

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXUAL AGGRESSIVENESS,
HYPERMASCULINITY, AND MISPERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S FRIENDLINESS

by

AILEEN E. PARKINSON

B.A., University of Victoria, 1984

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTERS OF SCIENCE

Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1989

Approved by:



Major Professor



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my adviser, Dr. Frank Saal, and my committee members, Dr. Patrick Knight and Dr. John Uhlarik, for their thorough review and critique of the manuscript. Their insightful and constructive comments were very much appreciated.

A special note of thanks go to my parents Betty and John Parkinson, whose unending love and support have helped create the person I am today. And to my dear friend Anthony D'Alessandro, who's belief in me never dies. To you, I say "Thank you with all my heart."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Method.....	14
Results.....	28
Discussion.....	74
Conclusion.....	86
References.....	92
Appendices.....	97

TABLE LISTINGS

Table		Page
1	Means and standard deviations of men's and women's perceptions of female student's and male professor's intentions.....	29-30
2	Overall means for simple main effects of sex of subject, role of actor and video viewed.....	32
3	Means, standard deviations, and percentages for men's reported frequency of engaging in items on the ASBI.....	38
4	Number and % of men giving a hypermasculine response to each item on the HI.....	40
5	Means, standard deviations, and percentages for women's reported frequency of experiencing behaviors described in FVI.....	44
6	Number and % of women who reported experiencing items described in SES.....	46
7	Correlations between men's perceptions of female actor and ASBI.....	50-51
8	Correlations between men's perceptions of female actor and HI.....	53
9	Correlations between HI and ASBI.....	55
10	Correlations between women's perceptions of male actor in friendly condition and FVI.....	58-59

Table	Page
11	Correlations between women's perceptions of male actor in harassing condition and FVI... 60-61
12	Comparison of significant correlations between male actor and FVI for friendly vs. harassing condition..... 62
13	Correlations between women's perceptions of male actor in friendly condition and SES.... 66
14	Correlations between women's perceptions of male actor in harassing condition and SES... 67
15	Comparison of significant correlations between male actor and SES for friendly vs. harassing condition..... 68
16	Correlations between FVI and SES..... 70
17	Correlations between MCSDS and all measures. 72
18	Comparison of % of males who reported experiencing behaviors on ASBI for present sample vs. Mosher and Anderson (1986)..... 77
19	Comparison of % of females who reported experiencing behaviors on SES for present sample vs. Koss and Oros (1982)..... 83

The Relationship between Sexual Aggressiveness,
Hypermasculinity, and Misperceptions of Women's Friendliness

Although the term "sexual harassment" was coined just over a decade ago, the phenomenon has been a persistent problem for working women since they joined the labor force. It was not until the feminist movement, however, that the phenomenon was viewed by the public as a legitimate problem (Brewer & Berk, 1982). Feminists focused on sexual harassment as a mechanism that was perpetuating women's inequitable status with men. Several surveys demonstrated that harassment victims incurred psychological and economic damage, while others showed that organizations incurred monetary losses due to factors such as job turnover, medical insurance claims, legal costs, and reduced productivity (Livingston, 1982).

An amendment to the guidelines for enforcing Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in 1980. Their working definition of sexual harassment is as follows:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

The industrial sector was held responsible for providing a working atmosphere free of harassment. Unfortunately, these actions have not eliminated sexual harassment from the work arena. The prevalence of sexual harassment in the U.S. is shockingly high, with estimates as large as 60% for working women (Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982).

Prevalence of Sexual Harassment

Estimates of the frequency of sexual harassment tend to vary with the sample and the definition of sexual harassment employed by the researcher. Behaviors that have been included as sexual harassment in previous studies fall into three categories: coercive or physically intrusive behaviors, offensive verbalizations, and flirtatious behaviors such as compliments or requests for dates (Brewer, 1982). The degree of intensity and seriousness of specific behaviors vary within each of the categories.

Reported frequencies of behaviors representing from the most serious category of harassment (physically intrusive or coercive acts) range from 15% for sexual assault to 40% for unwanted and intentional physical contact (Brewer, 1982). The reported frequencies increase when the other categories of behaviors are included: 20-60% of women experience offensive and sexual comments, and 50-60% report flirtatious behaviors. These high incident rates demonstrate that sexual harassment should be a public and scientific concern.

Tangri, Burt & Johnson (1982) analyzed data from a

survey of 20,083 federal employees conducted by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board in 1981; their analyses shed some light on who sexual harassment victims and perpetrators tend to be. The majority of harassment victims are women (42% of the women in the sample and 15% of the men reported being harassed within the last 2 years). Single and divorced women are more often victims (53% & 49%) than married women (37%). No relationship appears to exist between the type of job held (blue collar, clerical, professional, administration/management) and sexual harassment for either sex, except that female trainees reported more harassment than others in this sample.

The majority of sexual harassers are male (95% of the female victims and 22% of the male victims reported being harassed by men only), older than their victims, and married (Tangri et al., 1982). Female harassers, on the other hand, tend to be younger, single women.

Possible Reasons for Sexual Harassment

The preliminary research on sexual harassment focused on documenting its prevalence, but in the last several years research has begun to focus on the dynamics of sexual harassment. The aim of most researchers in this area is to explain why these socio-sexual behaviors occur at work. Based on a review of the literature, Tangri et al. (1982) identified three models or preferences for interpreting sexual harassment: the natural or biological model, the

organizational model, and the socio-cultural model. The first model posits that sexual harassment is a natural result of men's stronger sex drive, and that men and women are attracted to each other and act upon this attraction without intent to harass. The organizational model claims that the differential power created by an organizational structure provides opportunities for sexual displays of power. The socio-cultural model states that sexual harassment, which maintains men's dominance over women in the workplace, reflects the larger patriarchal system in which men have greater power and status than women.

Tangri and her colleagues (1982) found some evidence to support each model, and suggested that no single explanation can adequately account for sexual harassment. They did find that more men than women held views consistent with the natural model; but more women than men held views consistent with the cultural model. For example, twice as many men than women agreed with the statement: "The issue of sexual harassment has been exaggerated -- most incidents are simply normal sexual attraction between people." In addition, women viewed sexual harassment more negatively than men, and were more likely to believe that sexual behavior and work do not mix.

Gutek and Morasch (1982) viewed "sex-role spillover" as an important contributor to sexual harassment. They defined sex-role spillover as "the carryover into the workplace of

gender-based expectations for behavior," and provided evidence that the work-role, a set of shared expectations about behavior in a job, is affected by gender-based expectations whenever the sex-ratio in the workplace is skewed in either direction. Women in male-dominated work are perceived and treated as women first, and as work-role occupants second, because their sex becomes a salient characteristic. On the other hand, women in traditionally female-dominated occupations are seen predominantly as women because the job itself takes on aspects of the female sexrole. Consequently, expectations about the way a traditionally employed woman should behave reflect expectations about the way women in general should behave.

Gutek and Morasch (1982) hypothesized that a skewed sex-ratio at work leads to sex-role spillover which, in turn, leads to sexual harassment. Based on a survey of 827 women and 405 men, they reported that sexual harassment behaviors were more commonly experienced by women in jobs with skewed sex-ratios than by women working in sex-integrated jobs. Sex-role spillover and, hence, sexual harassment are experienced less frequently in sex-integrated occupations because neither the male nor female sex-role is emphasized.

Misperceptions of Women's Intentions

Some researchers have begun to study possible gender differences in perceptions and interpretations of social and

sexual behavior at work (Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983; Saal, Johnson, & Weber, in press). This area of research evolved from the "acquaintance rape" literature that focused on the apparent disparities between men's and women's interpretations of cues for sexual interest or intent (Abbey, 1982; Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin & Harnish, 1987; Abbey & Melby, 1986).

People use many verbal and nonverbal signals to communicate with one another. These communications vary in complexity and ambiguity, leaving room for possible misinterpretation of a sender's intended message. Goodchilds and Zellman (1984) described the sexual signaling system that exists between two people -- involving verbal and nonverbal cues about sexual interest -- that helps the pair learn about each other. They stated that a dysfunctional system, in which signals are misunderstood or distorted by the sender or receiver, can lead to unsatisfying or exploitive relationships.

Men have a more sexualized view of the world than women and attribute sexual meaning to a wider range of behaviors (Abbey, 1982; Goodchilds and Zellman, 1984; Shotland & Craig, 1988). Consequently, behaviors that are not perceived by women as sexual signals, and hence are not used as such, may nonetheless be interpreted sexually by men. A dysfunctional sexual signaling system could therefore exist in many heterosexual exchanges. For example, when a woman

is trying to signal friendliness towards a man, her behavior may be misperceived as sexual interest in him. The presence of these sex differences in perceptions of heterosexual exchanges has been confirmed among teenagers (Goodchilds & Zellman, 1984) and among college-aged students (Abbey, 1982, 1987).

Abbey (1982) conducted 36 laboratory sessions in which a man and woman interacted with each other for 5 minutes (these subjects were called the actors), while a hidden man and woman observed the interaction. The groups of four subjects then rated the actors on a series of trait terms based on how they thought each actor was trying to behave. The results indicated that male subjects perceived behaviors of both the female and male actors as more sexually motivated than did female subjects. Men rated both actors as more flirtatious, seductive, and promiscuous than women, and reported feeling more sexually attracted to the female actor than the women were to the male actor. Abbey (1987) also conducted a field study verifying that women are misperceived by men in naturally occurring incidents.

Extensions of Abbey's original (1982) study, using two different contexts (the workplace and academia) and two different methods (live and videotaped heterosexual interactions) to test the robustness of her findings, provided further evidence that men perceive sexual intent in women's behavior where only friendliness is intended (Saal,

Johnson, & Weber, in press). Even when less realistic procedures were used to test Abbey's findings -- by asking subjects to rate heterosexual pairs depicted in photographs -- the same phenomenon was demonstrated (Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin & Harnish, 1987; Abbey & Melby, 1986).

The term "misperception" has become common parlance with researchers in this area, but its use is inherently problematic. Although there can never be an "absolute perception," the term "misperception" implies an incorrect judgment on the part of the observer. The current author is aware of this flaw in reasoning, but will continue to use the term in keeping with the body of research in the area.

Women are more likely than men to label certain behaviors (sexual comments, teasing, looks or gestures) as sexual harassment (Gutek, Morasch & Cohen, 1983). Recall that women also appear to view sexual harassment more negatively than men, and believe that sexual behavior is not appropriate in the office (Tangri et al., 1982). It is therefore possible that men unintentionally engage in some behaviors at work that women perceive as offensive. When men misinterpret a woman's friendly, out-going manner in the office as sexual interest in them, it is possible that they will respond with some form of sexual harassment. Saal et al. (in press) suggested that this phenomenon should be considered as a potential component of any future model of sexual harassment.

Sufficient evidence has accumulated demonstrating men's general tendency to misperceive women's friendliness as sexual interest. It is now important to address the individual differences among men in the level of misperception that occurs. Perceptions of a woman's sexual intent vary substantially across men. For example, the average standard deviation for male subjects' ratings of females on the sexual traits in the studies by Saal et al. (in press) was 1.55 on a 7-point scale. This implies an underlying continuum representing the extent to which men misperceive women's friendliness as sexual interest. Some men misperceive women more than others.

The question then becomes whether there are any observable or measurable differences among men who are at different ends of the "misperception" continuum. Abbey et al. (1987) suggested that men who seriously misperceive a woman's sexual intent may engage in date rape. In support of this hypothesis, a recent study reported that 51% of 489 acquaintance rape victims labelled their experience as one of serious miscommunication (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). One can therefore hypothesize that men who seriously misperceive a woman's friendliness as "sexiness" in the office may engage in sexual harassment (remember that rape in an organizational context is the most serious form of sexual harassment). If it can be demonstrated that men who seriously misperceive women's friendliness are more likely

to engage in sexual harassment or date rape, it would be helpful to be able to differentiate the "high" misperceivers from the "low." It is possible that men who view the world in more sexual terms are more likely to view women as sexual objects, and to be more hypermasculine, power-oriented, and sexually aggressive.

In a similar fashion, one can question whether there are measurable differences among women who are at different positions on the "misperception" continuum. It would be interesting to determine if there is any relationship between women's experience with sexual victimization, or harassment, and the degree to which they misperceive friendly behavior as sexually motivated. It is possible that women who have been sexually victimized or harassed become overly sensitive to any signals from a man, and tend to misperceive friendliness as a sign of sexual interest. For example, rape victims who labelled the cause of their victimization as miscommunication (Koss et al., 1988) may develop this "over-sensitivity" to men's friendly behavior as a future rape-prevention technique.

On the other hand, it may be that women who misperceive men's intentions are more vulnerable to sexual victimization or harassment. If women misperceive that men to whom they are attracted are interested in them, these women may "reciprocate" with sexual signals of their own. Unfortunately, this makes them vulnerable to sexually

aggressive men who, when resisted, will try to blame their victim for giving them the "wrong idea." Consequently, these women may blame themselves for their present predicament and allow themselves to be victimized.

Purpose of Current Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify characteristics that differentiate among men who are high and low misperceivers of women's friendliness as sexual interest. Such differentiation may improve our understanding of sexual harassment (and in the process, our understanding of date rape). A man's history of sexual aggressiveness towards women and his level of hypermasculinity are the two potential identifying characteristics examined in this study. A second purpose of this thesis was to determine whether a woman's history of sexual victimization by men could predict her level of misperception of a man's friendly behavior as sexually motivated.

It is important to note that the subjects in the present study were college students. Although sexual harassment varies in form and degree from unwanted flirtatious behaviors to rape, college students constitute the high-risk group for reported incidences of rape (Koss & Oros, 1982). Consequently, this study focused on the more severe forms of sexual aggression. Men's reported histories of engaging in sexual aggression towards women -- ranging

from verbal coercion to physical force to gain sexual access -- and women's reported histories of these acts of sexual victimization were measured.

Each subject's position on a "misperception" continuum was measured by asking him or her to view one of two videotaped exchanges between a male professor and female student, and to rate each actor on several traits using the same procedure as Saal et al. (in press). One video depicted a friendly interaction between the two individuals, with no obvious signs of sexual attraction. The second video depicted the same interaction, but with a different conclusion -- the professor invites the student to return to his office that evening on the pretext of helping her with a term paper. The scripts for the videos are presented in Appendix A.

The misperception questionnaire consisted of 14 adjectives; subjects were asked to rate each actor in terms of how they perceived the actor was intending to behave. The misperception questionnaire is shown in Appendix B. The first page of the questionnaire contained "filler" material used to preserve the stated purpose of the study (the effectiveness of nonverbal communication).

The male subjects were then asked to complete two questionnaires: the Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory (Mosher & Anderson, 1986) and the Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). The two measures appear in

Appendices C and D, respectively. These measures, including the misperception measure, are described in detail in the Method section. Available reliability and validity data are cited there.

Female subjects completed an 18-item version of the Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory (Mosher & Anderson, 1986) that measures sexual victimization. This measure will be referred to as the Female Victimization Inventory (FVI). They also completed a second measure of sexual victimization, the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), designed by Koss & Oros (1982). The FVI and SES measures appear in Appendices E and F, respectively. These measures are also described in detail in the Method section. There is no information regarding the psychometric properties of the FVI because it was created for the present study; the psychometric properties of the SES are described later.

The potential existed for a social desirability response bias in subjects' answers to the various questionnaires. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) found an "acceptably small" negative correlation between the Hypermasculinity Inventory and the Jackson Personality Research Form Desirability scale, but they did not report the actual correlation. Therefore, a social desirability scale, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, was administered to the subjects in the current experiment (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) to check for this response bias in

any of the questionnaires (see Appendix G).

Hypotheses

The six hypotheses of this study are stated below. A detailed rationale for each of these hypotheses is presented in the Description of Measures Section.

1. A significant correlation will be found between the misperception measure and the ASBI.
2. A significant correlation will be found between the misperception measure and the HI.
3. A significant correlation will be found between the ASBI and the HI.
4. A significant correlation will be found between the misperception measure and the FVI.
5. A significant correlation will be found between the misperception measure and the SES.
6. A significant correlation will be found between the FVI and the SES.

