

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

8-1-2022

Perceptions of Sexual Refusals: Not so Black and White

Lavina Ying Ho

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

Recommended Citation

Ho, Lavina Ying, "Perceptions of Sexual Refusals: Not so Black and White" (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2375.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/2375>

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

PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL REFUSALS:
NOT SO BLACK AND WHITE
DISSERTATION
by
LAVINA YING HO

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

August 2022

Copyright Lavina Ying Ho 2022
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Sexual assault is an issue affecting approximately 1 in 5 women. Compared to White women, Black women report higher rates of lifetime rape, are at risk of developing physical/mental health issues post-assault (e.g., depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, and substance abuse), and are less likely to engage in help-seeking after sexual victimization. Research reveals the manner in which a woman refuses a sexual advance can influence a man's perceptions of the genuineness of her refusal. Sexual refusals that are explicit (e.g., not wanting to have sex due to religious beliefs) are identified more quickly as violating a woman's boundaries than sexual refusals based on level of relationship commitment (e.g., too early in the relationship for sex). Research also suggests that racially based sexual stereotypes influence perceptions of sexual interactions. There are several negative sexual stereotypes attributed to Black women (e.g., hypersexual and seductive). Moreover, sexual stereotypes of Black men include being viewed as aggressive and promiscuous relative to White men.

The purpose of the current study was to examine the impact of sexual refusal type, victim race, and perpetrator race on the length of time (with vignette line as proxy for duration) it takes for participants to identify a woman's sexual refusal. Participants were men and women aged 18 – 25 recruited via the research recruitment platform, Prolific. Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions. They read a vignette depicting a dating scenario between a woman (Black or White) and a man (Black or White), and indicated the point in the vignette at which it became clear that the woman wanted the man to cease his sexual

advances. Additionally, they identified what cues/behaviors they used to determine that the woman wanted the man to stop his advances.

Data analysis involved a 2 (refusal type: marriage/religious beliefs or relationship) X 2 (victim race: Black or White) X 2 (perpetrator race: Black or White) analysis of variance (ANOVAs) with latency serving as the dependent variable. Although main effects (refusal type, victim race, and perpetrator race) and interactions were hypothesized, none were observed. Qualitative analyses were performed in order to identify inductive themes regarding what cues contribute to acceptance of a woman's refusal. Overall, four prominent themes were identified. The most common theme was the woman's verbal refusal (81%). The second most common theme was the man's actions (e.g., putting his hand under clothing) following the woman's verbal boundary (41%) as the cue for why they believed the woman in the vignette wanted the man to stop his sexual advances. Implications of these findings as well as limitations and future directions are discussed.

DEDICATION

To my husband and daughter for your unwavering support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my mentor, Dr. Alan Gross. Shaping has indeed been a slow process, and I appreciate all your time and dedication to helping me grow as a clinician, researcher, and person.

To my committee members, Dr. John Bentley, Dr. Sarah Bilsky, and Dr. Scott Gustafson. Thank you for all your support and guidance throughout this process, and your input and wisdom has allowed my dissertation to grow into the project that it has become. Thank you for your continued time and energy, as well as your patience.

Finally, thank you to my husband, daughter, and friends who encouraged me to continue putting one foot in front of the other throughout the past seven years. I could not have done it without your words of support and unwavering belief that I could achieve this dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	vii
Background	1
Summar and Present Study	25
Method	27
Results	34
Discussion	39
Tables	45
List of References	53
List of Appendices	67
Vita.....	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participants' Descriptives Statistics.....	44
Table 2: Alcohol Use in Last 30 Days	46
Table 3: Correlation Table of SES, MC-SDS, MRS, and DRDT Stop Point.....	47
Table 4: Between-subject ANOVA Results	48
Table 5: Means and standard deviations of Modern Racism Scale, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Koss' Sexual Experiences Scale, and DRDT vignette stop point	49
Table 6: Means and Standards Deviations of DRDT Vignette Stop Points	50
Table 7: Qualitative Analysis Themes	51

I. BACKGROUND

Sexual assault on college campuses is a significant problem as 19% of female college students report having experienced attempted or completed sexual assault while in college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). Efforts to address this problem have prompted considerable discussion regarding understanding sexual interactions related to defining and clearly communicating both sexual consent and sexual refusal (Beres, 2010; Beres, 2014; Marcantonio, Jozkowski, & Lo, 2018). Sexual consent is the “freely given verbal or nonverbal communication of a feeling of willingness” to engage in sexual acts (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999, p.259).

