative evaluation by others regarding their experience. For example, Pitts and Schwartz (1997) found that women who were blamed for the rape by the individual to whom they disclosed the assault remained unacknowledged. Finally, women who are confused regarding whether their experience was rape or not may use others as a gauge for labeling the experience and may internalize the beliefs of others that her experience was not rape.

Returning to script theory, if future research supports the role of scripts in affecting perceptions of ambiguous sexual situations, then future research should focus on altering the scripts of young men and women in an effort to reduce the incidence of rape as well as reduce the number of unacknowledged victims. Specifically, such efforts could focus on altering individuals' perceptions that a woman engaging in potentially sexually connotative behaviors means that she wants intercourse or should expect the man she is interacting with to press for intercourse. Additionally, such efforts could focus on changing students' ideas that sexual coercion is

acceptable behavior on the part of males and that being the victim of sexual coercion does not lead to negative outcomes for the woman.

References

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behaviors. Do males misperceive females' friendliness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *42*, 830-838.
- Acock, A. C. & Ireland, N. K. (1983). Attribution of blame in rape cases: The impact of norm violation, gender, and sex-role attitude. Sex Roles, *9*, 179-193.
- Arata, C. M., & Burkhart, B. R. (1995). Post-traumatic stress disorder among college student victims of acquaintance assault. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, *8*, 79-92.
- Arata, C. M., & Burkhart, B. R. (1998). Coping appraisals and adjustment to nonstranger sexual assault. Violence Against Women, *4*, 224-239.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. Psychological Bulletin, *112*, 461-484.
- Bargh, J. A., Lombardi, W. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1988). Automaticity of chronically accessible constructs in person x situation effects on person perception: It's just a matter of time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *55*, 599-605.
- Bargh, J. A. & Pietromonaco, P. (1982). Automatic information processing and social perception: The influence of trait information presented outside of conscious awareness on impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *43*, 437-449.
- Bell, S. T., Kuriloff, P. J., Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, race, identification, and students' social perceptions of rape victims. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *24*, 1719-1734.
- Botta, R. A. & Pingree, S. (1997). Interpersonal communication and rape: Women acknowledge their assaults. Journal of Health Communication, *2*, 197-212.
- Bower, G. H. (1981). Emotional mood and memory. American Psychologist, *36*, 129-148.
- Bridges, J. S. (1991). Perceptions of date and stranger rape: A difference in sex role expectations and rape-supportive beliefs. Sex Roles, *24*, 291-307.
- Bridges, J. S. & McGrail, C. A. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for date and

stranger rape. Sex Roles, *21*, 273-286.

Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *38*, 217-230.

Burt, M. & Albin, R. S. (1981). Rape myths, rape definitions, and probability of conviction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *11*, 212-230.

Demorest, A. P. (1995). The personal script as a unit of analysis for the study of personality. Journal of Personality, *63*, 569-591.

Erdley, C. A., & D'Agostino, P. R. (1988). Cognitive and affective components of automatic priming effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *54*, 741-747.

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social Cognition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Frazier, P. A. (1990). Victim attributions and post-rape trauma. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *59*, 298-304.

Freetly, A. J. H. & Kane, E. W. (1995). Men's and women's perceptions of non-consensual sexual intercourse. Sex Roles, *33*, 785-802.

Gerdes, E. P., Dammann, E. J., & Heilig, K. E. (1988). Perceptions of rape victims and assailants: Effects of physical attractiveness, acquaintance, and subject gender. Sex Roles, *19*, 141-153.

Grant, J. M., Folger, W. A., & Hornak, N.J. (1995). College students' perception of victim responsibility in an acquaintance rape situation. College Student Journal, *29*, 532-535.

Hammock, G. S. & Richardson, D. R. (1997). Perceptions of rape: The influence of closeness of relationship, intoxication, and sex of participant. Violence and Victims, *12*, 237-246.

Hannon, R., Kuntz, T., Van Laar, S., Williams, J., & Hall, D. S. (1996). College students' judgments regarding sexual aggression during a date. Sex Roles, *35*, 765-780.

Heaven, P. C. L., Connors, J., & Pretorius, A. (1998). Victim characteristics and attributions of blame in Australia and South Africa. The Journal of Social Psychology, *138*, 131-133.

Higgins, E. T., Bargh, J. A., & Lombardi, W. (1985). The nature of priming effects on categorization. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, *11*, 59-

69.

Higgins, E. T., Rholes, W. S., & Jones, C. R. (1977). Category accessibility and impression formation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *13*, 141-154.