Method

Subjects

Two-hundred and seventy-four undergraduates (130 men and 144 women) attending Kansas State University received course credit for participating in this study. The average age of the total sample, and for men and women separately, was 20 years, with a range of 17 to 48 and a standard deviation of 4.26 years. Ninety percent of the sample was between 17 and 22 years of age.

Procedure

Subjects participated in the experiment in mixed-gender groups of ten to fifteen. The groups were deliberately mixed to preclude any demand characteristics (e.g. the "locker room effect") created by having single-sex groups. Subjects were told they were participating in a study designed to examine the effectiveness of nonverbal communication in social interactions. It was made clear that no identifying marks were to be placed on any materials given to them, because their responses were to be completely anonymous.

Subjects were asked to view one of two 10-minute videotapes showing an exchange between a male professor and a female student (discussed above and illustrated in Appendix A). Half the subjects viewed the friendly videotape, while the others viewed the harassing videotape. After viewing the videotape, subjects completed a questionnaire beginning with a page of items that reinforced the stated purpose of the study. The "real" part of the questionnaire (the misperception measure shown in Appendix B) asked the subjects to rate each actor on 14 trait terms. They were asked to base their ratings on how they thought each actor was trying to behave. Subjects rated both actors to prevent them from guessing the hypotheses. Half the male and female subjects rated the female actor first, followed by the male; the other half rated the male actor first.

After all subjects had completed the questionnaire, they were asked to place it under their seat for later collection, on the pretext of not taking the added time to pass materials forward. It was then explained that because this experiment had taken so little time, they were being asked to participate in a second, unrelated study. They were informed that the National Education Foundation had asked a random sample of universities across the U.S. to administer four questionnaires pertaining to the lifestyle and sexual behavior of students. The content of the various questionnaires was described, and example items were read aloud. Subject anonymity was emphasized several times during this explanation.

Every opportunity was provided for students to withdraw from this "second" study if they felt uncomfortable. The researcher pointed out that if anyone felt uncomfortable withdrawing overtly from the experiment, they could circle the item on the fourth questionnaire directing that their data should be discarded. This provision was included to satisfy ethical concerns, and to prevent erroneous data gathered from unwilling subjects from contaminating the results of the study. A second informed consent form was then administered to the subjects because they had not been advised about the sexual nature of this part of the experiment when they volunteered to participate. The distinction or discontinuity between the "two" experiments

was emphasized to prevent subjects from realizing the purpose of the overall study.

A packet containing the four questionnaires was then administered to each subject (different packets for men and women). Male subjects completed the ASBI and the HI; female subjects completed the FVI and the SES. The order of the two questionnaires given to each gender was counterbalanced to prevent a possible order effect. All subjects then completed the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, followed by a short questionnaire asking for some background information. This last questionnaire (see Appendix H) asked for the subjects' sex and age, and the type of jobs they had held -- in terms of part- or full-time employment and whether it was a temporary or permanent position. They were asked two questions to assess the efficacy of the deception that two experiments had been conducted rather than one. The first question asked if they felt that exposure to the first study influenced their responses in the second study; the second asked whether they saw any relationship between the first and second study.

After ensuring that subjects understood their task, the researcher informed the group that she would wait outside to reduce any unnecessary discomfort caused by her presence. She instructed them to leave their packet face-down on their desk when they were finished, and to leave the room. As the subjects quietly left the room, the researcher

gave them a detailed debriefing statement (see Appendix I). The entire experiment took approximately 45-50 minutes.

The researcher carefully gathered all materials for each subject, from underneath and on top of the desk. The lack of any identification marks on the questionnaires was to encourage subjects to complete the tasks honestly, without fear of retribution and to reinforce the deception that they had participated in two "separate" studies. This procedure was followed for all groups.

Description of Measures

Extent of Misperception

This instrument involves showing each subject one of two 10-minute videotapes portraying an exchange between a male professor and a female student. The characters in the videotapes were played by a drama student and a professor from the theater department at Kansas State University. In each case, the student is in the professor's office asking for an extension of the deadline for submitting her term paper. In what will be referred to as the "friendly" video, the actors behaved in a generally friendly and out-going manner without doing or saying anything overtly flirtatious or seductive. It resembled an ordinary student-professor interaction.

In what will be referred to as the "harassing" video, the same videotape is shown until the end, where the professor concludes the conversation by inviting the student

to return to his office that evening so that they can work together. Although the student reluctantly accepts the professor's invitation, this positive response was not expected to affect subjects' perceptions of her sexual interest in him. Johnson, Stockdale and Saal (1987) demonstrated that the student's response to the professor, whether positive or negative, did not affect subjects' perceptions of the student.

After viewing the videotape, subjects rated each actor on 14 trait terms using a 7-point Likert scale. This questionnaire was developed by Abbey (1982), and was also used by Saal, Johnson & Weber (in press). Subjects based their ratings on how they thought the actor was trying to behave, because it is perceived intentions that are of interest here. The trait terms used to measure the construct "sexuality" are the adjectives "flirtatious," "seductive," "promiscuous" and "sexy." Adjectives such as "considerate," "warm" and "likeable" were included to prevent people from guessing the true purpose of the instrument.

Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory

The Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory (ASBI) identifies individuals who have engaged in sexual aggression towards women in a variety of contexts (Mosher & Anderson, 1986). The ASBI measures individuals on a continuum of sexual aggression that ranges from verbal coercion to

physical force in order to gain sexual access. Subjects were asked to rate how frequently they have engaged in various forms of sexual aggression towards women. The ASBI is an appropriate measure for a college-aged sample because students are in the high-risk age and occupational group for reported sexual aggression (Koss & Oros, 1982). The first hypothesis of this study predicted that those men who misinterpreted a woman's friendliness as sexual interest (i.e. were higher on the "misperception" continuum) would be higher on the continuum of sexual aggression.

In a pilot study for the current experiment, 25 undergraduates were asked to rate how frequently they had engaged in the various behaviors described (using a 7-point scale, where 1 = never and 7 = extremely frequently). This was the same format used by Mosher and Anderson (1986). Analysis of these data, however, revealed that men appeared to be simply circling the "1" on the scale all the way down the page. Subjects were therefore either displaying a response bias, or they truly had never engaged in any of these behaviors. Based on previous findings (Mosher & Anderson, 1986), the latter possibility was unlikely. A new format for this scale was therefore developed to try to overcome the response bias. Subjects were asked to state how many times they had actually engaged in each behavior. This revised format overcame much of the response bias -- variance in responses to the items emerged (standard

deviations ranged from .09 to 6.43). The new format appeared to encourage subjects to read and reflect upon each item before responding, and resulted in their responses being less obvious to other subjects in the room (which could have been a factor in the response bias).

Hypermasculinity Inventory

The Hypermasculinity Inventory (HI) is a measure of a hypermasculine personality constellation consisting of three theoretical components: calloused sex attitudes towards women; a conception of violence as manly; and a view of danger as exciting (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). These components reflect the hypermasculine man's desire to appear powerful and to be dominant in interactions with other men, women, and the environment. Mosher and Sirkin indicated that this 30-item forced-choice inventory can be used as three independent subscales or as a single score for the hypermasculine constellation.

"Calloused Sex Attitudes" reflect the view that sexual intercourse with women establishes masculine power and female submission, and should be achieved without empathy for the woman's subjective experience. "Violence as Manly" reflects the view that verbal or physical aggression is an acceptable, even preferable, masculine expression of power and dominance toward other men. Finally, "Danger as Exciting" represents the view that survival in dangerous situations demonstrates masculine power over the

environment.

The present study hypothesized that males who interpreted a woman's friendliness as sexual interest would score higher than others on the HI. In addition, according to Mosher and Sirkin, situations that threaten a hypermasculine man's identity will activate the hypermasculine personality constellation and lead to hypermasculine behaviors such as the exploitation of women and domination of other men. Consequently, it was predicted in the present study that men with high scores on the HI would have high scores on the ASBI -- in other words, the hypermasculine man would be positioned higher than others on the sexual aggression continuum.

Sexual Victimization Measures

The FVI and SES measure the extent to which a woman has been sexually victimized by men in her past. They contain similar items to the ASBI, but the items address a female audience. The FVI is an 18-item version of the Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory created by the current author to measure sexual victimization (Mosher & Anderson, 1986). Items 15 and 17 on the ASBI were not included in the FVI. Based on the results of the pilot study, the format of this questionnaire was revised in the same manner as the ASBI. Subjects were asked to state how many times they had actually experienced each item on the FVI.

The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), a 12-item

checklist that measures sexual victimization, was designed by Koss & Oros (1982). A sexual event is described, and the subject indicates whether such an event has happened to her. The first two items, however, do not represent events that could be classified as sexual victimization. Therefore, these items were not included in any analyses involving the SES.

This study predicted that women who misinterpreted the male professor's friendliness as sexual interest in the female student (i.e. were higher on the "misperception" continuum) would be higher on the continuum of sexual victimization (i.e. higher scores on the FVI and the 10-item SES).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) is a 33-item true/false measure of a subject's need to "obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). The items are statements concerning personal attitudes and traits; subjects indicate whether each statement is true or false as it pertains to them. Half the statements are culturally acceptable but probably untrue, and the remaining statements are undesirable but true. One point is scored for each response in the socially desirable direction; scores can vary from 0 (no social desirability) to 33 (highest social desirability). No significant correlations will exist

between scores on this scale and scores on the other scales if subjects have honestly answered the questionnaires without regard for the appropriateness or acceptability of their responses.

Psychometric Properties of the Measures

Psychometric Properties -- ASBI

The ASBI was constructed by Mosher and Anderson in 1986, and they have provided some reliability and validity data to support its use. Mosher and Anderson (1986) administered the original Inventory, consisting of 33 items, to a sample of 175 male college students. The Inventory had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .94, a mean of 53.86 and a standard deviation of 17.23. They found that the ASBI was significantly related ($r(173) = .33, p < .001$) to the HI, suggesting a certain degree of construct validity. The third hypothesis of the current study was a retest of this result. Mosher and Anderson also found that the Calloused Sex Attitudes subscale of the HI accounted for most of the variance in sexually aggressive behavior ($r(173) = .53, p < .001$), followed by the Danger as Exciting ($r(173) = .26, p < .001$) and the Violence as Manly ($r(173) = .23, p < .01$) subscales. In addition, men with a history of sexual aggression, measured by the ASBI, experienced more subjective arousal while imagining committing a rape.

A factor analysis was conducted on the ASBI to determine if conceptually discrete tactics were used by men

to gain sexual access (Mosher & Anderson, 1986). Six factors emerged, representing a total of 20 (of the 33) items, with alpha coefficients ranging from .76 to .83. Each of the six factor scales was significantly and positively correlated with the Hypermasculinity Inventory used as a single score and as three separate subscales. The 20 items representing these factors were used in the current study.

Psychometric Properties -- HI

Based on a sample of 135 male undergraduates, the HI had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .89, a mean of 11.03 and a standard deviation of 6.79 (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). The three subscales had the following alpha coefficients: Calloused Sex, .79; Danger as Exciting, .71; and Violence as Manly, .79. Nine factors emerged from a factor analysis, but the factor loadings did not aggregate according to the three apriori subscales. This analysis revealed a "single, predominant, latent variable that was relatively homogeneous and which was named the macho personality pattern" (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). At the same time, the analysis did not support the view that three separate components/factors make up this constellation.

In terms of construct validity, the Hypermasculinity Inventory has been found to correlate positively with sexual aggressiveness as discussed above (Mosher & Anderson, 1986). It has also been positively correlated with drug and alcohol

use, dangerous driving, aggressive and assaultive behaviors, frequency of sexual relations (during high school years), and law breaking (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984).

Psychometric Properties -- SES

Koss and Gidycz (1985) provided support for the reliability and validity of the SES. The internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) of their 10-item version of the SES was .74 with a sample of 305 women. A test-retest reliability check was conducted using a sample of 71 women with administrations one week apart. The mean item agreement between the two administrations was 93%, suggesting that the SES produced stable responses. Based on the relatively low internal consistency reliability coefficient for the SES, Koss and Gidycz concluded that the items showed some diversity, indicating that sexual victimization is not necessarily a "series of interlocking, escalating events, where lesser acts necessarily lead to greater acts."

Koss and Gidycz (1985) administered the 10-item SES to over 1000 female undergraduates. Interviews were conducted with 242 of these women who were selected, on the basis of their scores on the SES, to represent four degrees of exposure to sexual victimization. At the time of the interview, the subjects were readministered the SES and given a standardized interview regarding their reported experiences. The correlation between a woman's level of

victimization based on her original and re-administered SES responses was .73 ($p < .001$). Only two of the 62 women who reported on either of their SES forms that they had been raped changed their responses during the interview that followed the second administration of the SES. These results suggest that women answered the SES reliably.

Psychometric Properties -- MCSDS

Several researchers have studied the psychometric properties of the MCSDS. Crowne and Marlowe (1964) reported an internal consistency coefficient (Kuder-Richardson 20) of .88, and a test-retest correlation (separated by one week) of .88 with a sample of 57 undergraduates. Nordholm (1974) reported an adjusted split-half reliability coefficient of .73 ($n = 163$). McFarland and Sparks (1985) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .71 ($n = 104$) for 19- and 20-year-olds, .79 ($n = 77$) for 21- through 25-year-olds, and .79 for college graduates. O'Grady (1988) demonstrated that men and women did not differ in the consistency of their responses to the scale; the alpha coefficients for men ($n = 108$) and women ($n = 189$) were .71 and .72, respectively. These results indicate that subjects respond consistently to the items on the scale.

The validity of the scale has been supported by Crowne and Malowe (1964). They found that high scorers on the MCSDS tended to show more favorable attitudes towards boring tasks; to show greater social conformity; to set

conservative goals in risk-taking situations; and to show a higher susceptibility to persuasion.

Results

Only two out of 274 subjects reported never having held a job. Eighty percent ($n = 220$) of the sample reported that they had held a part-time (less than 35 hours a week) summer job; 59 percent ($n = 161$) had experienced a full-time (35 hours or more a week) summer job; 60 percent ($n = 164$) had experienced a part-time job with no definite stopping date; and 29 percent ($n = 79$) had experienced a full-time job with no definite stopping date.

Ninety two percent ($n = 237$) of the sample indicated that exposure to the first study had not influenced their responses in the second study. Very few comments from those who perceived any relationship between the two studies showed any relevance to the true nature of the study's purposes.

Misperceptions

Subjects' mean perceptions (and standard deviations) of how the female student and the male professor were trying to behave are presented in Table 1. These data were analyzed using a 2 X 2 X 2 (Sex-of-Subject X Role-of-Actor X Video-Viewed) MANOVA. It must be noted that the Role-of-Actor was confounded by gender -- the professor was male and the student was female. All three main effects were significant ($p < .00001$); the Sex-of-Subject by Role-of-Actor interaction

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Men's and Women's Perceptions of
Female Student's and Male Professor's Intentions

"Actor" tried to be:	Friendly Videotape			
	Female Student		Male Professor	
	Men ^a	Women ^b	Men ^a	Women ^b
Assertive ^d	4.37 (1.53)	4.56 (1.41)	4.81 (1.35)	4.92 (1.34)
Attractive ^{c,d,e,f,g}	4.32 (1.76)	3.37 (1.62)	3.02 (1.49)	2.91 (1.53)
Cheerful ^f	5.02 (1.21)	5.26 (1.30)	5.15 (1.25)	5.18 (1.10)
Considerate ^{d,h}	5.66 (0.96)	5.40 (1.40)	5.18 (1.09)	5.21 (1.43)
Enthusiastic ^d	4.61 (1.35)	4.64 (1.45)	4.58 (1.43)	4.33 (1.51)
Friendly ^g	6.00 (0.79)	6.05 (0.88)	5.77 (0.86)	5.81 (0.91)
Intelligent ^{d,g}	5.40 (1.06)	5.73 (1.08)	5.65 (0.93)	5.65 (1.19)
Likeable ^d	5.79 (1.04)	5.50 (1.15)	5.39 (1.00)	5.53 (1.31)
Sincere ^{d,e,f,g}	5.47 (1.39)	5.80 (1.36)	5.61 (1.16)	5.53 (1.34)
Warm	4.87 (1.23)	4.97 (1.39)	4.92 (1.27)	4.97 (1.36)

Flirtatious ^{c,d,e,g}	3.23 (1.65)	2.59 (1.49)	3.02 (1.52)	2.41 (1.57)
Promiscuous ^{c,d,e,g}	3.57 (1.61)	2.44 (1.55)	3.57 (1.57)	2.42 (1.64)
Seductive ^{c,d,e,f,g}	2.82 (1.58)	1.97 (1.35)	2.44 (1.40)	1.69 (1.18)
Sexy ^{c,d,e,f,g}	2.94 (1.60)	1.72 (1.08)	2.36 (1.34)	1.73 (1.19)

^a_n = 62.

^b_n = 78.

Table 1 (continued):

Means and Standard Deviations of Men's and Women's Perceptions of
Female Student's and Male Professor's Intentions

"Actor" <u>tried to be:</u>	<u>Harrassment Videotape</u>			
	<u>Female Student</u>		<u>Male Professor</u>	
	<u>Men^a</u>	<u>Women^b</u>	<u>Men^a</u>	<u>Women^b</u>
Assertive ^d	4.13 (1.35)	4.37 (1.47)	4.98 (1.35)	5.17 (1.18)
Attractive ^{c,d,e,f,g}	4.51 (1.48)	3.35 (1.52)	4.29 (1.53)	3.89 (1.74)
Cheerful ^f	5.06 (1.31)	5.26 (1.24)	5.29 (1.16)	5.00 (1.19)
Considerate ^{d,h}	5.40 (1.20)	5.88 (1.04)	5.11 (1.18)	4.94 (1.35)
Enthusiastic ^d	4.81 (1.38)	4.85 (1.31)	4.46 (1.38)	4.22 (1.45)
Friendly ^g	5.83 (1.04)	5.83 (0.78)	5.94 (1.01)	5.83 (1.02)
Intelligent ^{d,g}	5.79 (1.10)	5.77 (1.10)	5.40 (1.24)	5.22 (1.42)
Likeable ^d	5.86 (0.98)	5.88 (0.84)	5.33 (1.30)	5.26 (1.27)
Sincere ^{d,e,f,g}	5.79 (1.00)	6.17 (0.98)	4.57 (1.64)	4.63 (1.67)
Warm	4.91 (1.27)	5.05 (1.05)	5.11 (1.35)	4.77 (1.53)

Flirtatious ^{c,d,e,g}	2.83 (1.45)	2.34 (1.22)	5.24 (1.51)	4.85 (1.76)
Promiscuous ^{c,d,e,g}	3.48 (1.70)	2.66 (1.57)	4.87 (1.52)	4.63 (1.65)
Seductive ^{c,d,e,f,g}	2.78 (1.54)	1.83 (1.14)	4.60 (1.60)	4.59 (1.85)
Sexy ^{c,d,e,f,g}	3.16 (1.70)	1.94 (1.13)	3.92 (1.67)	3.55 (1.86)

Note. Larger mean values indicate higher levels of perceived intentions; standard deviations are in parentheses.

^an = 63. ^bn = 65.

^cSignificant Sex-of-Subject main effect ($p < .0001$).

^dSignificant Role-of-Actor main effect ($p < .02$).

^eSignificant Video Viewed main effect ($p < .016$).

^fSignificant Sex-of-Subject X Role-of-Actor interaction ($p < .036$).

^gSignificant Role-of-Actor X Video Viewed interaction ($p < .016$).

^hSignificant Sex-of-Subject X Role-of-Actor X Video Viewed interaction ($p < .039$).

was significant ($p < .01$), as was the Role-of-Actor by Video-Viewed interaction ($p < .00001$). Neither the Sex-of-Subject by Video-Viewed interaction nor the three-way interaction was significant.

Subsequent univariate ANOVAS identified the specific perceptions that contributed to the significant MANOVA results. Table 1 indicates the significant results of the ANOVA analyses through the use of superscripts c through h. Although the significant main effects will be described first, they will be discussed in the context of their relevant significant interactions. Table 2 indicates, for each of the 14 perceptions, the means associated with the three simple main effects.

Significant Sex-of-Subject main effects indicated that the men saw more flirtatiousness, more promiscuity, more seductiveness, more sexiness, and more attractiveness in the actors' behaviors than did the women. Significant Role-of-Actor main effects indicated that subjects saw greater levels of flirtatiousness, promiscuity, seductiveness, and sexiness in the male professor than in the female student. The female student, on the other hand, was perceived to be more assertive, attractive, considerate, enthusiastic, intelligent, likeable, and sincere than the male professor. Higher scores on these nonsexual perceptions may indicate subjects' empathy for the student's situation because they are students themselves. Significant main effects for the

Table 2

Overall means for Simple Main Effects of Sex of Subject, Role of Actor and Video Viewed

<u>"Actor"</u> <u>tried to be:</u>	<u>Sex of Subject</u>		<u>Role of Actor</u>		<u>Video Viewed</u>	
	<u>Male</u> ^a	<u>Female</u> ^b	<u>Prof</u> ^c	<u>Student</u> ^d	<u>Friendly</u> ^e	<u>Harrass</u> ^f
Assertive	4.60	4.74	4.38	4.37	4.68	4.67
Attractive	4.05	3.37	3.52	3.86	3.42	4.00
Cheerful	5.14	5.17	5.16	5.15	5.16	5.15
Considerate	5.34	5.34	5.11	5.57	5.36	5.32
Enthusiastic	4.65	4.50	4.40	4.74	4.55	4.60
Friendly	5.89	5.88	5.84	5.92	5.91	5.85
Intelligent	5.56	5.59	5.50	5.68	5.61	5.55
Likeable	5.59	5.53	5.39	5.73	5.55	5.57
Sincere	5.37	5.52	5.11	5.79	5.60	5.28
Warm	4.95	4.93	4.96	4.93	4.94	4.94

Flirtatious	3.63	3.03	3.84	2.76	2.83	3.84
Promiscuous	3.91	3.03	3.82	3.01	3.00	3.93
Seductive	3.21	2.51	3.27	2.36	2.25	3.47
Sexy	3.14	2.22	2.87	2.42	2.20	3.15

Note. Larger mean values indicate higher levels of perceived intentions.

^a_n = 130. ^b_n = 144. ^c_n = 274. ^d_n = 274. ^e_n = 141. ^f_n = 133.

Video-Viewed indicated that the actors were perceived as more flirtatious, promiscuous, seductive, sexy, and attractive in the harassing video than in the friendly video. In addition, both actors were viewed as more sincere in the friendly video.

Several of these main effects must be interpreted in light of significant two-way interactions. The following five perceptions yielded significant Sex-of-Subject by Role-of-Actor interactions: promiscuous, seductive, attractive, cheerful, and sincere. Both sexes perceived the professor as more promiscuous and seductive than the student. Nevertheless, men still perceived the student as having much higher intentions to behave in a promiscuous and seductive manner than did the women.

The professor was rated similarly in terms of attractiveness by men and women, but the student was viewed as much more attractive by men than women. Although there were no significant main effects for the cheerful perception, there was a significant Sex-of-Subject by Role-of-Actor interaction, indicating that the professor was viewed as more cheerful than the student by men and vice versa for women. This pattern of results appears to represent a same-sex bias on the part of subjects' ratings of cheerfulness. Finally, the student was perceived to be more sincere than the professor by both sexes, but women saw her as more sincere than did men.

Significant Role-of-Actor by Video-Viewed interactions occurred for all four sexual perceptions and for attractive, intelligent, and sincere perceptions. The actors were perceived to be intending to behave at similar levels of promiscuity in the friendly video, but the professor was rated much higher for this perception in the harassing video. Ratings of the student's level of promiscuity remained constant across the two videos. The student was perceived to be acting in a more flirtatious, sexy and seductive manner than the professor in the friendly video but, again, perceptions of the professor's intentions were significantly elevated in the harassing video, while perceptions of the student remained constant. The student was viewed as more attractive than the professor in the friendly video but, in the harassing video, both actors were perceived to be equally attractive. The actors were viewed as equally intelligent and sincere in the friendly video, but the professor was viewed as lower in both traits in the harassing video.

The Role-of-Actor by Video-Viewed interactions appear to be a result of the professor's perceived harassment of the student in one of the videos. When he became "more than friendly" in his behavior towards the student, he was perceived as more flirtatious, promiscuous, seductive, sexy, and attractive, but less intelligent and sincere. Perceptions of this actor's sexuality significantly

increased when he made a gesture that appeared to reflect sexual interest rather than friendliness. It is very important to note that there were no Sex-of-Subject by Video-Viewed interactions. Regardless of the sex of the observer, the professor was perceived to be acting more sexually in the harassing video than in the friendly video.

Summary of Misperceptions

These data are consistent with the findings of Abbey (1982), Johnson et al. (1987), and Saal et al. (in press). The men attributed more sexuality to the behavior of the female student engaging in a normal social exchange than did the women. This finding provides further support for the view that men tend to misperceive women's friendly behavior as sexual interest in them. Regardless of gender, the actors were seen to be equally promiscuous in the friendly video, but the student was perceived to behave in a more flirtatious, seductive, and sexy manner. This may reflect the operation of cultural stereotypes of gender roles and behaviors. In the harassing video, however, the professor was perceived to be more flirtatious, promiscuous, seductive, and sexy than the student. This reversal in perceptions of the actors was expected because the harassing video, compared to the friendly video, portrayed a situation where the professor's intentions toward the student were not so clearly "just friendly."

Perceptions of the female student were unaffected by

the video viewed: the woman was viewed similarly by subjects in the friendly and harassing videos. Perceptions of the male professor were significantly affected by the video viewed: subjects gave significantly higher ratings of his sexual intentions in the harassing video. Both these results are consistent with the findings of Johnson et al. (1987).

In the harassing video, it is important to note that subjects were not misperceiving the professor when they rated him as intending to behave in a sexual way toward the student. Their perceptions of his sexual intentions appear quite justified based on his behavior at the end of the video. Ratings of the professor's behavior in the harassing video actually reflected how strongly subjects perceived his invitation to the student as sexual attraction toward her. Subjects ratings of the professor therefore represented a "misperception" continuum in the friendly video condition, and a legitimate "sexual perception continuum" in the harassing video.

Male subjects from the two video conditions were analyzed as one sample because their ratings of the woman reflected a "misperception" continuum regardless of video viewed. Female subjects, however, were analyzed separately by the video viewed because ratings of the man in the friendly video reflected a "misperception" continuum, while ratings of the man in the harassing video represented a

"sexual perception" continuum.

Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the ASBI could not be calculated using all 20 items because items 12 and 18 were perfectly correlated. Only one subject in the sample reported engaging in the behaviors described in items 12 and 18, resulting in a perfect correlation between the two items. Item 18 was arbitrarily omitted from the analysis. In addition, item 11 showed an extremely low item-total correlation ($\underline{r} = .03$) which, based on an inspection of that statement, was probably caused by its "double-barreled" nature. Removal of this item produced an alpha coefficient of .70 (compared to .53 with item 11 included). This internal consistency coefficient is much lower than the value of .94 obtained by the authors of the ASBI (Mosher & Anderson, 1986).

The mean numbers of times (and the standard deviations) that male subjects reported engaging in each of the sexually aggressive behaviors described in the ASBI are indicated in Table 3. The percentages of men who reported engaging in each behavior at least once is also displayed in Table 3. Sixty three percent of the sample ($\underline{n} = 130$) reported engaging in at least one of these forms of sexual aggression.

An attempt was made to factor analyze the ASBI to determine if the same factors found by Mosher and Anderson

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Men's Reported Frequency of engaging in the Behaviors Described in the Items on the ASBI^a

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>% of Responses > 0</u>
1	1.29	3.60	30
2	1.16	3.17	29
3	0.16	0.58	9
4	0.82	2.52	19
5	0.29	0.99	12
6	0.54	1.61	18
7	0.29	1.14	12
8	0.20	0.72	9
9	0.15	0.68	7
10	0.16	0.63	8.5
11	1.44	6.43	15
12	0.02	0.18	1
13	0.02	0.12	1.5
14	0.29	1.20	15
15	0.04	0.29	2
16	0.03	0.21	2
17	0.13	0.46	9
18	0.01	0.09	1
19	0.02	0.12	1.5
20	0.03	0.21	2

^an = 130.

(1986) reappeared for this sample. The factors found by Mosher and Anderson represented different tactics used by men to gain sexual access, such as verbal manipulations (items 2, 3, 4, and 7), threats (items 13 and 18), and sexual force (items 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 20).

Unfortunately, the factor analysis could not be conducted because the variance within and between the items was too small and created a colinearity problem (the communalities of items kept exceeding 1). Responses to the ASBI were therefore correlated with other measures as total scores and as separate items.

Hypermasculinity Inventory

The 30-item Hypermasculinity Inventory had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .83 ($n = 105$), which is only slightly lower than the value of .89 reported by Mosher and Sirkin (1984) for their sample of 135. The scale had a mean of 9.92, and a standard deviation of 5.54 (compared to Mosher and Sirkin's results of 11.03 and 6.79, respectively). The percentages of men giving a hypermasculine response to each item on the Hypermasculinity scale are noted in Table 4. The respective means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alpha coefficients for the three 10-item subscales (with Mosher and Sirkin's results in parentheses) were: Danger, 4.09 (3.87), 2.28 (2.44), and .65 (.71); Violence, 3.72 (3.84), 2.67 (2.84), and .75 (.79); Calloused Sex, 2.43 (3.33), 1.91 (2.63), and .62 (.79). The internal

Table 4

Number and % of Men Giving a Hypermasculine Response to Each Item
on the Hypermasculinity Inventory^a

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>No. of Men</u>	<u>% of Men</u>
1	54	45
2	43	33
3	60	46
4	59 (127)	47
5	75 (127)	59
6	41 (128)	32
7	75 (129)	58
8	44 (129)	34
9	26 (128)	20
10	28 (129)	21
11	28 (125)	22
12	35 (124)	28
13	32 (127)	25
14	4	3
15	15	12
16	39 (124)	32
17	18	14
18	40 (128)	31
19	44 (129)	34
20	54	42
21	37 (127)	29
22	85 (129)	66
23	56 (128)	44
24	20	15
25	48 (128)	38
26	12 (127)	9
27	45 (128)	35
28	57 (126)	45
29	59 (128)	46
30	57 (128)	45

^an = 130 unless otherwise indicated in parentheses.

consistency of these subscales was poor.

A principal-axis factor analysis was conducted on the HI. The first factor accounted for 17% of the variance and nine other factors explained between 5% and 2% of the variance. Following varimax rotation, four factors emerged that explained 31% of the variance. It is generally considered to be the researcher's choice of factor loading size that determines which variables are included in a factor. A natural cut-off exists, however, if there is an apparent gap between loadings within and across factors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). A natural cut-off value of .40 was used in the present analysis.

The six items (items 6, 18, 19, 20, 21, 29) that loaded on the first factor (loadings of .40 or greater) represented 60 % of the items on the "Violence as Manly" subscale. The three items (items 9, 15, 26) that loaded on the second factor came from the subscale called "Calloused Sex." Three of the four items (items 3, 8, 30) that loaded on the third factor represented 75% of the remaining items on the Violence as Manly subscale (the fourth item (28) was a Calloused Sex item). There seemed little pattern to items in the fourth factor.

A subscale was created for each of the first three factors using the items that loaded high on that factor. The Chronbach alpha coefficients for the new subscales were .77 (items from first factor), .67 (items from second

factor), and .66 (items from third factor). The internal consistency of these subscales was poor.

The three factors provide some statistical evidence for the existence of at least two of the three HI subscales proposed by Mosher and Sirkin (1984) -- the Violence as Manly subscale and the Calloused Sex subscale. Mosher and Sirkin (1984), however, defined "Violence as Manly" as "the attitude among some men that violent aggression, either verbal or physical, is an acceptable, even preferable, masculine expression of power and dominance toward other men." Results of the present factor analysis indicate that, contrary to Mosher and Sirkin's assertions, the Violence as Manly subscale appears to be multidimensional. Factors one and three represent 90% of the items on the Violence as Manly subscale. The first factor represents acts of physical aggression, and the view that aggression is the most effective way to dominate men. The third factor reflects a confrontive nature, a tendency to react with verbal aggression to situations and to people who appear threatening (this includes effeminate men and lesbians who inherently reject a hypermasculine man's view of a man). Consequently, the Violence as Manly subscale can be separated into two smaller subscales, each representing a different form of aggression as an acceptable masculine expression of power and dominance toward other men. These two subscales will be labelled "Physical Aggression as

Manly" and "Verbal Aggression as Manly."