Howells, K., Shaw, F., Greasley, M., Robertson, J., Gloster, D., & Metcalfe, N. (1984). Perceptions of rape in a British sample: Effects of relationship, victim status, sex, and attitudes to women. British Journal of Social Psychology, *23*, 35-40.

Jenkins, M. J. & Dambrot, F. H. (1987). The attribution of date rape: Observer's attitudes and sexual experiences and the dating situation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *17*, 875-, 895.

Johnson, J. D. & Jackson, L. A. (1988). Assessing the effects of factors that might underlie the differential perception of acquaintance and stranger rape. Sex Roles, *19*, 37-45.

Kahn, A., Gilbert, L. A., Latta, M., Deutsch, C., Hagen, R., Hill, M., McGaughey, T., Ryen, A. H., & Wilson, D. W. (1977). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim: A failure to replicate or extend. Representative Research in Social Psychology, *8*, 98-107.

Kahn, A. S., Mathie, V. A., & Torgler, C. (1994). Rape scripts and rape acknowledgment. Psychology of Women Quarterly, *18*, 53-66.

Kanekar, S. & Seksaria, V. (1993). Acquaintance versus stranger rape: Testing the ambiguity reduction hypothesis. European Journal of Social Psychology, *23*, 485-494.

Kanekar, S., Shaherwalla, A., Franco, B., Kunju, T., & Pinto, A. J. (1991). The acquaintance predicament of a rape victim. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *21*, 1524-1544.

Kopper, B. A. (1996). Gender, gender identity, rape myth acceptance, and time of initial resistance on the perception of acquaintance rape blame and avoidability. Sex Roles, *34*, 81-93.

Koss, M. P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, *9*, 193-212.

Koss, M. P. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In A. W. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and Sexual Assault II (pp. 2-25). New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc.

Kowalski, R. M. (1992). Nonverbal behaviors and perceptions of sexual intentions: Effects of sexual connotativeness, verbal response, and rape outcome. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, *13*, 427-445.

Krahe, B. (1988). Victim and observer characteristics as determinants of responsibility attributions to victims of rape. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *18*, 50-58.

Krahe, B. (1991). Police officers' definitions of rape: A prototype study. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, *1*, 223-244.

Krulewitz, J. E. & Nash, J. E. (1978). Effects of rape victim resistance, assault outcome, and sex of observer on attributions about rape. Journal of Personality, *47*, 558-574.

Layman, M. J., Gidycz, C. A., & Lynn, S. J. (1996). Unacknowledged versus acknowledged rape victims: Situational factors and posttraumatic stress. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, *105*, 124-131.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Lewin, M. (1985). Unwanted intercourse: The difficulty of saying no. Psychology of Women Quarterly, *9*, 184-192.

Lombardi, W. J., Higgins, E. T., & Bargh, J. A. (1987). The role of consciousness in priming effects on categorization: Assimilation versus contrast as a function of awareness of the priming task. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *13*, 411-429.

Luginbuhl, J. & Mullin, C. (1981). Rape and responsibility: How and how much is the victim blamed. Sex Roles, *7*, 547-559.

McKenzie-Mohr, D., & Zanna, M. P. (1990). Treating women as sexual objects: Look to the (gender schematic) male who has viewed pornography. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *16*, 296-308.

McNally, R. J., Amir, N., & Lipke, H. J. (1996). Subliminal processing of threat cues in posttraumatic stress disorder? Journal of Anxiety Disorders, *10*, 115-128.

Muehlenhard, C. L. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, *6*, 20-37.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Friedman, D. E., & Thomas, C. M. (1985). Is date rape justifiable?

The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women.

Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 297-310.

Muehlenhard, C. L. & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 186-196.

Norris, J. & Cubbins, L. A. (1992). Dating, drinking, and rape: Effects of victim's and assailant's alcohol consumption on judgments of their behavior and traits. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 179-191.

Pitts, V. L., & Schwartz, M. D. (1997). Self-blame in hidden rape cases. In Schwartz, M. D. (Ed.), Researching Sexual Violence Against Women: Methodological and Personal Perspectives (pp. 65-73). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Proite, R., Dannells, M., & Benton, S. L. (1993). Gender, sex-role stereotypes, and the attribution of responsibility for date and acquaintance rape. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 411-417.

Richardson, D. & Campbell, J. L. (1982). Alcohol and rape: The effect of alcohol on attributions of blame for rape. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 468-476.

Ryan, K. M. (1988). Rape and seduction scripts. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 237-245.

Sawchuk, C. N., Lohr, J. M., Lee, T. C., & Tolin, D. F. (1999). Exposure to disgust-evoking imagery and information processing biases in blood-injection-injury phobia. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 37, 249-257.

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schuller, R. A. & Wall, A. (1998). The effects of defendant and complainant intoxication on mock jurors' judgments of sexual assault. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22, 555-573.

Schwartz, M. D. & Legett, M. S. (1999). Bad dates or emotional trauma? The aftermath of campus sexual assault. Violence Against Women, 5, 251-271.

Selby, J. W., Calhoun, L. G., & Brock, T. A. (1977). Sex differences in the social perception of rape victims. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 412-415.

Sheldon-Keller, A., Lloyd-McGarvey, E., West, M., & Canterbury, R. J. (1994).

Attachment and assessment of blame in date rape scenarios. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 22, 313-318.

Shotland, R. L. & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46, 220-232.

Shotland, R. L. & Goodstein, L. (1992). Of sexual refusal: An examination of attributions concerning date rape and consensual sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 756-764.

Simonson, K. & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionalism and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles*, 40, 617-634.

Snell, W. E. & Godwin, L. (1993). Social reactions to depictions of causal and steady acquaintance rape: The impact of AIDS exposure and stereotypic beliefs about women. *Sex Roles*, 29, 599-616.

Stormo, K. J., Lang, A. R., & Stritzke, W. G. K. (1997). Attributions about acquaintance rape: The role of alcohol and individual differences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 279-305.

Syzmanski, L. A., Devlin, A. S., Chrisler, J. C., & Vyse, S. A. (1993). Gender role and attitudes toward rape in male and female college students. *Sex Roles*, 29, 37-57.

Tetreault, P. A., & Barnett, M. A. (1987). Reactions to stranger and acquaintance rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 353-358.

Willis, C. E. (1992). The effect of sex role stereotype, victim and defendant race, and prior relationship on rape culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, 26, 213-225.

Willis, C. E. & Wrightsman, L. S. (1995). Effects of victim gaze behavior and prior relationship on rape culpability attributions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 367-377.

Zadney, J., & Gerard, H. B. (1974). Attributed intentions and informational selectivity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 34-52.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my advisor Dr. Danny Axsom for all of his invaluable assistance in the development and implementation of this program of study. I would also like to acknowledge the members of my committee, Dr. George Clum and Dr. Robert Stephens for their assistance and ideas regarding this research. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance and support provided by my husband, Mr. Fred Anthony Miller who never lost faith in me.

Table 1

Percentage of Rape and Seduction Scripts Containing Particular Elements in Free-Writing Task

Element	Rape	Seduction
The man and woman are strangers	20%	8%
The man and woman are acquaintances	44%	36%
The man and woman just met at a bar/party	28%	48%
The event occurs in an apartment/home	32%	32%
The event occurs at a party/bar	52%	32%
The event occurs on a date	21%	12%
The man and woman have sex again	0%	16%
The man stalks/picks out the woman from a crowd	24%	20%
The woman dresses in sexy clothing	24%	24%
The event involves alcohol use	64%	32%
The event involves drug use	20%	8%
The man persuades the woman to leave with him/ have sex with him	24%	32%
The man compliments the woman	12%	32%
The man and woman engage in consensual kissing	36%	40%
The woman flirts with the man	16%	36%
The man uses physical force	72%*	4%*
The man threatens the woman	20%*	0%*
The woman resists the man's advances verbally	52%*	0%*
The woman resists the man's advances physically	36%*	0%*
The woman is physically injured	24%*	4%*
The woman is vulnerable	12%	20%
The woman is scared of the man	48%*	8%*
The woman showers afterward	16%	0%
The woman calls the police afterward	16%	4%
The woman tells her friends about the event	32%	0%
The woman feels guilty afterward	20%	8%
The woman feels dirty afterward	20%	8%
The woman is afraid of/ dislikes men afterward	28%	4%
The man feels powerful/ in control	32%	4%
The woman feels confident/powerful	0%	16%

* $p < .01$

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings in the Rape and Seduction Conditions