Responses to the HI were correlated with other measures as a total score, and Mosher and Sirkin's three subscales. In addition, based on the results of the factor analysis, the other measures were correlated with the Physical Aggression as Manly subscale, the Verbal Aggression as Manly subscale, and the second factor labelled "Disrespect for Women."

Female Victimization Inventory

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the FVI was .84 ($n = 143$); this is very similar to the coefficient for the ASBI (which represents the male version of the scale) reported above. The mean numbers of times (and the standard deviations) female subjects reported experiencing each of the items described in the FVI are indicated in Table 5. Seventy percent of the sample ($n = 144$) reported experiencing at least one of these 18 forms of sexual victimization.

The FVI was factor analyzed using the method of principal axes. The first factor accounted for 27% of the variance, and the remaining six factors explained between 10% and 2% of the variance. The items that loaded on the factors did not show any obvious pattern, and certainly did not show any similarity to Mosher and Anderson's factors for their male sample (1986). Items reflecting the use of sexual force as a tactic to gain sexual access were mixed

Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Women's Reported
Frequency of Experiencing the Behaviors Described in the Items on
the FVI^a

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>% of Responses > 0</u>
1	1.05	2.38	35
2	2.48	6.71	45
3	0.35	0.78	21.5
4	0.42	1.87	14
5	0.42	1.80	18
6	0.56	1.72	23
7	0.35	0.95	19
8	0.31	1.45	7
9	0.44	1.87	17
10	0.49	1.85	19
11	0.21	1.35	6
12	0.04	0.22	3
13	0.20	1.02	8
14	0.15	0.57	10
15	0.10	0.42	6
16	0.03	0.17	3
17	0.01	0.83	1
18	0.05	0.30	3.5

^a_n = 144.

with verbal manipulations, threats, and angry expressions. Consequently, the scale was not separated into subscales for further analysis. FVI responses were correlated with other scales in the form of a total score and as separate items.

Sexual Experiences Survey

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the 10-item SES was .74 ($n = 141$); Koss and Oros (1982) obtained the same value with their sample of 305 women. The percentages of women who reported experiencing each of the items described in the SES are indicated in Table 6. Sixty eight percent of the sample ($n = 144$) reported experiencing at least one of the forms of sexual victimization described in items 3 through 10 (recall that the first two items do not represent descriptions of sexual victimization). In a representative sample of college women across the U.S. ($n = 3,187$), Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski (1987) reported that 54% had experienced at least one of the forms of sexual victimization described on the SES. In the present study, women answered "yes, I experienced that event" to an average of two out of the ten items (s.d. = 2). Eleven percent of the women, however, had experienced at least five of these 10 events. The first item on the SES asked subjects whether they had experienced sexual intercourse when partners gave mutual consent. Seventy-three percent of the women indicated that they had engaged in mutually desired sex; this number is slightly higher than those reported by other

Table 6
Number and % of Women who Reported Experiencing Each of the Items
Described in the Sexual Experiences Inventory^a

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>No. of Women</u>	<u>% of Women</u>
1	105	73
2	92	64
3	54	38
4	8	6
5	30	21
6	40	28
7	41	29
8	17	12
9	21 (143)	15
10	3	2
11	6	4
12	16 (142)	11

^an = 144 unless otherwise indicated in parentheses.

researchers. A review of the literature produced frequencies of 65% ($n = 127$) and 61% ($n = 205$) for female undergraduate samples who reported engaging in sexual intercourse (Darling & Davidson, 1986; Turner et al., 1988), indicating that the present sample of women may be slightly more sexually active than the college-aged population.

To determine if certain types of questions on the SES clustered together in a meaningful manner, a principal-axis factor analysis was conducted. The first factor accounted for 24% of the variance, and the remaining three factors explained between 12% and 6% of the variance. The first two factors accounted for 36% of the variance. Following varimax rotation, the first factor contained three items with loadings greater than .40 (again, a natural cut-off existed between factor loadings). These items (items 7, 8, and 9) described situations in which threats or force were used by a man to engage in kissing or sex, but sexual intercourse did not occur. The items in the remaining factors did not appear to reflect distinguishable underlying dimensions. Consequently, SES responses were correlated with the other measures as a total score (using items 3 through 10) and as separate items.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the MCSDS was .75 ($n = 254$). This coefficient was similar to those reported by previous researchers (McFarland & Sparks, 1985; Nordholm,

1974; O'Grady, 1988). The mean number of socially desirable responses was 12.33 out of 33, with a mode of 11, a range of 1 to 25, and a standard deviation of 5. Separate analyses for men and women produced means of 12.24 (s.d. = 5.15, range = 1-25) and 12.41 (s.d. = 4.81, range = 1-23), respectively. These results can be compared to norms reported by Crowne and Marlowe (1964) and other researchers. Fourteen-hundred Ohio State undergraduates who were administered the scale produced means of 15.1 (s.d. = 5.6) and 16.8 (s.d. = 5.5) for men and women, respectively (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). A 1986 study of 135 men and 256 women attending college produced means of 14.25 and 13.72, respectively (Tanaka-Matsumi & Kameoka, 1986). The most recent sample of undergraduates (University of Maryland) produced means of 13.83 (s.d. = 4.59) and 15.15 (s.d. = 4.78) for men and women, respectively (O'Grady, 1988). The current study's statistics indicate a general tendency to respond to items on the scale in a slightly less socially desirable manner than previous samples, regardless of gender.

Relationship Between Men's Misperceptions and ASBI

It was hypothesized that men who score higher than others on the misperception measure will score higher on the ASBI. Pearson product moment correlations were therefore calculated between men's perceptions of the female actor on the misperception measure and their total scores on the ASBI

(with item 11 removed), as well as their scores on each of the ASBI items. These correlations are presented in Table 7.

Significant positive correlations between each of the four sexual perceptions and scores on the ASBI would constitute support for this hypothesis. As can be seen in the table, however, such expected correlations did not emerge. Some evidence consistent with the first hypothesis emerged in the pattern of correlations obtained between perceptions and the ASBI items. Six out of the seven significant correlations between the sexual perceptions and the ASBI items demonstrated a positive relationship, while 74% of the significant correlations for the nonsexual perceptions demonstrated a negative relationship.

Men's perceptions of friendly, intelligent and likeable intentions showed significant negative correlations with total scores on the ASBI, indicating that the more friendly, intelligent and/or likeable the woman was perceived to be, the less sexually aggressive the perceiver. The negative relationship between sexual aggressiveness and perceived friendliness is consistent with the hypothesis. The more a man perceives a woman's friendliness as such, the less likely he is to report a history of sexual aggression.

Summary of Relationship Between Men's Misperceptions and ASBI

Significant negative correlations between the four sexual perceptions and total ASBI scores did not emerge in

Table 7
Pearson Correlations Between Men's Perceptions of Female Actor and Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory

Female Actor tried to be:	Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory Items										
	TOTAL ASBI	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assertive	.02	.02	-.03	.09	.04	-.02	-.08	.05	.10	-.09	.00
Attractive	.03	-.03	-.07	.07	-.10	.01	-.03	-.03	.12	.08	.06
Cheerful	-.06	-.18*	-.03	.17*	-.10	-.02	.13	.09	.06	.01	-.15*
Considerate	-.14	-.11	-.13	.09	-.15*	-.03	-.12	-.11	-.01	.05	.00
Enthusiastic	-.01	-.04	.02	-.02	-.03	.02	.03	.06	.04	-.08	-.02
Friendly	-.20**	-.18*	-.14	.03	-.24**	-.03	-.09	-.18*	.05	-.07	-.13
Intelligent	-.22**	-.11	-.34**	-.03	-.12	-.19*	-.22**	-.10	-.02	-.01	.03
Likeable	-.16*	-.16*	-.13	.12	-.03	-.03	-.09	-.04	-.02	.03	-.09
Sincere	-.04	-.06	.02	.01	-.03	.02	-.18	-.16	-.05	.13	.14
Warm	-.11	-.09	-.18	.07	-.09	.05	-.15	-.07	.10	.11	.03
Flirtatious	.13	.10	.10	-.09	.06	-.05	.15*	.09	.02	.05	.07
Promiscuous	.10	.03	.03	.04	-.06	.11	.12	.17*	.00	.09	.13
Seductive	.09	.02	.06	.00	.03	.05	.09	.19*	.02	.17*	.08
Sexy	.04	-.01	.06	.00	-.03	.03	.05	.08	.01	.11	.05

Table 7 (Continued)
 Pearson Correlations Between Men's Perceptions of Female Actor and Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory

Female Actor tried to be:	Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory Items									
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Assertive	.10	-.02	.02	.08	.00	.07	-.11	-.02	-.02	-.05
Attractive	-.11	-.02	.05	.07	-.03	.03	.11	-.02	-.07	.00
Cheerful	-.05	.07	-.10	.00	.12	.14	-.13	.07	-.05	-.03
Considerate	.05	.04	.06	-.03	-.01	.06	.04	.04	-.12	-.04
Enthusiastic	-.06	.02	.07	-.08	-.07	.11	.08	.02	-.02	-.08
Friendly	.02	.01	.01	-.01	.04	.01	.04	.01	-.12	-.10
Intelligent	-.01	.03	.05	-.20*	-.22**	.05	.04	.03	-.01	.02
Likeable	.01	-.07	-.04	-.21**	-.23**	.00	-.11	-.07	-.16	-.07
Sincere	.11	.10	.09	.00	-.04	.10	.13	.10	-.01	.07
Warm	-.05	.15*	.16*	-.04	-.07	.18*	.02	.15*	.06	.13
Flirtatious	-.14	-.11	-.12	.19*	.13	-.10	.05*	-.11	-.01	-.05
Promiscuous	-.03	.13	.18*	.13	.07	.08	.12	.13	.03	.13
Seductive	-.08	-.05	-.03	.00	-.04	-.08	.00	-.05	-.07	.04
Sexy	-.21**	-.11	-.08	.08	.03	.14	-.06	-.11	-.12	-.07

^an = 130

* p < .05

** p < .01

this study. Only 7.5% of the correlations between ASBI items and sexual perceptions and between ASBI items and nonsexual perceptions were significant and in the expected direction. Consequently, the present data do not provide support for the hypothesis that men who are higher on the continuum of "misperception" report greater histories of sexual aggression.

Relationship Between Men's Misperceptions and HI

It was hypothesized that men who score higher than others on the misperception measure will score higher on the HI. Table 8 depicts the correlations between men's perceptions of the female actor and their total scores on the HI, as well as their scores on the six HI subscales.

The perception of promiscuity showed significant positive correlations with overall HI scores and five of the six HI subscales. These results indicate that men who rated the female student high on the perception of promiscuity shared attitudes represented by Mosher and Sirkin's (1984) hypermasculine personality. The perception of sexy showed a significant positive correlation with the Violence as Manly subscale, but significant correlations were not found when the physical and verbal types of violence were examined separately.

The nonsexual perceptions of cheerful, enthusiastic, intelligent, and likeable showed significant negative correlations with the Disrespect for Women subscale. The

Table 8

Pearson Correlations Between Men's Perceptions of Female Actor and Hypermasculinity Inventory^a

Female Actor tried to be:	HI	VAM	Hypermasculinity Inventory			DISR	DANGER
			PAAM	VAAM	CSEX		
Assertive	.11	.18*	.15*	.11	.07	.03	.00
Attractive	.03	.07	.04	-.01	.01	.06	.00
Cheerful	-.07	-.09	-.03	-.13	-.09	-.20*	-.04
Considerate	.01	-.03	-.03	.05	.01	.03	.01
Enthusiastic	.02	-.02	.02	.05	-.08	-.19*	.06
Friendly	.02	.00	.03	.04	.02	-.06	-.03
Intelligent	-.11	-.04	-.11	-.06	-.07	-.20*	-.20*
Likeable	.06	-.01	.14	.07	.13	-.15*	-.01
Sincere	.00	-.08	-.09	.05	.06	-.07	.03
Warm	-.01	.05	.06	-.05	-.10	-.05	-.04
Flirtatious	.06	.11	.11	.01	.02	-.06	.05
Promiscuous	.25**	.19*	.14	.24**	.21*	.20*	.16*
Seductive	.09	.11	.07	.07	.02	.06	.05
Sexy	.13	.17*	.12	.05	.08	.06	.04

Note. HI = Total score on Hypermasculinity Inventory;
 VAM = Violence as Manly subscale; PAAM = Physical Aggression as Manly subscale;
 VAAM = Verbal Aggression as Manly subscale; CSEX = Calloused Sex subscale;
 DISR = Disrespect for Wome subscale; DANGER = Danger as Exciting subscale.

^an = 130 *p < .05 ** p < .01

more the female student was perceived as cheerful, enthusiastic, intelligent or likeable, the more the man tended to show less disrespect towards women. The nonsexual traits did not correlate with the Calloused Sex subscale.

The perception of assertive showed significant positive correlations with the Violence as Manly and Physical Aggression as Manly subscales. The more assertive the female student was perceived to be, the higher the man's score tended to be on the HI. Such a result appears logical because hypermasculine men, who like to dominate and control, would most likely feel threatened by assertive women.

Summary of Relationship Between Men's Misperceptions and the HI

The findings of the present study provide little support for the hypothesis that misperceptions and hypermasculinity are positively related. Only the perception of promiscuity showed significant correlations with total HI scores and/or any of the subscales. According to the results of this study, men who are higher misperceivers of women's friendly behavior are not more likely to be more hypermasculine than other men.

Relationship Between Men's HI and ASBI Scores

It was hypothesized that men who score higher on the HI will score higher on the ASBI. In other words, the more hypermasculine a man appeared to be, the greater his expected history of sexual aggression. Table 9 indicates the correlations between scores on the HI and ASBI (total

Table 9
Pearson Correlations Between Hypermasculinity Inventory and Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory

HI	Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory									
	Items									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total ASBI										
Total HI ^a	.36***	.17*	.25**	.01	.30**	.16*	.28**	.20**	.10	.21**
VAM ^b	.16**	.06	-.04	.18*	.02	.21*	.13	.04	.07	.00
PAAM ^c	.20**	-.09	.03	.20*	.00	.25**	.14	.00	.09	.00
VAAM ^d	.06	.04	-.12	.05	.07	.06	.07	.04	.01	-.04
CSEX ^e	.33***	.17*	.35***	.00	.26**	.24**	.12	.07	.18*	.10
DISR ^f	.36***	.13	.35***	-.03	.31***	.25**	.01	.05	.23**	.18*
DANGER ^g	.36***	.16*	.25**	-.04	.33***	.12	.31***	.26**	.23**	.23***
11	.12	.13	.14	.15	.16	.17	.18	.19	.20	
Total HI	.15*	.07	.22**	.17*	.06	.22**	.13	.14	.17*	
VAM	.14	.01	.16*	.10	.05	.15*	.08	.11	.10	
PAAM	.09	.04	.21**	.15*	.03	.12	.04	.13	.11	
VAAM	.20*	.07	.04	.03	.00	.14	.08	.03	.03	
CSEX	.14	-.08	.22**	.11	-.13	.19*	--	.03	.07	
DISR	.09	.19*	.39***	.25**	.11	.16*	.19*	.10	.16*	
DANGER	.07	--	.16*	.14	-.06	.11	--	.04	.14	

Note. HI = Hypermasculinity Inventory; ASBI = Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory; VAM = Violence as Manly subscale; PAAM = Physical Aggression as Manly subscale; VAAM = Verbal Aggression as Manly subscale; CSEX = Calloused Sex subscale; DISR = Disrespect for Wome subscale; DANGER = Danger as Exciting subscale.

^an = 130. ^bn = 116. ^cn = 123. ^dn = 124. ^en = 116. ^fn = 125. ^gn = 120.