Element	Rape		Seduction	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
The man has been drinking	5.22*	1.22	4.42*	1.69
The woman resists the man ' s advances, at least at first	5.38*	1.50	4.43*	1.59
The woman feels guilty afterward	5.85*	1.59	4.58*	1.65
The man uses physical force to get what he wants	6.26*	0.96	3.86*	2.30
The man manipulates the woman	5.74*	1.30	5.00*	1.60
The woman feels manipulated/used	6.69*	0.53	4.65*	1.89
The woman feels dirty	6.71*	0.61	4.42*	1.90
The man ignores the woman afterward	5.26*	1.64	4.31*	1.63
The woman distrusts men afterward	6.09*	1.13	3.88*	1.96
The man enjoys controlling others	5.98*	1.27	4.65*	1.83
The woman is afraid of the man	6.31*	0.85	4.09*	2.15
The woman is ashamed afterward	6.49*	1.05	4.34*	1.94
The woman is depressed afterward	6.06*	1.51	4.35*	2.13
The woman loses self-esteem afterward	6.38*	0.90	4.11*	1.86
The woman is vulnerable	5.78*	1.37	4.40*	1.68
The woman is physically injured	5.51*	1.35	2.98*	1.93
The woman showers afterward	6.06*	1.33	4.75*	1.98
The man threatens the woman	5.48*	1.38	3.43*	2.13
The woman does not tell anyone about the event	4.74*	1.54	3.92*	1.90
They go to the man ' s apartment	4.44*	1.40	5.17*	1.42
The man is self-confident	4.11*	1.91	5.08*	1.64
The woman wants the man to like her	4.18*	1.74	5.00*	1.33
The woman dresses in sexy clothing	4.58*	1.55	5.45*	1.29
The man and woman have sex afterward	1.94*	1.30	4.60*	1.84
The man picks the woman out from a crowd	4.48	1.46	4.52	1.58
The man tries to persuade the woman to have sex with him	5.40	1.52	5.31	1.54
The woman has been drinking	5.17	1.39	4.69	1.60
The man compliments the woman	4.32	2.02	4.89	1.75
The woman acts flirtatiously	4.42	1.44	5.02	1.41
The woman consents to kissing the man	4.35	1.56	5.03	1.55
They go to the woman ' s apartment	4.22	1.69	4.66	1.51
The woman tells her friends about the event	3.80	1.86	4.63	1.82

*p < .01

Table 3

Breakdown of Rape and Seduction-Related Elements into Rape-Related, Seduction-Related, Highly Ambiguous, and Moderately Ambiguous Categories

Category	Elements
Rape-related	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The man has been drinking The woman resists the man ' s advances, at least at first The woman feels guilty afterward The man uses physical force to get what he wants The man manipulates the woman The woman feels manipulated/used The woman feels dirty The woman distrusts men afterward The man enjoys controlling others The woman is afraid of the man The woman is ashamed afterward The woman is depressed afterward The woman loses self-esteem afterward The woman is vulnerable The woman is physically injured The woman showers afterward The man threatens the woman The woman does not tell anyone about the event The man ignores the woman afterward
Seduction-related	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They go to the man ' s apartment The man is self-confident The woman wants the man to like her The woman dresses in sexy clothing The man and woman have sex afterward
Highly-ambiguous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The man tries to persuade the woman to have sex with him
Moderately-ambiguous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The woman has been drinking The man picks the woman out from a crowd The man compliments the woman The woman acts flirtatiously The woman consents to kissing the man They go to the woman ' s apartment The woman tells her friends about the event

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Ratings of the Ambiguous Scenario by Males and Females Ranging from Rape (1) to Seduction (7)

Rating	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.0	0	0%	1	2%
2.0	4	20%	7	14%
2.5	0	0%	1	2%
3.0	7	35%	11	22%
4.0	2	10%	8	16%
5.0	3	15%	13	26%
6.0	2	10%	6	12%
7.0	2	10%	3	6%

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage of Ratings of the Ambiguous Scenario Ranging from Rape (1) to Seduction (7) Across Experimental Condition

	Rating	Frequency	Percentage
Rape	1	3	7.0%
	2	5	11.6%
	3	12	27.9%
	4	7	16.3%
	5	10	23.3%
	6	2	4.7%
	7	2	4.7%
Seduction	1	5	11.9%
	2	12	28.6%
	3	10	23.8%
	4	0	0.0%
	5	11	26.2%
	6	3	7.1%
	7	1	2.4%

Table 6
Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Inference Items Broken Down by Condition and Assimilation/No Assimilation Groups

Item	Rape				Seduction			
	Assimilate		Contrast		Assimilate		Contrast	
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S. D.
Diane wanted Lee to like her	6.05	0.69	5.76	0.94	5.80	0.77	6.00	1.00
Diane felt dirty afterward	5.55*	1.28	4.76*	1.22	4.60*	1.45	5.56*	1.12
Lee was self-confident	6.15	0.99	6.00	1.55	6.40	0.74	6.67	0.68
Diane felt ashamed afterward	5.40	1.27	5.00	1.14	4.93	1.39	5.48	1.31
Diane dressed in sexy clothing	5.30	1.22	5.05	1.24	5.53	1.13	5.33	1.36
Diane felt depressed afterward	5.15	1.23	4.62	1.40	4.20*	1.66	5.15*	1.20
Lee enjoyed controlling other people	5.40	1.10	5.19	1.03	4.73	1.62	5.44	1.09
Diane showered afterward	5.30	1.22	5.14	1.28	4.80	1.21	5.26	1.35