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

scores and scores on separate subscales or items). All significant correlations between the HI and ASBI were in the hypothesized (positive) direction. The correlation between men's total scores on the HI and their overall ASBI scores (with item 11 removed) was highly significant ($r(130) = .36$, $p < .0001$). In addition, five of the six subscales were significantly correlated with total ASBI scores in the expected direction. These results are consistent with Mosher and Anderson's (1986) findings.

Total HI scores were significantly correlated with 13 out of the 20 items on the ASBI. The 7 items that were not significantly correlated tended to be those with the lowest variances; as few as one subject responded with values greater than zero. The Violence as Manly subscale was significantly correlated with 4 of the 20 items; the Physical Aggression as Manly subscale with three of the same items; and the Verbal Aggression as Manly subscale with only one item (not one of the three that correlated with the two related subscales).

The Calloused Sex Attitudes subscale was significantly correlated with 7 of the 20 items, and the Disrespect for Women subscale correlated with five of the same items plus an additional 8 items. These 8 items were again those with very low variability. Apparently one or two subjects (who reported aggressive behaviors on the ASBI and showed calloused sex attitudes towards women on the HI) were

creating these significant correlations. The Danger as Exciting subscale significantly correlated with 8 of the 20 items. There were no obvious patterns to the significant correlations within or across the various subscales.

Summary of Relationship Between Men's HI and ASBI Scores

There seems to be little doubt that higher levels of hypermasculinity are associated with greater reported histories of sexual aggression. This result supports Mosher and Anderson's (1986) previous findings, and supports the construct validity of the two scales.

Relationship Between Women's Misperceptions and the FVI

The fourth hypothesis tested in this study was that women who score higher than others on the four sexual perceptions of the male actor will also score higher on the FVI. The sample of females was separated according to the video they viewed. Correlations were calculated between women's perceptions of the male actor on the misperception measure and their total score on the FVI, as well as each of the items on the FVI. The correlations for each of the two videos are depicted in Table 10 and 11. In addition, the patterns of significant correlations for the two video conditions are compared in Table 12.

Friendly Video

All significant correlations for the sexual perceptions were in the hypothesized (positive) direction. Correlations between perceptions of seductive, sexy, and attractive and

Table 10

Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Friendly Video Condition and Female Victimization Inventory (FVI)^a

Male Actor tried to be:	TOTAL FVI	Female Victimization Inventory Items								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assertive	.08	-.22*	-.07	.00	-.02	.03	-.15	.13	-.23*	
Attractive	.21*	.18	.16	.05	.10	.02	.36***	-.05	.21*	
Cheerful	.08	-.03	.19	-.04	.07	.20*	.21*	-.13	.11	
Considerate	.05	-.09	.09	-.16	-.07	-.21*	.07	-.21*	.16	
Enthusiastic	-.04	-.03	.05	-.08	-.13	-.08	.03	-.03	.01	
Friendly	-.04	.01	.01	-.12	-.02	-.22*	.06	-.17	.09	
Intelligent	-.10	-.09	-.21*	.03	-.03	.14	-.08	-.05	-.15	
Likeable	-.05	-.02	.00	-.22*	-.04	-.20*	.06	-.25*	.09	
Sincere	-.05	-.03	.00	-.18	-.04	-.07	.07	-.25*	.10	
Warm	-.04	.03	.12	-.22*	.02	.05	.16	-.27**	.11	
Flirtatious	.16	.18	.25*	.05	.11	-.01	.17	.14	.17	
Promiscuous	.03	-.06	.14	.00	-.02	-.01	.03	-.06	.01	
Seductive	.24*	.13	.36***	.03	.23*	.05	.41***	.07	.22*	
Sexy	.29**	.11	.32**	.10	.28**	.10	.34***	.03	.35***	

Table 10 (continued)
 Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Friendly Video Condition
 and Female Victimization Inventory (FVI)

Male Actor tried to be:	Female Victimization Inventory Items								
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Assertive	-.24*	-.16	-.25*	-.17	-.25*	-.10	.07	--	-.04
Attractive	.14	.19	-.14	.16	.09	.22*	.06	--	.03
Cheerful	-.07	.19	-.23*	.26*	-.15	.12	-.03	--	.08
Considerate	.04	.15	.06	.14	.04	.13	.03	--	.13
Enthusiastic	-.17	.08	-.10	.03	-.14	.03	-.09	--	.10
Friendly	-.11	.12	-.10	.10	-.09	.08	.03	--	.08
Intelligent	-.03	-.18	-.16	-.17	-.11	-.25*	-.23*	--	-.26*
Likeable	-.05	.13	.04	.08	-.12	.04	-.07	--	-.02
Sincere	-.06	.12	.04	.14	-.09	.00	-.13	--	-.07
Warm	-.23*	.18	.17	.17	-.18	.16	.00	--	.03
Flirtatious	.00	.23*	-.10	.22*	.01	.38***	.22*	--	.19*
Promiscuous	.07	-.01	.11	-.03	.07	.08	.21*	--	.24*
Seductive	.04	.27*	-.07	.25*	.02	.33***	.25*	--	.31**
Sexy	.15	.37***	-.07	.35***	.06	.49***	.24*	--	.21*

Note. The only subject who reported engaging in behavior described in item 17 was in harassment condition. There was no variance in responses to item 17 in friendly condition and consequently no correlations were produced for that item.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 11

Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Harassing Video Condition and Female Victimization Inventory (FVI)^a

Male Actor tried to be:	TOTAL FVI	Female Victimization Inventory Items								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assertive	.06	.21*	.04	.06	.02	.00	-.04	.07	-.02	.11
Attractive	.11	-.06	.03	.00	.15	.11	.11	.03	.16	.13
Cheerful	-.14	.08	.01	-.17	-.15	-.09	-.15	-.09	-.09	-.20
Considerate	-.14	.26*	-.08	-.02	-.23*	-.20	-.14	.00	-.12	-.08
Enthusiastic	-.16	-.03	-.09	.06	-.24*	-.20	-.08	-.06	-.03	-.04
Friendly	.02	.24*	.00	-.03	-.04	-.07	.11	.09	.11	.12
Intelligent	-.06	-.05	-.02	-.24*	.06	.14	-.10	-.14	-.22*	-.07
Likeable	-.04	.11	.04	-.07	.05	-.03	-.06	-.08	-.07	-.03
Sincere	-.01	.10	.16	-.18	.09	.06	-.22*	-.18	-.12	-.19
Warm	-.01	-.05	.05	-.18	.12	.08	-.05	-.09	-.12	-.05
Flirtatious	.24*	.17	.21*	.14	.17	.10	.09	.07	.16	.12
Promiscuous	-.01	-.04	.03	.19	-.06	-.04	.01	-.14	-.07	-.02
Seductive	.09	.02	-.06	.06	.02	.08	.10	.14	.14	.14
Sexy	.20*	.03	.13	.02	.20	.16	.15	.07	.21*	.16

Table 11 (Continued)
 Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Harassing Video Condition
 and Female Victimization Inventory (FVI)

Male Actor tried to be:	Female Victimization Inventory									
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	18
Assertive	.15	.02	.06	.05	-.20	-.02	-.01	.09	--	--
Attractive	.15	-.05	-.07	.16	.11	.00	.02	-.20	--	--
Cheerful	-.17	-.17	-.17	-.17	-.12	-.03	-.15	-.21*	--	--
Considerate	-.19	.03	.01	-.11	-.07	-.05	.01	.01	--	--
Enthusiastic	-.10	-.07	-.13	-.07	.04	-.03	-.02	-.18	--	--
Friendly	-.05	-.19	-.27*	-.01	.12	.04	-.06	-.10	--	--
Intelligent	.09	-.13	-.07	-.10	-.15	-.32**	-.15	-.11	--	--
Likeable	-.14	-.33**	-.45***	-.19	.06	.05	-.17	-.02	--	--
Sincere	-.22*	-.10	-.17	-.21*	.05	.03	-.06	-.05	--	--
Warm	-.08	-.19	-.28*	-.09	.04	-.18	-.09	.10	--	--
Flirtatious	.19	.15	.17	.14	.18	.10	.12	.15	--	--
Promiscuous	.05	.10	.14	.02	.00	-.07	.04	.10	--	--
Seductive	.14	-.13	-.09	.08	.15	.08	-.10	.16	--	--
Sexy	.16	.02	.03	.20	.12	.11	.05	-.10	--	--

Note. The five subjects who reported engaging in behavior described in item 18 were in friendly condition. There was no variance in responses to item 18 in harassment condition and consequently no correlations were produced for that item.

^an = 66. *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 12

Comparison of Significant Correlations Between Male Actor and FVI for Friendly Video Versus Harassing Video Conditions

Male Actor tried to be	Female Victimization Inventory Items																				
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		
Assertive	f+	h+	f-																		
Attractive							f+	f+		f-	f-		f-	f-	f-						
Cheerful						f+							f-	f+		f+				h-	
Considerate	h+	h+			h-																
Enthusiastic					h-																
Friendly	h+	h+			h-								h-								
Intelligent				f-h-		f-			h-				h-			f-h-	f-				
Likeable					f-				f-		h-		h-								
Sincere					h-				f-		h-		h-								
Warm					f-				f-		f-		h-								
Flirtatious	h+		h+	f+								f+	f+		f+					f+	
Promiscuous	f+		f+		f+					f+		f+	f+		f+						f+
Seductive	f+h+		f+		f+					f+		f+	f+		f+						f+
Sexy																					f+

Note. f+ = Positive correlation for Friendly Video; f- = Negative correlation for Friendly Video; h+ = Positive correlation for Harassing Video; h- = Negative correlation for Harassing Video.

total FVI scores were significant. Apparently, women who perceived the male professor as more seductive, sexy and attractive than others, tended to report greater histories of sexual victimization. The perception of flirtatious showed significant correlations with items 3, 11, 13, 15, 16, and 18 of the FVI; the perception of promiscuous with items 16 and 18; the perception of seductive with items 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, and 18, and the perception of sexy with items 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 18. Although these nine items were significantly correlated with at least two of the sexual perceptions, there were no discernible patterns between the types of sexual victimization (described in the items) that correlated with sexual perceptions.

The majority (87%) of the significant correlations between the nonsexual perceptions and the FVI items were in the expected negative direction. The three correlations that deviated from this pattern were for the perception of cheerful; the more cheerful the man was perceived to be, the higher the level of reported sexual victimization.

Harassing Video

Significant positive correlations emerged for perceptions of flirtatious and sexy and the total FVI scores. Only two out of a possible 72 correlations (3%) between sexual perceptions and FVI items, however, were positive and significant, compared to 36% of the

correlations in the friendly video.

Summary of Relationship Between Women's Misperceptions and FVI

Table 12 provides a graphic comparison of the significant correlations obtained between misperceptions and FVI scores for both videos. Two out of the four sexual perceptions were significantly and positively correlated with total FVI scores for each of the videos. Perceptions of seductive and sexy in the friendly video provide moderate support for the hypothesis that women who misperceive men's friendly behavior as sexually motivated will report greater histories of sexual victimization. Perceptions of flirtatious and sexy in the harassing video provide moderate support for the hypothesis that women who perceive men's ambiguous behavior as sexually motivated will be more likely to report greater histories of sexual victimization. Additional support for the relationship between sexual perceptions and sexual victimization was provided by the individual FVI items in the friendly video, but not by the items in the harassing video. Half of the FVI items in the friendly video showed significant correlations with at least two of the four sexual perceptions. Individual FVI items were not related to sexual perceptions in the harassing video.

Relationship Between Women's Misperceptions and SES

It was hypothesized that women who score higher than others on the sexual perceptions will also score higher on

the 10-item SES. Correlations were therefore calculated between women's perceptions of the male actor's sexual intentions and their total scores on the SES, as well as each of the items on the SES. The sample of females was again separated according to the video they viewed. The resulting correlations for each video viewed are depicted in Table 13 and 14. The patterns of significant correlations for the two video conditions are compared in Table 15.

Friendly Video

Perceptions of seductive and sexy showed significant positive correlations with overall scores on the SES, indicating some support for the hypothesis that the more a woman misperceives the professor's friendly behavior as sexual interest, the more likely she is to report a greater history of sexual victimization. Although only 21% of the possible correlations between sexual perceptions and SES items were significant, they were all in the hypothesized positive direction. Nine of the 11 significant correlations for the nonsexual items, however, were also in the positive direction. This result does not fit the expected trend: the more a nonsexual trait was perceived, the greater the perceiver's history of sexual victimization.

Harassing Video

Sexual perceptions of the professor were not related to total SES scores, and these perceptions correlated with only 19% of the SES items. In addition, a mere 7% of the

Table 13

Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Friendly Video Condition and

Sexual Experiences Survey^a

Male Actor tried to be:	Total SES	Sexual Experiences Survey Items											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Assertive	-.09	-.07	.21*	-.04	.01	-.01	.02	-.04	-.08	-.02	-.18	-.14	-.18
Attractive	.10	.05	.23*	.05	.01	.01	-.02	.11	.13	.22*	.12	.01	-.01
Cheerful	.17	.04	-.04	-.10	.23*	.02	.03	.15	.16	.25*	.12	.27**	.12
Considerate	.10	.10	.06	-.13	.21*	.09	.01	.08	.12	.11	.15	.07	.07
Enthusiastic	.10	-.05	.02	-.12	.14	.08	.10	.04	.11	.05	.18	.09	.13
Friendly	-.02	.14	-.02	-.19*	-.01	-.09	.00	-.02	.12	.12	.12	.12	-.05
Intelligent	-.05	-.12	.01	.00	-.08	.11	-.04	.00	.06	-.08	-.09	.00	-.13
Likeable	.06	.02	.05	-.17	.13	.04	.00	.02	.10	.09	.18	.12	.11
Sincere	.11	.04	.09	-.06	.08	.10	.06	.10	.07	-.03	.18	.22*	.10
Warm	.13	-.19*	-.01	-.10	.18	-.08	.01	.18	.10	.07	.18	.30**	.28**
Flirtatious	.11	-.06	.09	-.05	.16	.13	.03	.01	.11	.12	.11	.03	.13
Promiscuous	.11	.02	-.11	.06	.19	.12	.07	.04	.05	.08	-.09	-.01	.09
Seductive	.22*	-.02	.05	.04	.26*	.12	.09	.07	.23*	.20*	.11	.05	.19*
Sexy	.34***	.05	.10	.13	.30**	.18	.24*	.12	.32**	.22*	.31**	.10	.25*

^an = 78. *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 14
 Pearson Correlations Between Women's Perceptions of Male Actor in Harassing Video Condition and
 Sexual Experiences Survey^a

Male Actor tried to be:	Total SES	Sexual Experiences Survey Items											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Assertive	.07	-.05	.08	-.02	.02	.12	-.08	.14	.19	-.01	.09	-.13	-.18
Attractive	-.04	.13	.19	-.15	.02	-.05	.23*	-.04	.09	-.08	.01	-.23*	-.08
Cheerful	-.15	-.01	-.22*	-.02	.00	-.09	-.05	-.08	-.11	-.13	.11	-.12	-.16
Considerate	-.03	.04	-.14	-.07	.06	.00	-.01	.01	-.05	.03	.10	-.04	-.09
Enthusiastic	-.13	.14	-.28*	.02	.01	-.05	-.03	-.09	-.01	-.11	.07	-.22*	-.24*
Friendly	.15	.09	.05	.07	.10	.08	.01	.17	.11	.15	.02	.04	-.04
Intelligent	-.07	-.11	-.11	-.18	-.08	-.07	.05	.06	.01	.09	.07	-.15	-.12
Likeable	-.09	.05	-.01	-.05	.00	-.18	-.15	.04	-.11	.14	.07	.02	-.14
Sincere	-.15	-.10	-.10	.00	.02	-.17	-.15	-.04	-.33**	.08	.03	-.04*	-.10
Warm	-.07	-.08	-.08	-.21*	-.09	-.11	-.10	.09	-.01	.15	.02	.13	-.08
Flirtatious	.07	.00	.24*	.01	-.04	-.01	.24*	.24*	.30**	.10	.01	-.06	-.01
Promiscuous	.09	.10	.17	.02	-.06	-.06	.00	.03*	.20	.08	-.05	.18	.05
Seductive	.11	.06	.22*	.16	-.04	-.06	.23*	.04	.22*	-.13	-.04	.02	-.18
Sexy	.19	.06	-.26*	-.01	-.04	-.03	.35***	-.01	.20*	-.01	-.03	-.06	-.04

^a $\eta = 66.$

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 15

Comparison of Significant Correlations Between Male Actor and SES for Friendly Video Versus

Harassing Video Conditions

Male Actor tried to be	Sexual Experience Survey Items												
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Assertive			f+										
Attractive			f+							f+		h-	
Cheerful			h-		f+	h+				f+		f+	
Condsiderate			h-									h-	h-
Enthusiastic													
Friendly				f-									
Intelligent													
Likeable													
Sincere									h-			f+	
Warm		f-		h-								f+	f+
Flirtatious			h+			h+		h+	h+				
Promiscuous													
Seductive	f+		h+		f+	h+			f+h+	f+			f+
Sexy	f+		h+		f+	f+h+			f+	f+	f+		f+

Note. f+ = Positive correlation for Friendly Video; f- = Negative correlation for Friendly Video; h+ = Positive correlation for Harassing Video; h- = Negative correlation for Harassing Video.

nonsexual perceptions correlated significantly (and negatively) with the SES items. The results of this analysis do not support the hypothesis that women's ratings of the male professor's ambiguous or potentially harassing behavior are related to their histories of sexual victimization.