*p < .05

Table 7

Proportion of Participants Recalling Details from the Scenario by Condition and Assimilation/Contrast Groups

Detail	Rape		Seduction	
	Assimilate	Contrast	Assimilate	Contrast
Lee's physical size	65%	52%	67%	52%
Diane's physical size	50%	38%	60%	48%
Lee's self-confidence	5%	10%	9%	0%
Diane's clothing	80%	86%	93%	81%
Date context	100%*	81%*	100%	100%
Just met at party night before	80%	62%	87%*	100%*
Go to Diane's apartment	95%	95%	93%	96%
Alcohol use/drinking	85%	71%	73%*	96%*
Eye contact and looking away	40%	33%	47%*	22%*
Lee complimenting Diane	35%*	30%	60%*	33%*
Lee stroking Diane's shoulder/ putting his arm around her	30%	14%	33%	30%
Kissing	95%	90%	87%	89%
Open mouth/French kissing	50%	57%	67%*	30%*
Fondling above the waist	50%	52%	67%	59%
Diane unbuttoning Lee's shirt	65%	43%	53%*	30%*
Lee unbuttoning Diane's dress	80%*	57%*	60%	70%
Lee touching Diane's thighs/ genitals	65%	48%	47%	59%
Diane moves Lee's hands/ moves away from him	35%	43%	27%	41%
Diane says she's not sure/too fast	60%	76%	73%	59%
Lee says relax/ don't worry	85%	81%	93%	85%
Lee removes Diane's underwear	50%*	19%*	27%	15%
Lee removes his pants/underwear	40%*	9%*	33%	18%
Lee lays Diane down	15%	14%	13%	3%
Diane says no/stop	50%**	4%**	20%*	18%
Diane pushes Lee away	15%	14%	33%	15%
Diane says okay	35%	57%	27%	15%
Intercourse	75%	81%	93%	85%
Lee gets on top of Diane	50%*	19%*	27%	30%
Diane presses her breasts against Lee	15%	14%	33%	22%
Lee checks himself out in the mirror	20%	29%	20%	37%

*p < .05, ** p < .01

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Inference Items by Characterization of the Scenario as Rape or Seduction/Ambiguous

Item	Rape		Seduction	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Diane wanted Lee to like her	6.02	0.87	5.78	0.87
Diane felt dirty afterward	5.55*	1.18	4.69*	1.31
Lee was self-confident	6.45	0.85	6.17	1.28
Diane felt ashamed afterward	5.45	1.28	4.97	1.23
Diane dressed in sexy clothing	5.32	1.29	5.25	1.20
Diane felt depressed afterward	5.15*	1.20	4.44*	1.50
Lee enjoyed controlling other people	5.43	1.08	5.00	1.31
Diane showered afterward	5.28	1.28	5.00	1.24

* $p < .05$

Table 9

Proportion of Participants Recalling Details from the Scenario Based on Their Characterization of the Scenario as Rape or Seduction/ Ambiguous

Detail	Rape	Seduction
Lee's physical size	57%	58%
Diane's physical size	49%	47%
Lee's self-confidence	2%	8%
Diane's clothing	81%	89%
Date context	100%**	89%**
Just met at party night before	91%**	72%**
Go to Diane's apartment	96%	94%
Alcohol use/drinking	91%**	72%**
Eye contact and looking away	29%	39%
Lee complimenting Diane	34%	44%
Lee stroking Diane's shoulder/ putting his arm around her	30%	22%
Kissing	91%	89%
Open mouth/French kissing	38%*	61%*
Fondling above the waist	55%	58%
Diane unbuttoning Lee's shirt	45%	47%
Lee unbuttoning Diane's dress	74%	58%
Lee touching Diane's thighs/genitals	62%	47%
Diane moves Lee's hands/ moves away from him	38%	36%
Diane says she's not sure/too fast	60%	75%
Lee says relax/ don't worry	85%	86%
Lee removes Diane's underwear	30%	22%
Lee removes his pants/underwear	28%	19%
Lee lays Diane down	8%	14%
Diane says no/stop	32%*	11%*
Diane pushes Lee away	15%	22%
Diane says okay	23%*	44%*
Intercourse	81%	86%
Lee gets on top of Diane	38%	22%
Diane presses her breasts against Lee	19%	22%
Lee checks himself out in the mirror	30%	25%

* p < .05, ** p < .01

Appendix B

For each of the following descriptions, **please rate to what extent you feel it is part of what happens before, during, or after a typical rape.** While we realize that no two rapes are alike, please rate how much each characteristic is part of what you think of when you think about rape. For each item, please circle the *one number* that best reflects your response. Again, your responses will be anonymous, and you should feel free not to complete the task if it makes you uncomfortable, or for any other reason. When completing your answers, assume that the rape involves a male rapist and female rape victim.

Extent characterizes typical rape:

	Not at all	Barely	A little bit	Unsure	Somewhat	Greatly	Completely
1. The man and woman just met at a bar/party	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The man and woman are strangers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The man has been drinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The woman has been drinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The man and woman have had sex before.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The man and woman are in a romantic relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. The woman resists the man's advances, at least at first.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. The man compliments the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. The man is self-confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. The man manipulates the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. The woman feels guilty afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. The man uses physical force to get what he wants.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. The man is not self-confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. The woman feels more attached to the man afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. The man feels guilty afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. The woman feels manipulated/used.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. The woman feels dirty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. The man and woman are on a date.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. The woman acts flirtatiously.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. The woman consents to kissing the man.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. They go to the man's apartment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. They go to the woman's apartment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. The event happens outdoors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. The event happens in a car.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Extent characterizes typical rape:

	Not at all	Barely	A little bit	Unsure	Somewhat	Greatly	Completely
25. The woman wants the man to like her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. The woman dresses in sexy clothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. The man picks out the woman from a crowd.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. The man plans the event in advance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. The man ignores the woman afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The woman tells her friends about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. The woman tells the police about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. The woman distrusts men afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. The woman loses self-esteem afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. The woman is vulnerable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. The man and woman have sex afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. The man tries to persuade the woman to have sex with him.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. The woman is physically injured.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. The woman feels happy afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. The woman showers afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. The woman goes to the hospital afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. The man enjoys controlling others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. The woman is afraid of the man.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. The woman is ashamed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. The man goes to jail.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. The woman denies what happened.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. The woman is depressed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. The man calls the woman afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. The man threatens the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. The woman wants to resist the man's advances but does not.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. The woman feels powerful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. The woman does not tell anyone about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

For each of the following descriptions, **please rate to what extent you feel it is part of what happens before, during, or after a typical seduction.** While we realize that no two seductions are alike, please rate how much each characteristic is part of what you think of when you think about seduction. For each item, please circle the *one number* that best reflects your response. Again, your responses will be anonymous, and you should feel free not to complete the task if it makes you uncomfortable, or for any other reason. When completing your answers, assume that the seduction involves a male seducing a female.

Extent characterizes typical seduction:

	Not at all	Barely	A little bit	Unsure	Somewhat	Greatly	Completely
1. The man and woman just met at a bar/party	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The man and woman are strangers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The man has been drinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The woman has been drinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The man and woman have had sex before.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The man and woman are in a romantic relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. The woman resists the man's advances, at least at first.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. The man compliments the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. The man is self-confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. The man manipulates the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. The woman feels guilty afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. The man uses physical force to get what he wants.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. The man is not self-confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. The woman feels more attached to the man afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. The man feels guilty afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. The woman feels manipulated/used.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. The woman feels dirty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. The man and woman are on a date.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. The woman acts flirtatiously.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. The woman consents to kissing the man.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. They go to the man's apartment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. They go to the woman's apartment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. The event happens outdoors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. The event happens in a car.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Extent characterizes *typical* seduction:

	Not at all	Barely	A little bit	Unsure	Somewhat	Greatly	Completely
25. The woman wants the man to like her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. The woman dresses in sexy clothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. The man picks out the woman from a crowd.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. The man plans the event in advance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. The man ignores the woman afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The woman tells her friends about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. The woman tells the police about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. The woman distrusts men afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. The woman loses self-esteem afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. The woman is vulnerable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. The man and woman have sex afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. The man tries to persuade the woman to have sex with him.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. The woman is physically injured.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. The woman feels happy afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. The woman showers afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. The woman goes to the hospital afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. The man enjoys controlling others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. The woman is afraid of the man.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. The woman is ashamed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. The man goes to jail.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. The woman denies what happened.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. The woman is depressed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. The man calls the woman afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. The man threatens the woman.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. The woman wants to resist the man's advances but does not.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. The woman feels powerful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. The woman does not tell anyone about the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix C

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Lee walked into the lobby of the Creighton Hill Apartments and picked up the house phone. He buzzed Diane's apartment. When she answered, he told her he was waiting for her downstairs to take her to the movie. While waiting, he checked himself in the mirror. His 5 foot, 10 inch, 160 pound frame fit well into the polo shirt and khakis he had donned for the occasion. Overall, Lee felt confident in himself. Diane walked down the steps and over to Lee. Lee smiled and said he really liked the short, green dress she was wearing. She was only 5 feet, 2 inches, small in relation to Lee.