Summary of Women's Misperceptions and the SES

Table 15 provides a graphic comparison of the significant correlations obtained between misperceptions and SES scores for both videos. Significant positive correlations between sexual perceptions of seductive and sexy and total SES scores in the friendly video condition provide some support for the hypothesis that women who misperceive a man's friendly behavior as sexual interest will show greater histories of sexual victimization. On the other hand, little evidence was found to support the hypothesis that women who perceive the professor's ambiguous or potentially harassing behavior as sexually motivated are more likely to report greater histories of sexual victimization.

Relationship Between Women's FVI and SES Scores

The large correlation obtained between the overall scores on the FVI and the SES provided support for the construct validity of both scales ($r(144) = .53, p < .01$). (See Table 16.) In addition, 17 of the 18 items on the FVI were significantly correlated with the overall SES scores,

Table 16

Pearson Correlations Between Female Victimization Inventory (FVI) and Sexual Experiences Survey (SES)^a

FVI	Total SES	Sexual Experiences Survey Items											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total FVI	.53**	.13	.24**	.24**	.40**	.31**	.15*	.34**	.36**	.34**	.39**	.30**	.30**
1	.38**												
2	.37**												
3	.39**												
4	.10												
5	.15*												
6	.30**												
7	.30**												
8	.23**												
9	.50**												
10	.31**												
11	.49**												
12	.18*												
13	.47**												
14	.38**												
15	.43**												
16	.23*												
17	.15*												
18	.33**												

Note. Total SES represents items 3 through 10 on scale.

^an = 144. *p < .05 **p < .01

and 11 of the 12 items on the SES were significantly correlated with the overall FVI scores. As one would expect, the first item on the SES (which described sexual intercourse with mutual consent) was not significantly related to the FVI because it was not a form of sexual victimization. The second item on the SES was significantly correlated to the FVI because it asked women whether a man ever misperceived the level of sexual intimacy they had desired. Recall that these items were not included in other SES analyses because they did not represent a behavioral description of sexual victimization.

Test for Possible Response Bias

To test whether a social desirability response bias may have occurred when subjects completed the questionnaires, correlations were computed between the MCSDS and the overall scores on the four main questionnaires (ASBI, HI, FVI, and SES) and the six HI subscales. These correlations are depicted in Table 17.

The correlation between the MCSDS and the HI barely reached significance ($r(130) = -.15, p = .049$), suggesting the existence of a slight response bias in completing this inventory. Apparently, the lower the reported level of hypermasculinity, the greater the tendency to answer the Marlowe-Crowne items in a socially desirable way. A similar finding was reported by Mosher and Sirkin (1986) in their study. There was a significant correlation between the

Table 17

Pearson Correlations Between Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) and All Measures

	ASBI ^a	HI ^b	FVI ^c	SES ^d	VAM ^e	PVAM ^f	VVAM ^g	CSEX ^h	DISR ⁱ	DANGER ^j
MCSDS	-.05	-.15*	-.07	-.18*	-.24**	-.19*	.10	-.03	-.01	-.09

Note. ASBI = Aggressive Sexual Behavior Inventory; HI = Hypermasculinity Inventory; FVI = Female Victimization Inventory; SES = items 3 through 10 of Sexual Experiences Survey; VAM = Violence as Manly subscale of HI; PVAM = Physical Aggression as Manly subscale of HI; VAAM = Verbal Aggression as Manly subscale of HI; CSEX = Calloused Sex subscale of HI; DISR = Disrespect or Women subscale of HI; DANGER = Danger as Exciting subscale of HI.

^an = 130.

^bn = 130.

^cn = 144.

^dn = 144.

^en = 116.

^fn = 123.

^gn = 124.

^hn = 116.

ⁱn = 125.

^jn = 120.

* p < .05

** p < .01

MCSDS and the Violence as Manly subscale ($r(116) = -.24, p < .01$) and the Physical Aggression as Manly subscale ($r(123) = -.19, p < .05$). Again, the lower the scores on the Violence as Manly subscale or Physical Aggression as Manly subscale, the greater the tendency to answer the Marlowe-Crowne items in a socially desirable way.

Partial correlations, with the effect of the MCSDS partialled out, between misperceptions and total HI scores and the Violence as Manly and Physical Aggression as Manly subscale scores were therefore calculated. No significant differences in the results were observed: only the perception of promiscuous showed a significant correlation with the HI.

Scores on the total HI and the two subscales that correlated with the MCSDS were then partially correlated with total ASBI scores. No significant differences were obtained; all previous correlations remained significant.

A significant negative correlation between the MCSDS and the 10-item SES was also significant ($r(144) = -.18, p < .05$), indicating that the lower the reported frequency of sexual victimization, the greater the tendency to answer the MCSDS items in a socially desirable way. Partial correlations between perceptions and total SES scores were therefore calculated. One significant difference in the results emerged: the perception of flirtatious was now significantly correlated with total SES scores in the

harassing condition. The emergence of this significant correlation in the harassing condition provides mild support for the view that women who perceive a man's ambiguous or potentially harassing behavior as sexually motivated will show greater histories of sexual victimization.

Discussion

The present study replicated the results of several studies demonstrating that men have a tendency to misperceive women's friendliness as sexual interest in them (Abbey, 1982; Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin & Harnish, 1987; Abbey & Melby, 1986; Goodchilds & Zellman, 1984; Saal et al., in press). After observing a friendly interaction between a man and woman, men attributed greater sexual intentions to the female actor than women did. In an interaction where the man could be construed as harassing the woman, men still attributed more sexual intentions to the female actor than did women, but the man was perceived by both sexes as having greater sexual motives than he did in the friendly interaction. This result was consistent with the findings of Johnson, Stockdale and Saal (1987).

Subjects' mean ratings of how sexual they perceived the female student intending to behave fell below the mid-point (4.00) of the 7-point scale; this is also consistent with previous findings (Abbey et al., 1982; Saal et al., in press). As explained by Saal et al., subjects did not perceive the woman as trying to behave in a particularly

provocative manner; men simply saw her as trying to be "less unseductive, less unflirtatious, less unpromiscuous, and less unsexy" than women did. In the harassing video, however, the male professor received mean ratings above the mid-point of the scale, indicating that subjects, especially men, perceived him behaving in a provocative manner.

Saal et al. (in press) concluded that men were not perceiving "a blatantly flirtatious seductress" when confronted with a friendly woman. Instead, they suggested that men's "thresholds" for perceiving sexual behavior in women may be reached by actions that are less overtly "sexy" than women's thresholds. These researchers observed that as men and women become better acquainted, women will display increasingly friendly and outgoing behavior. These data suggest that men will be quicker to label this increasingly friendly behavior as "sexy." Men may then respond to these women in a "variety of ways that the woman in question may construe as sexual harassment."

Saal et al.'s threshold hypothesis suggests that men who misperceive a female acquaintance's friendly behavior as sexual interest in them may be more likely to engage in sexual harassment (Saal et al., in press) or date rape (Abbey et al., 1987). One objective of the present study was to determine whether men's levels of misperception of a woman's friendly behavior are related to their histories of sexual aggression against women. A significant relationship

between these variables would constitute support for the prediction that men who misperceive women more than others may engage in date rape and the coercive or physically intrusive forms of sexual harassment.

The present data do not support the predicted relationship between men's misperceptions and their sexual aggressiveness. Total ASBI scores were not significantly correlated with sexual perceptions, and only 7.5% of the correlations between ASBI items and sexual perceptions were significantly correlated in the hypothesized direction.

Responses to the ASBI indicate that the men in this sample reported very low frequencies of sexual aggressiveness towards women. Table 18 compares the percentages of men in the present sample who reported engaging in the items on the ASBI compared to those in Mosher and Anderson's (1986) sample. It is clear that the percentages for the present sample are much lower than Mosher and Anderson's sample. Their sample of students attended the University of Connecticut and had a mean age of 19, so the men were at least similar in age to the present sample.

The third column of Table 18 displays the percentages of women in the present sample who reported experiencing the items described on the ASBI (by completing the FVI). In general, greater percentages of women reported experiencing the events in the questionnaire than men in the present

Table 18

Comparison of % of Males Who Reported Experiencing Behaviors
described on ASBI for Present Sample vs. Mosher & Anderson (M & A)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>M & A^a</u>	<u>Present^b</u>	<u>(FVI^c)</u>
1	66	30	(88)
2	76	29	(45)
3	34	9	(21.5)
4	51	19	(14)
5	19	12	(18)
6	26	18	(23)
7	44	12	(19)
8	42	9	(7)
9	41	7	(17)
10	18	8.5	(19)
11	18	15	(6)
12	6	1	(3)
13	6	1.5	(8)
14	19	15	(10)
15	11	2	(--)
16	6	2	(6)
17	10	9	(--)
18	10	1	(3)
19	5	1.5	(1)
20	6	2	(3.5)

Note: Responses to the female version of the ASBI are printed in parentheses.

^a \bar{n} = 175.

^b \bar{n} = 130.

^c \bar{n} = 144.

sample. This may indicate that the men were less honest in reporting their sexual histories than the women. No significant correlation emerged between the men's ASBI responses and scores on the MCSDS, however, indicating that men were not "hiding" their true responses out of a need for social approval. A more plausible explanation for this sample's gender difference in reported frequencies of sexual aggression/victimization is that a small number of men have perpetrated these sexually aggressive behaviors on numerous K-State women.

Both men and women in the present sample reported significantly fewer sexually aggressive experiences than the men attending the University of Connecticut in Mosher and Anderson's (1986) sample. The Midwest is known for its political, religious and moral conservatism; therefore, this sample's frequency of sexual aggression/victimization may be lower than that of the general U.S. college-aged population.

It might be argued that the consistently low values and lack of variance in responses to the ASBI items (the mean standard deviation across the 20 items was 1.25, with a range of .09 to 6.43) would render it unlikely that significant correlations could be obtained using these ASBI scores. Significant correlations were obtained between ASBI scores and HI scores, however, which undermines such an argument.

Nevertheless, it must be noted that only 13% of the

variance in ASBI scores was accounted for by the HI. There is evidence to suggest that the ASBI is a multidimensional measure. Such a measure is likely to show poor internal consistency, which can affect the size of any correlation with other variables. Factor analysis of the original ASBI (Mosher & Anderson, 1986) produced six factors. This suggests multidimensionality, and might explain the relatively low reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha of .70) found for the ASBI in this study. If the ASBI was a "purer" measure of sexual aggression, a stronger correlation with hypermasculinity may have emerged as well as significant correlations between misperceptions and sexual aggression. Unidimensional measures of sexual aggression and sexual harassment must be developed and tested to support the tentative conclusions of this study.

The second purpose of this study was to determine whether men's misperceptions of women's friendly behavior as "sexiness" is related to their level of hypermasculinity. The results provide little support for this hypothesized relationship. The perception of promiscuity was the only sexual perception that provided any support for the hypothesis. Men who viewed the female student's behavior as more promiscuous had higher levels of hypermasculinity. Even this small amount of support is questionable, however.

It has become apparent that subjects may not have clearly understood the term "promiscuous." Responses to

this item tended to have the highest variability in the present study, as well as in the study by Saal et al. (in press), indicating that subjects may have been unsure how to respond to this item. The New Webster's Dictionary defines a "promiscuous" person as one who engages in indiscriminate sexual relations. Because subjects were not informed of the sexual histories of the actors in the videotapes, they could not be expected to accurately respond to this item. This confusion may explain why it was the only perception that showed a significant correlation with the HI. It is the author's suggestion that this term be removed from the misperception measure in future studies.

A third objective of this study was to replicate Mosher and Anderson's (1986) finding that men's histories of sexual aggression are related to their levels of hypermasculinity. The results provided strong support for this relationship. Total HI scores and all subscales were significantly and positively correlated with men's overall ASBI scores, even after any effects of the MCSDS were partialled out. These results are consistent with Mosher and Anderson's findings, and provide further support for the construct validity of the HI and ASBI. As mentioned earlier, a unidimensional measure of sexual aggression would probably produce a much stronger correlation between sexual aggression and hypermasculinity.

Mosher and Sirkin's (1986) Violence as Manly and

Calloused Sex subscales correlated with the same items, or subset of those items, as the newly created Physical Aggression as Manly and Disrespect for Women subscales, respectively. This result provides some support for the validity of two of Mosher and Sirkin's three components of the hypermasculinity personality constellation.

The Calloused Sex and Disrespect for Women subscales correlated with more ASBI items than the other HI subscales; this is consistent with the hypothesis, because the ASBI is a measure of sexual victimization of women. These subscales reflect the attitude that "sexual intercourse with women establishes masculine power and female submission, and is to be achieved without empathic concern for the female's subjective experience" (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). The higher the men's scores on these subscales, the more likely they were to report greater histories of sexual aggression. Mosher and Anderson reported similar relationships between the HI and ASBI scores in 1986.

The Violence as Manly subscale, and its two newly created subscales -- Physical Aggression as Manly and Verbal Aggression as Manly -- correlated with relatively few ASBI items. The lack of association between the ASBI and Violence as Manly component of the HI is to be expected, considering that the ASBI measures violence against women, not men.

It must be noted that conclusions derived from analyses

of the majority of the HI subscales should be interpreted with caution. Factor analysis of the HI did not produce the three distinct hypermasculinity components defined by Mosher and Sirkin (1984). The Violence as Manly component received some support, the Calloused Sex Attitudes component received less support, and the Danger as Exciting component received no support at all. In addition, four of the six HI subscales showed poor internal consistency (Cronbach alphas between .62 and .67). This is a problem because reliability is a necessary (although not sufficient) condition for validity. The Violence as Manly and Physical Aggression as Manly subscales showed acceptable reliability coefficients. These findings support the presence of a global hypermasculine personality constellation (total HI scores), but do not provide convincing evidence for the existence of three distinct HI components.

This study also looked at women's reported frequency of sexual victimization. Approximately 70% of the women in this sample had experienced some form of sexual victimization. Table 19 compares the percentages of women who reported experiencing the items on the SES in the present sample compared to the Koss and Oros (1982) sample. The percentages from the present sample are consistent with those obtained by Koss and Oros. Subjects in the previous study were students at Kent State University with a mean age of 21. Young people attending Kansas State University and

Table 19

Comparison of % of Females Who Reported Experiencing Behaviors
described on SES for Present Sample vs. Koss & Oros (K & O)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>K & O^a</u>	<u>Present^b</u>
1	75.4	73
2	70.5	64
3	32.8	38
4	5.9	6
5	21.4	21
6	20.4	28
7	30.2	29
8	18.3	12
9	8.7	15
10	3.1	2
11	8.2	4
12	6.4	11

^a \bar{n} = 305.

^b \bar{n} = 144.