Diane and Lee, both juniors in college, had met the night before at a party and had decided to go out on a date.

As they walked to the car, Diane mentioned a particular movie she'd wanted to see for a long time. As they drove to the theater they talked about their mutual friends and the party last night. After parking the car, they waited in line, making small talk until the ticket window opened. Lee bought the tickets and they went inside. They were spellbound by the movie; neither talked until the film was over. After the movie, Diane suggested that they go back to her apartment where they could listen to music, have a drink, and talk. Lee agreed.

When they got to her apartment, Diane put on a CD and made a drink for both of them. They sat on the couch for a while, listening to music and talking. As they were talking, their eyes would meet and then both would quickly look away. Lee told Diane how beautiful she looked and Diane smiled at him. Lee moved closer to Diane, put his arm around her and gently stroked her shoulder. He kissed her softly.

Lee put both his arms around Diane and held her close to him. He kissed her again, longer this time, and then opened his mouth slightly so that his tongue touched hers. Diane opened her mouth wider, allowing Lee's tongue to move further into her mouth. Feeling her responsiveness, he continued to kiss her like this for awhile.

With Diane stroking his shoulder, Lee slid his hand inside her dress and began to fondle her breast. With the other hand, he started unbuttoning her dress. Diane's breathing became more rapid. She began to unbutton Lee's shirt and stroke his chest. Soon Lee managed to finish

unbuttoning Diane's dress and with Diane's help he slipped it off her shoulders. Breathing heavily, Diane pressed her breasts against Lee's chest and hugged him tight. Kissing her so their mouths were in continuous contact, he stroked her breasts rhythmically and then rubbed the inside of her thighs. Diane moved his hands away from her thighs. Lee responded, "It's okay, I'll go slow." Lee kissed her breasts and stomach and touched her genital area, and Diane moved his hands away again and said, "I'm not sure I want to do this." Lee answered, "Relax, Diane, don't worry." Then Lee slid her dress completely off, removed her underwear and then quickly unzipped his pants and pulled them down. Diane said, "This is happening awful fast for me." Lee said, "Don't worry. I'll take care of everything." With Diane totally naked, Lee leaned against her and laid her down on the couch until he was on top of her. Diane moved away from him. Lee reassured her once again. Diane nodded and said, "okay." He then laid on top of her and continued to kiss and fondle her. This time Diane did not move away. Lee then penetrated her and intercourse occurred.

Appendix D

Please answer the following questions about the scenario to the best of your ability.

How would you describe this situation? Mark the one space that you feel best describes the situation. If you are unsure, mark the center space.

Rape ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Seduction

Please circle the number that best characterizes how much you feel each statement describes Lee and Diane’s thoughts and behavior.

	<u>How well describes</u>						
	Not at all	Barely	A little bit	Unsure	Somewhat	Greatly	Completely
1. Diane wanted Lee to like her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Diane felt dirty afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Lee was self-confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Diane felt ashamed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Diane dressed in sexy clothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Diane felt depressed afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Lee enjoyed controlling other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Diane showered afterward.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix E

Recall details of ambiguous scenario

Lee's physical size

Diane's physical size

Lee's self-confidence

Diane's clothing

Date context

Just met at party night before

Go to Diane's apartment

Alcohol use/drinking

Lee complimenting Diane

Lee stroking Diane's shoulder/ putting his arm around her

Kissing

Open mouth/French kissing

Fondling above the waist

Diane unbuttoning Lee's shirt

Lee unbuttoning Diane's dress

Lee touching Diane's thighs/genitals

Diane moves Lee's hands/

moves away from him

Diane says she's not sure/too fast

Lee says relax/ don't worry

Lee removes Diane's underwear

Lee removes his pants/underwear

Lee lays Diane down

Diane says no/stop

Diane pushes Lee away

Diane says okay

Intercourse

Lee gets on top of Diane

Diane presses her breasts against Lee

Lee checks himself out in the mirror

Curriculum Vitae

Heather Leigh Littleton
Psychological Services Center
Virginia Tech
3110 Prices Fork Rd.
Blacksburg, VA 24061
e-mail: hlittlet@vt.edu

Education:

1999-present Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
 Blacksburg, VA

Degree Expected: Doctor of Philosophy

Program: Clinical Psychology

Specialization: Clinical-Adult Psychology

1995-1998

Clemson University,
 Clemson, SC

Degree earned: Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
 with Women's Studies minor

Overall GPA 3.97

Affiliations: American Psychological Association
 Student Affiliate

Research Experience:

6/00-present Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
 Blacksburg, VA.

Work in progress: School-based group treatment of aggressive youth: Outcomes and applications. Duties: Gathered measures for use in study, wrote and submitted protocol to IRB, trained graduate clinicians, scored measures.

8/99-present Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
 Blacksburg, VA. Work in progress: When is it rape? The role of rape and seduction scripts. Duties: Conducted a literature review, designed and proposed original project, collected and analyzed data, prepared manuscript for conference submission.

8/99-present Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
 Blacksburg, VA. Work in progress: Attributions of self-blame following victimization: A meta-analysis. Duties: Supervised undergraduate research assistants in obtaining studies, reviewed studies for relevancy, coded studies, entered data, conducted preliminary data analyses.

- 1/98-present** Department of Psychology, Clemson University, Clemson, SC and Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA. Honors thesis research: Development of a body dysmorphic questionnaire. Duties: Proposed and designed an original questionnaire, gathered and analyzed reliability and validity data, and prepared manuscript for submission.
- 1/98-5/99** Department of Psychology, Clemson University, Clemson, SC. Honors thesis: The relationship between body dysmorphic, eating disordered, and obsessive-compulsive symptoms in a non-clinical population. Duties: Proposed, designed, and ran an original project, collected data, entered data, conducted data analyses, and prepared manuscript for submission.
- 6/98-8/98** Department of Behavioral Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, FL. Supervisor: Michael Antoni, Ph.D., SMART2 project, summer internship. Duties: Assisted in preparation of a procedures manual, prepared questionnaires for use in study, screened potential subjects for eligibility, transcribed audio taped data, coded data for emotional content.
- 2/96-5/96** Department of Psychology, Clemson University, Clemson, SC. How gender affects perceptions of aggression in negative campaign advertising. Duties: Designed an original project, collected data, entered data, conducted data analyses, prepared manuscript for publication.
- 1/95-5/95** Department of Psychology, Clemson University, Clemson, SC. Pedestrian estimations of their own visibility under different nighttime conditions. Duties: Contributed to conceptualization of an original project, collected data.

Teaching Positions:

- 8/99-5/99** Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA. Teaching Assistant for Introductory Psychology. Duties: Presented material and guided discussion on different topics in psychology, developed and administered quizzes, graded essays.

Clinical Training:

- 8/00-present** Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA. PSC/CSC assistant. Duties: Conducted child and adult psychoeducational assessments of intellectual, achievement, and psychological functioning, attended weekly supervision meetings, reviewed charts of other clinicians, updated assessment instruments at clinic, and conducted reliability checks of structured clinical interviews as part of graduate assistantship. Supervision: Thomas Ollendick, Ph.D.

8/99-present Department of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA. Graduate Clinician. Duties: Conducted cognitive-behavioral and behaviorally oriented individual, couples, and family therapy part of clinical training. Conducted anger management/social skills group therapy with adolescents as part of clinical training. Attended weekly group and individual supervision meetings.

Supervision: Robert S. Stephens, Ph.D (8/00-present), Lee Cooper, Ph.D. (5/00-8/00), Richard M. Eisler, Ph.D (8/99-5/00), Angela Scarpa, Ph.D. (8/99-5/00)

In Progress:

Littleton, H. L., Axsom, D., & Pury, C. L. S. (submitted March 2001). Development of a Self-Report Measure of Body Dysmorphic Symptoms: The Brief Body Dysmorphic Questionnaire. Submitted to Psychological Assessment.

Littleton, H. L., Axsom, D., & Pury, C. L. S. (accepted Feb. 2001). Development of a body dysmorphic questionnaire. Submitted to annual meeting of American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Blier, H. K., Fox, L. D., Scarpa-Friedman, A., & **Littleton, H.** (accepted Jan. 2001). School-based group treatment of aggressive youth: Outcomes and applications. Submitted to 2001 World Congress of Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, Vancouver, B. C.

Presentations and Posters:

Littleton, H. L. & Axsom, D. (March 2001). The rape and seduction scripts of college students. Poster presented at annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Littleton, H. L. & Stephens, B. R. (Apr. 1997). How gender affects perceptions of aggression in negative campaign advertising. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Patton, C.W., Allen, D. K., Bundrick, C. L., **Littleton, H. L.**, Sloan, P. A., & Tyrrell, R. A. (Apr. 1997). Pedestrian estimations of their own visibility under different nighttime conditions. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Publications:

Littleton, H. L. & Stephens, B. R. (1999). How gender affects perceptions of aggression in negative campaign advertising. *Psi Chi Undergraduate Research Journal*, 4 33-36.