Kent State University are probably quite similar in their backgrounds, values, etc. No female norms were available for the FVI because it was created from the ASBI specifically for this study. Its validity is supported, however, by its significant correlations (total scores and individual item scores) with the SES, even after the effect of the MCSDS was partialled out.

This study explored whether women's histories of sexual victimization by men are related to their misperceptions of men's friendly behavior as sexual interest, or to their perceptions of men's ambiguous or potentially harassing behaviors as sexually motivated. Subjects' responses were analyzed separately based on the video viewed; subjects' ratings created a "misperception" continuum in the friendly video condition, and a "sexual perception continuum" in the harassing video. Two measures of women's histories of sexual victimization were utilized -- the FVI and SES. The predictions were similar for both groups: women who score higher on the perception continuum will score higher on the FVI and SES. After the effect of the MCSDS was partialled out of the correlations between perceptions and the SES scores, similar results were obtained for both measures.

The results provide moderate support for the hypothesis that women's levels of misperception of men's friendly behavior as sexually motivated (measured by the friendly video) are related to their histories of sexual

victimization. Significant positive correlations emerged between total FVI and SES scores and perceptions of seductiveness and sexiness.

Moderate support also emerged for the hypothesis that women's perceptions of men's ambiguous or potentially harassing behavior as sexually motivated are related to their histories of sexual victimization. Significant positive correlations emerged between total FVI and SES scores and the perception of flirtatiousness, and between total FVI scores and the perception of sexiness.

The results of these analyses suggest that the more a woman reports that she has been sexually victimized, the lower her threshold tends to be for perceiving men's friendly and/or ambiguous behaviors as sexually motivated. It is important to note, however, that a relatively small percentage of the variance (a maximum of 12%) in women's reported sexual victimization was accounted for by their misperceptions. It is possible that these small effect sizes were caused by the multidimensionality of the sexual victimization measures. The FVI and SES produced four factors explaining 54% and 48% of the variance in responses to the scales, respectively. A unidimensional measure of sexual victimization is needed to substantiate the present findings.

The correlational nature of this study makes it impossible to draw conclusions as to the causal direction of

the relationship between misperceptions and sexual victimization. Another question for future research is whether sexually victimized women develop an "over-sensitivity" to men's behaviors as a rape prevention technique, or whether their lower perceptual thresholds make them more vulnerable to sexual abuse by men.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide some direction for researchers in the field of sexual harassment and acquaintance rape. The present data provide strong evidence that men who have lower perceptual thresholds for seeing sexual motives in women's friendly behavior (i.e. are positioned higher on the misperception continuum) are not more sexually aggressive than men with higher perceptual thresholds. It must be remembered, however, that these conclusions are based on a particular sample of men ($n = 130$) and the use of the ASBI as a measure of men's histories of sexual aggression. These tentative conclusions need to be supported by the use of other measures of men's histories of sexual aggression.

The present findings provide little evidence to suggest that men who have lower perceptual thresholds for seeing sexual intent in women's friendly behavior are more hypermasculine than men with higher perceptual thresholds. Based on the results of the present study, men's levels of sexual aggression and/or hypermasculinity do not predict

whether they are are high or low misperceivers of women's friendly behavior as sexual interest in them.

It must be noted that the ASBI measures the extent to which men have engaged in severe forms of sexual aggressiveness. The Inventory does not encompass the mild forms of sexual harassment such as sexual teasing, jokes, offensive remarks, gestures, or unnecessary physical contact. Although the results of this study indicate that no relationship exists between misperceptions and severe sexual aggression, it is very possible that misperceptions are related to the mild forms of sexual harassment. Researchers in the sexual harassment field must determine if this hypothesized relationship exists before misperceptions are abandoned as a potential sexual harassment dynamic.

The results of this study provide further support for Mosher and Sirkin's (1984) conclusion that men with higher levels of hypermasculinity are more sexually aggressive than men with lower levels of hypermasculinity. The hypermasculine personality constellation (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) appears to be a worthy phenomenon to pursue in the struggle to explain why men sexually victimize and harass women. Hypermasculinity is defined as a desire to appear powerful and to be dominant in interactions with other men, women, and the environment (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). The strong relationship between hypermasculinity and sexual aggression toward women suggests that sexual aggression

occurs because some men desire to dominate, humiliate, and control women. The need-for-power explanation for sexual aggression does not appear to be limited to stranger rape, as generally thought. This study provides some support for the socio-cultural model used to explain the occurrence of sexual harassment (Tangri et al., 1982). The model states that sexual harassment maintains men's dominance over women. Such a model is congruent with the hypermasculine man's view of the world. It appears that the solution lies in understanding why some men desire to dominate, humiliate, and control women, and how they developed that desire.

Conclusions derived from this study have important implications for date rape and sexual harassment researchers. Training men to accurately perceive their dates' or co-workers' interpersonal behaviors will not reduce the incidence rate of date rape or severe forms of sexual harassment. Instead, a more effective focus for our efforts is to find ways to change the calloused and disrespectful attitudes that hypermasculine men hold towards women. Unfortunately, this task is a difficult one; according to Mosher and Sirkin (1984), the hypermasculine personality constellation begins to develop during the early childhood socialization process and continues through late adolescence. The parental use of contempt and humiliation to socialize the emotions of fear and distress in boys is believed to be the key to fostering hypermasculinity (Mosher

& Sirkin, 1984). Consequently, focusing on parental child-rearing behaviors and school teacher behaviors may be the way to overcome the development of calloused sex attitudes in boys.

This study does not explain why men engage in the less severe forms of sexual harassment (such as offensive verbalizations and flirtatious behaviors). As mentioned above, future research should test whether men's misperceptions of women's friendly behavior are related to these milder forms of sexual harassment. In addition, one of the components of the hypermasculine personality constellation may shed some light on the reason that men engage in some of the lesser forms of sexual harassment. Some men may engage in these behaviors to satisfy a need to be dominant over other men, or to appear powerful in the eyes of men, rather than to satisfy the need to be dominant over women.

Many offensive verbalizations and flirtatious behaviors occur in a public area, where other men can overhear the interactions. These behaviors may therefore be an attempt by hypermasculine men to demonstrate their power and domination over women so that they appear powerful in the eyes of male observers. Remember that the domination of others and callousness towards women are highly valued by hypermasculine men; these men will therefore believe that other men hold similar attitudes and will be impressed by

such a demonstration of power over women. If this explanation has any validity, then hypermasculine men who engage in lesser forms of sexual harassment are not sexually motivated; women will not necessarily experience these behaviors at the hands of sexually aggressive men (although hypermasculine men tend to be sexually aggressive). Future researchers of sexual harassment should test whether a relationship exists between men's need for various forms of power and their histories of, or at least condonement of all categories of sexual harassment. It is hypothesized that hypermasculine men engage in severe forms of sexual harassment to demonstrate power over women (strong support was found for the relationship between hypermasculinity and sexual aggression), but they engage in milder forms of sexual harassment to establish their need to be powerful and dominant in the eyes of other men.

The female data for the present study indicate that women who have lower perceptual thresholds for seeing sexual motives in women's friendly and/or ambiguous behavior have reported more sexual victimization than women with higher perceptual thresholds. The present study was exploratory in nature; future studies should focus on the causal direction of this relationship. Future research should also focus on the development of unidimensional measures of sexual aggression, sexual harassment, and sexual victimization. These measures could then be utilized to substantiate the

tentative conclusions and post-hoc hypotheses made in this thesis.

References

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830-838.
- Abbey, A. (1987). Misperceptions of friendly behavior as sexual interest: A survey of naturally occurring incidents. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 173-194.
- Abbey, A., & Melby, C. (1986). The effects of nonverbal cues on gender differences in perceptions of sexual intent. Sex Roles, 15, 283-298.
- Abbey, A., Cozzarelli, C., McLaughlin, K., & Harnish, R.J. (1987). The effects of clothing and dyad sex composition on perceptions of sexual intent: Do women and men evaluate these cues differently. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 108-126.
- Brewer, M.B., & Berk, R.A. (1982). Beyond nine to five: Introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 1-4.
- Brewer, M.B. (1982) Further beyond nine to five: An integration and future directions. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 149-158.
- Crowne, D. Marlowe, D. (1964). The Approval Motive. NY: Wiley.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1980, November). S 29-1604.11

- Darling, C.A., Davidson, J.K. (1986). Coitally active university students: Sexual behaviors, concerns, and changes. Adolescence, 21, 403-419
- Goodchilds, J.D., & Zellman, G.L. (1984). Sexual signalling and sexual aggression in adolescent relationships. In N.M. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and Sexual Aggression. NY: Academic Press, Inc.
- Gutek, B.A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 55-74.
- Gutek, B.A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A.G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behavior in a work setting. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22, 30-48.
- Johnson, C.B., Stockdale, M.S., & Saal, F.E. (1987). Men perceive more sexuality -- except when it's really there? Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Koss, M.P., Dinero, T.E., Seibel, C.A., & Cox, S.L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape. Are their differences in the victim's experience? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 1-24.
- Koss, M.P., & Gidycz. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and Validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 422-423.

- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.
- Koss, M.P., & Oros, C.J. (1982). Sexual experience survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50 455-457.
- Livingston, J.A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individual actions. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 5-22.
- McFarland, S.G., & Sparks, C.M. (1988). Age, education, and the internal consistency of personality scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1692-1702.
- Mosher, D.L., & Anderson, R.D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. Journal of Research in Personality, 20, 77-94.
- Mosher, D.L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. Journal of Research in Personality, 18, 150-163.
- New Webster's Dictionary. (1975). Chicago, MI: Consolidated Book Publishers

- Nordholm, L. A. (1974). A note on the reliability and validity of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability. Journal of Social Psychology, 93, 139-140.
- O'Grady, K. E. (1988). The Marlowe-Crowne & Edwards Social Desirability Scales: A psychometric perspective. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23, 87-101.
- Saal, F.E., Johnson, C.B., & Weber, N. (in press). Friendly or sexy? It may depend on whom you ask. Psychology of Women Quarterly.
- Schneider, B.E. (1982). Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 75-98.
- Shotland, R.L., & Craig, J.M. (1988). Can men and women differentiate between friendly and sexually interested behavior? Social Psychology Quarterly, 52, 66-73.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1989). Using Multivariate Statistics. NY: Harper & Row.
- Tanaka-Matsumi, J., & Kameoka, V.A. (1986). Reliabilities and concurrent validities of popular self-report measures of depression, anxiety, and social desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 328-333.

Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R., Johnson, L.B. Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 33-54.

Turner, C., Anderson, P., Fitzpatrick, R, Fowler, G., & Mayon, R. (1988). Sexual behavior, contraceptive practice and knowledge of aids of Oxford University students. Journal of Bio-social Science, 20, 445-451.

Appendix A

Script for Friendly Videotape

Setting: A male professor (Dr. Jones) and a female student (Sharon) are sitting around a desk in the professor's office. The following conversation occurs.

Jones: How was your break?

Sharon: It was okay. I went to the dentist and...(laughs)

Jones: That was it? You went to the dentist every day for eight days? (Sharon laughs)

Sharon: No, I rested and did some cooking and sewing.

Jones: Where's your home?

Sharon: Lysene, Kansas. Have you heard of it? (Both laugh).

Jones: No. I must confess I haven't, but I've only been in Kansas for 6 years, so I'm not surprised, not surprised at all.

Sharon: That's okay, then. How was yours?

Jones: (enthusiastic) Great! I didn't go to the dentist, but I went to California instead, which probably is more expensive than going to the dentist, but I had a lot more fun.

Sharon: I bet (laughs).

Jones: I had a convention up there that I had to go to, so I combined business and pleasure.

Sharon: Oh really, good.

Jones: Taking a sort of tax break, which can take the airfare and some of the expenses too.

Sharon: That must have been nice too. Did you get to do a little bit of sight-seeing and that sort of stuff?

Jones: Oh yeah, we actually rented a car in San Diego and managed to go north to San Fransisco; it was a lot of fun.

Sharon: I bet, it sounds like it. More fun than going to the dentist and staying home.

Jones: Much more fun than going to the dentist.

Sharon: I did get to relax though, and see my family. So that was nice.. I worked on that paper a little bit, and I guess that's why..

Jones: (interrupts) That's why you're here.

Sharon: ...I wanted to talk to you, yeah. I did do some research over spring-break, and I just really have a problem finding some resources for the topic that I chose.

Jones: What's your topic?

Sharon: It's mentally retarded adults, and some of the different kinds of living arrangements; the communal homes instead of the private, or the institutional types, sort of traditional...

Jones: (nods) Well, I'm not surprised. There's probably not a lot written on that topic.

Script for Friendly Videotape (continued)

- Sharon: Right. Not a whole lot of research that I can find, but it's been done...
- Jones: (interrupts) I'm glad you chose that anyway.
- Sharon: Well, it's been really interesting, and you know...
- Jones: How did you get...why did you decide to pick that topic?
- Sharon: Well, I don't know if your familiar with a class on campus, it's called "Theater for Social Populations," and Dr. Fedder who's in the speech and theater department...
- Jones: Norman Fedder?
- Sharon: Yeah, Norman, right.
- Jones: Yeah, I know Norman Fedder.
- Sharon: In his "Theater for Special Populations" class, we worked with some mentally retarded or handicapped individuals. Kind of got me interested in the topic, so I wanted to see what I could do with it.
- Jones: (nods) Right, okay. So what's the problem you're having with the paper?
- Sharon: Well, I did find one resource, and I went ahead and made an outline, so I do have that (hands him some papers).
- Jones: Okay (looks at papers). Well, it looks like a detailed outline.
- Sharon: I did do some work on it.
- Jones: Well, this is more than what I'm getting from most of the students; I still don't see what the problem is (leans back in chair).
- Sharon: (hesistantly) I guess the problem is that I have 18 hours this semester, and I'm trying to work pretty much 10 to 15 hours a week, and I got a presentation and another project due even before this one. And on top of that... I mean I have done some research, but I'm still not finding enough to feel comfortable writing the paper.
- Jones: Okay...
- Sharon: So, I don't know if you have some ideas, or...
- Jones: Time is the problem!
- Sharon: (laughs) Time!
- Jones: (hesitantly and slowly) Well, you know it's my policy not to extend, or to give extensions on papers. I had a student in yesterday asking for an extension, and I really had to decide that I didn't think it was warranted, so I turned the student down.
- Sharon: I can understand that, you need to be consistent.
- Jones: ...and fair...
- Sharon: ...and fair and all that.
- Jones: Why do you think your particular circumstances are, might be different, or more...?
- Sharon: Well, I guess, because I have worked on it, and it's

Script for Friendly Videotape (continued)

not like I've been putting it off, and...

Jones: Well, I can see that, and it looks like you've done a lot of work, - a lot of good work.

Sharon: I just need some more time to put it all together.. to do a good job on it. I'd like to...

Jones: Okay, well, how about if I think about it, and maybe I can let you know tomorrow.

Sharon: Yeah, in class, if you can let me know then, maybe? Alright.

Jones: Okay, that will be fine.

Sharon: That sounds good, thanks.

Jones: Listen, I may have (gets up and walks to the bookshelf, student turns around to look at him). I may have a book or two that might help (picks out two books). This one,... and this one (puts them on table in front of student and sits down again). These two may have, if you check the indexes, may have some sort of cross-reference that you might be able to take advantage of. And also, check the bibliographies, maybe that can lead you to something.

Sharon: Right.

Jones: This is not a primary source, but something, maybe a chapter or a part of a chapter that might be helpful.

Sharon: Okay, thanks a lot, and I'll talk to you tomorrow in class (gets up to leave). Goodbye.

Jones: Okay, goodbye Sharon.

Appendix A (continued)

Script for Harassment Videotape

Same as script for Friendly videotape except the last two minutes are replaced by the following:

Sharon: Yeah, in class, if you can let me know then, maybe?
Alright.

Jones: Okay, that will be fine.

Sharon: That sounds good, thanks.

Jones: Wait a minute Sharon. I'm going to be here...sit down...I'm going to be here tonight working late. Why don't you come on by a little later on and I can give you some...perhaps some help with your paper.

Sharon: Well...I guess.

Jones: Maybe around 8 o'clock?

Sharon: Yeah...I guess that would be okay.

Jones: It's kind of quiet around here at night and...eh...maybe we can get something done.

Sharon: Okay, 8 o'clock then?

Jones: Eight o'clock.

Sharon: Alright, thanks.

Jones: Okay Sharon, see you then!

Appendix B

Misperception Measure

Please answer each of the following questions by circling the number that most accurately represents your opinion. It is important that you answer each question honestly, and to the best of your ability.

1. Did you find the desk to be a barrier in the communication?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
2. By his gestures did the professor project an attitude of superiority over the student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
3. Did the participants contribute equally to the conversation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, the female did most of the talking			yes, their contributions were equal			no, the male did most of the talking
4. How would you rate the body posture of the student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very tense						very relaxed
15. How would you rate the body posture of the professor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very tense						very relaxed
6. Did the student express herself well through the use of gestures?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
7. Do you think the student's gestures projected an attitude of reluctance in asking the professor for a favor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
8. Do you think the professor's gestures projected an attitude of willingness to help the student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
9. Do you think the student felt uncomfortable in the situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so
10. Do you think the student was receptive to help offered by the professor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very much so

Misperception Measure (continued)

Based upon your impressions of the student, please circle the response that most accurately describes the way you believe she was trying to behave during the interaction you observed. We realize this is a difficult task, but please answer each question to the best of your ability.

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| 11. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very cheerful | | | | | | not at all cheerful |
| 12. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very friendly | | | | | | not at all friendly |
| 13. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very assertive | | | | | | not at all assertive |
| 14. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very flirtatious | | | | | | not at all
flirtatious |
| 15. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very considerate | | | | | | not at all
considerate |
| 16. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very enthusiastic | | | | | | not at all
enthusiastic |
| 17. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very likeable | | | | | | not at all likeable |
| 18. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very seductive | | | | | | not at all seductive |
| 19. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very attractive | | | | | | not at all
attractive |
| 20. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very warm | | | | | | not at all warm |
| 21. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very intelligent | | | | | | not at all
intelligent |
| 22. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very promiscuous | | | | | | not at all
promiscuous |
| 23. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very sincere | | | | | | not at all sincere |
| 24. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very sexy | | | | | | not at all sexy |

Misperception Measure (continued)

Based upon your impressions of the professor, please circle the response that most accurately describes the way you believe he was trying to behave during the interaction you observed. We realize this is a difficult task, but please answer each question to the best of your ability.

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| 25. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very cheerful | | | | | | not at all cheerful |
| 26. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very friendly | | | | | | not at all friendly |
| 27. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very assertive | | | | | | not at all assertive |
| 28. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very flirtatious | | | | | | not at all
flirtatious |
| 29. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very considerate | | | | | | not at all
considerate |
| 30. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very enthusiastic | | | | | | not at all
enthusiastic |
| 31. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very likeable | | | | | | not at all likeable |
| 32. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very seductive | | | | | | not at all seductive |
| 33. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very attractive | | | | | | not at all
attractive |
| 34. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very warm | | | | | | not at all warm |
| 35. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very intelligent | | | | | | not at all
intelligent |
| 36. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very promiscuous | | | | | | not at all
promiscuous |
| 37. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very sincere | | | | | | not at all sincere |
| 38. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | very sexy | | | | | | not at all sexy |

Appendix C

Aggressive Sexual Behaviour Inventory

For each of the following 20 items, please state approximately how many times you have engaged in the behavior described. Give a number estimate, rather than "several times." We realize these items are very personal, but remember, your responses are completely anonymous so please answer honestly.

1. I have gotten a woman drunk in order to have sex with her.
How many times?
2. I have told a woman that I was petting heavily, that she couldn't stop and leave me feeling so uncomfortable.
How many times?
3. I have threatened to leave or to end a relationship if a woman wouldn't have sex with me.
How many times?
4. I have told a woman that I wanted to come into her apartment so I could get her where I wanted.
How many times?
5. I have given a woman expensive gifts so she would feel obligated to do me a sexual favor.
How many times?
6. I have told a woman I was going out with that I could find someone else to give me sex if she wouldn't.
How many times?
7. I have told a woman that her refusal to have sex with me was changing the way I felt about her.
How many times?
8. I have gotten a woman high on marijuana or pills so she would be less able to resist my advances.
How many times?
9. I have gripped a woman tightly and given her an angry look when she was not giving me the sexual response I wanted.
How many times?
10. I have called a woman an angry name and pushed her away when she would not surrender to my need for sex.
How many times?
11. I have blown my top and sworn or broken something to show a woman that she shouldn't get me angry.
How many times?

Aggressive Sexual Behaviour Inventory (continued)

12. I have calmed a woman down with a good slap or two when she got hysterical over my advances.
How many times?
13. I have warned a woman that she could get hurt if she resisted me, so she should relax and enjoy it.
How many times?
14. I have gotten a little drunk and forced a woman that I'm with to have sex with me.
How many times?
15. I have roughed a woman up a little so that she would understand that I meant business.
How many times?
16. I have brought a woman to my place after a date and forced her to have sex with me.
How many times?
17. I have waited my turn in line with some other guys who were sharing a "party girl."
How many times?
18. I have promised a woman that I wouldn't harm her if she did everything that I told her to do.
How many times?
19. I have forced a woman to have sex with me and some of my pals.
How many times?
20. I have pushed a woman down and made her undress or torn her clothes off if she wouldn't cooperate.
How many times?

Appendix D

Hypermasculinity Inventory

Please use the opti-scan answer sheet provided to mark your responses to the following 30 items. There are two statements to read for each item. Your task is to choose the item that most accurately reflects your opinion. When you have read both statements for an item, please darken the letter (A or B) on your opti-scan card which is written beside the statement that best represents how you feel. Please feel free to ask if you are unsure of these instructions. Remember, your responses are completely anonymous so please answer honestly.

1. A. After I've gone through a really dangerous experience my knees feel weak and I shake all over.
B. After I've been through a really dangerous experience I feel high.
2. A. I'd rather gamble than play it safe.
B. I'd rather play it safe than gamble.
3. A. Call me a name and I'll pretend not to hear you.
B. Call me a name and I'll call you another.
4. A. Fair is fair in love and war.
B. All is fair in love and war.
5. A. I like wild, uninhibited parties.
B. I like quiet parties with good conversations
6. A. I would prefer to forget the physical fights I have experienced.
B. I still enjoy remembering my first real fight.
7. A. Some people have told me I take foolish risks.
B. Some people have told me I ought to take more chances.
8. A. So-called effeminate men are more artistic and sensitive.
B. Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
9. A. Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she'll do whatever you want.
B. It's gross and unfair to use alcohol and drugs to convince a woman to have sex.
10. A. I like fast cars and fast women.
B. I like dependable cars and faithful women.
11. A. So-called prick-teasers should be forgiven.
B. Prick-teasers should be raped.
12. A. When I have a few drinks under my belt, I mellow out.
B. When I have a few drinks under my belt, I look for trouble.
13. A. Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
B. Any man who is a man can do without sex.

Hypermasculinity Inventory (continued)

14. A. All women, even women-libbers, are worthy of respect.
B. The only woman worthy of respect is your own mother.
15. A. You have to fuck some women before they know who's boss.
B. You have to love some women before they know you don't want to be boss.
16. A. When I have a drink or two I feel ready for whatever happens.
B. When I have a drink or two I like to relax and enjoy myself.
17. A. Risk has to be weighed against possible maximum loss.
B. There is no such thing as too big a risk, if the payoff is large enough.
18. A. I win by not fighting.
B. I fight to win.
19. A. It's natural for men to get into fights.
B. Physical violence never solves an issue.
20. A. If you're not prepared to fight for what's yours, then be prepared to lose it.
B. Even if I feel like fighting, I try to think of alternatives.
21. A. He who can, fights; he who can't, runs away.
B. It's just plain dumb to fist fight.
22. A. When I'm bored I watch TV or read a book.
B. When I'm bored I look for excitement.
23. A. I like to drive safely avoiding all possible risks.
B. I like to drive fast, right on the edge of danger.
24. A. Women who allow themselves to be picked-up should expect to put out.
B. Women who leave a night club/party with men they just met should be careful who they choose.
25. A. Some women are good for only one thing.
B. All women deserve the same respect as your own mother.
26. A. I only want to have sex with women who want to have sex with me.
B. I never feel bad about my tactics when I have sex.
27. A. I would rather be a famous scientist than a famous prizefighter.
B. I would rather be a famous prizefighter than a famous scientist.
28. A. Lesbians have chosen a particular life style and should be respected for it.
B. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.

Hypermasculinity Inventory (continued)

29. A. If you are chosen for a fight, there's no choice but to fight.
B. If you are chosen for a fight, it's time to talk your way out of it.
30. A. If you insult me, be prepared to back it up.
B. If you insult me, I'll try to turn the other cheek.

Appendix E

Female Victimization Inventory (FVI)

For each of the following 18 items, please state approximately how many times you have experienced the behavior described. Give a number estimate, rather than "several times." We realize these items are very personal, but remember, your responses are completely anonymous so please answer honestly.

1. A man has gotten me drunk in order to have sex with me.
How many times?
2. When I have asked a man to stop during petting he has told me I cannot leave him feeling so uncomfortable.
How many times?
3. A man has threatened to leave or to end our relationship if I wouldn't have sex with him.
How many times?
4. A man has told me that he wanted to come into my apartment so he could get me where he wanted.
How many times?
5. A man has given me expensive gifts to try to make me feel obligated to do him a sexual favor.
How many times?
6. A man I was going out with has told me that he could find someone else to give him sex if I wouldn't.
How many times?
7. A man has told me that my refusal to have sex with him was changing the way he felt about me.
How many times?
8. A man has gotten me high on marijuana or pills so that I was unable to resist his advances.
How many times?
9. A man has gripped me tightly and given me an angry look when I was not giving him the sexual response he wanted.
How many times?
10. A man has called me an angry name and pushed me away when I would not surrender to his need for sex.
How many times?
11. A man has sworn at me or broken something to scare me into submitting to his sexual advances.
How many times?

Female Victimization Inventory (continued)

12. A man has slapped me when I tried to resist his advances.
How many times?
13. A man has threatened that I could get hurt if I resisted him.
How many times?
14. A man has gotten drunk and forced me to have sex with him.
How many times?
15. A man has invited me to his place after a date and forced me to have sex with him.
How many times?
16. A man has promised that he wouldn't harm me if I did everything that he told me to do.
How many times?
17. A man has forced me to have sex with him and some of his friends.
How many times?
18. A man has pushed me down and made me undress or torn my clothes off if I wouldn't cooperate.
How many times?

Appendix F

Sexual Experiences Survey

Please use the opti-scan answer sheet provided to mark your responses to the following 12 items. Your task is to answer YES or NO to each question. On your opti-scan sheet darken the first circle or A if you are answering YES and the second circle or B if you are answering NO. We realize these questions are very personal, but remember, your responses are completely anonymous so please answer honestly.

Have you ever:

A = YES

B = NO

1. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you both wanted to?
2. Had a man think that you wanted more sexual intimacy than you really did?
3. Been in a situation where a man became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop him even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse?
4. Had sexual intercourse with a man even though you didn't really want to because he threatened to end your relationship otherwise?
5. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't really want to because you felt pressured by his continual arguments?
6. Found out that a man had had sexual intercourse with you by saying things he didn't really mean?
7. Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn't want to?
8. Been in a situation where a man tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn't want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?
9. Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse with him when you didn't want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?
10. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he threatened to use some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?
11. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?

Sexual Experiences Survey (continued)

12. Been in a situation where a man engaged in sexual acts with you when you didn't want to by using threats or physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Please use the second opti-scan answer sheet provided to mark your responses to the following 33 statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Your task is to read each statement and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. Darken the letter A on your opti-scan sheet if your answer to an item is "true" and B if your answer is "false." Please ask if you are unsure of these instructions. Remember, your responses are completely anonymous so please answer honestly.

T(rue) = A
F(alse) = B

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
7. I am always careful about my manners of dress.
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
9. If I could get into a movie without paying for it and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
11. I like to gossip at times.
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
14. I can remember playing sick to get out of something.
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
17. I always try to practice what I preach.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (continued)

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
28. There have been times when I have been quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
31. I have never felt that I was punished without a cause.
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Appendix H

Demographics Questionnaire

Important note:

If you did not feel comfortable leaving the room at the beginning of this second study, and you consequently did not answer the questionnaires in a way that reflects your true feelings, please circle YES that we should discard your data from this study. If you answered the questionnaires honestly, please circle NO that we should NOT discard your data.

YES (discard my data) NO (do not discard my data)

What is your age? _____

What is your sex? Male Female (circle one)

Please read the following definitions before answering the questions below:

Temporary job = summer job

Permanent job = job with no definite stopping date

Part-time job = work less than 35 hours a week

Full-time job = work 35 or more hours a week

Have you had a temporary part-time job before? Yes No (circle one)

" " " " permanent part-time job before? Yes No (circle one)

Have you had a temporary full-time job before? Yes No (circle one)

" " " " permanent full-time job before? Yes No (circle one)

Do you think that being exposed to the first study influenced your responses in the second study? If so, in what way were you influenced?

Did you think there was any relationship between the first and the second study? If so, what do you think it was?

Appendix I

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this experiment. You were informed that the first study concerned nonverbal communication and the second was a survey on student sexual behaviors. In order to obtain candid responses, however, it was necessary for us to "misinform" you about the true purpose of this research. In actuality we are attempting to understand the phenomena of sexual harassment and date rape.

Previous studies have found that men, compared to women, tend to view the behavior of women in a friendly interaction as more sexual, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive. In this study we are trying to determine if this misperception of friendly cues is in any way related to a person's sexual aggressiveness and/or hypermasculinity. We are hypothesizing that the more men misperceive friendly interactions as a "sexual come-on" the more likely they are to have engaged in sexual aggression and the more hypermasculine or "macho" they tend to be. We are also examining whether a relationship exists between women who perceive men's behavior as sexual in nature and the degree to which they have experienced sexual victimization.

The questionnaire you completed after viewing the videotape was a measure of your perception or misperception of that friendly interaction. The questionnaires that you completed as part of the "separate task" were measures of male sexual aggressiveness and hypermasculinity (or measures of female sexual victimization).

It is important to understand that this study does not prove that anyone is a sexual harasser/rapist, or potential sexual harasser/rapist, based on their responses to the questionnaires. We are only looking for a pattern of relationships that may or may not exist to responses to the items on the questionnaires. We are hoping that this study will help us better understand why some men sexually harass women. The questions you answered may have caused you some discomfort, but we hope that the importance of this research makes this discomfort worthwhile to you. Remember, your responses will always remain anonymous. If you have any questions or concerns about this experiment, please talk to the experimenter, Aileen Parkinson.

Please do not discuss this study with anyone else as this may contaminate future participants' responses. Thank you very much for your time and effort; it is very much appreciated.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXUAL AGGRESSIVENESS,
HYPERMASCULINITY, AND MISPERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S FRIENDLINESS

by

AILEEN E. PARKINSON

B.A., University of Victoria, 1984

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTERS OF SCIENCE

Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1989

Abstract

This investigation tested whether men with lower perceptual thresholds for perceiving sexual intent in women's friendly behavior had greater histories of sexual aggression or higher levels of hypermasculinity than men with higher perceptual thresholds. Previous research in the area suggests that date rape and sexual harassment may be a consequence of men misperceiving women's friendly behaviors. A laboratory study was conducted in which 130 men and 144 women watched a 10-minute videotape of a male professor and female student interacting in either a friendly or potentially harassing situation and rated the actors in terms of their perceived sexual intent. The men then completed the Aggressive Sexual Behavior and Hypermasculinity Inventories, while the women completed two measures of sexual victimization. The two parts of the study were presented as separate experiments to inhibit subject response bias. Men with lower perceptual thresholds described themselves as neither more sexually aggressive nor more hypermasculine than other men. Men with higher levels of hypermasculinity did report greater histories of sexual aggression, however, suggesting that the Hypermasculinity Inventory should be pursued as a potential identifier of men who engage in sexual aggression and/or the more severe forms of sexual harassment. Women with lower perceptual thresholds for perceiving sexual intent in men's behavior

reported significantly greater histories of sexual
victimization.