Traditional gender roles suggest women carry the burden/responsibility of controlling sexual situations (Simon & Gagnon, 1969). Many legal models of sexual refusal reflect the “No Model” which requires that the woman verbally refuse sexual activity through a “no” statement (Anderson, 2005; Gunby, Carline, & Beynon, 2012). Women convey their sexual desires and sexual boundaries largely in two ways: verbal behavior (e.g., saying “I don’t want sex”) and non-verbal behaviors (e.g., pushing their partner away) (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; Jozkowski et al., 2014; Kitzinger & Frith, 1999; Marcantonio, Jozkowski, & Lo, 2018). Unfortunately, women often report feeling uncomfortable directly saying “no” to a partner during a sexual encounter (Beres, 2010; Kitzinger & Frith, 1999). Rather than being direct (e.g., “I will not have sex with you”) (Kitzinger & Frith, 1999) female verbal refusals of sex are typically indirect and softened with excuses (e.g., having a “period”). Moreover, data indicate women most often use these indirect methods to refuse sex (O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006).

Women also use non-verbal behaviors to refuse sex. These refusal behaviors may be direct nonverbal actions (e.g., “keep my distance from my partner”), as well as indirect nonverbal (e.g., “body language”) actions (Marcantonio, Jozkowski, & Lo, 2018). Consistent with verbal refusals, women often rely on subtle nonverbal behaviors, such as slightly pulling away, not actively engaging in the sexual activity, or being tense to signal sexual refusal (Beres, 2010). Compared to subtle refusal behaviors (e.g., ignoring a partner’s sexual advances), overt refusal strategies (e.g., slapping the partner) are seen as reflecting a woman’s genuine refusal of sex (Garcia, 1998).

While communicating sexual refusals would seem straightforward, people often do not believe that the woman means what she says when she tells her partner she does not want further sexual intimacy (Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998; Osman & Davis, 1994). For example, Van Wie and Gross (2001) found that some verbal refusals of sex (e.g., refusal due to feeling it is too early in the relationship to engage in intercourse) were seen by men as negotiable compared to other types of refusals (e.g., refusal due to fear of pregnancy) which were perceived as non-negotiable. Byers and Wilson (1985) noted that college students sometimes interpret verbal refusals that are given with an excuse as a cue to temporarily stop his sexual advance and try it again later. Moreover, a woman’s refusal of sexual advances is seen as less sincere if she had previously engaged in sex with her partner (Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Other variables related to the perception of sexual refusals include refusal type, relationship/sexual history, and sexual stereotypes.

As noted, sexual refusal also is conveyed via indirect nonverbal behavior. However, when women do not directly resist or concretely verbally refuse a partner’s sexual advances, this subtle refusal behavior may be seen as a sign of sexual consent (Byers, 1980; Hickman &

Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski et al., 2014). Unfortunately, the absence of forceful resistance/refusal may reflect the fear response of freezing (e.g., being unable to move; Fantasia, 2011; Heidt, Marx, & Forsyth, 2005; Marx & Gross, 1995). As a result of issues that may arise when using non-verbal refusals, direct verbal refusals are the clearest method of communicating sexual boundaries (Pitagora, 2013; Winslett & Gross, 2008).

Sexual stereotypes of men and women may also affect how people perceive sexual interactions, particularly sexual refusals. A stereotype is “the set of attributes that subjects agree on as typical of the group” (Judd & Park, 1993), and placing individuals into categories leads people to see relationships between certain groups and behaviors (Schaller, 1991). Stereotypes also vary by gender, as men are associated with aggressively sexually pursuing women as well as having a preoccupation with sex (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Conversely, women’s gender stereotypes are that they frequently set limits on sexual activities and avoid sex (Sanchez et al., 2012). Racial stereotypes also affect perceptions, as Black individuals are often seen in terms of a set of narrow stereotypes that limits them to their physical attributes and portrays them as hypersexual beings. Previous studies indicate that Black women are perceived as more “promiscuous” than White women (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013).

Black women are often portrayed in stereotypes relating to generalized images of the Mammy, Sapphire, or the Jezebel (West, 1995). The Jezebel archetype of a Black woman portrays her to be hypersexual, immoral, promiscuous, and easily sexually aroused. It is suggested that as a result of these sexual stereotypes Black women may be viewed as likely to have a higher number of sexual partners and less likely to utilize contraception consistently relative to White women (Roesenthal & Lobel, 2016). Black girls and women report feeling as though others reduce them to sexual objects or represent them in the media as hypersexual

(Davis & Tucker-Brown, 2013; French, 2013; Watson, Robinson, Dispenza, & Nazari, 2012). In contrast, White women are more likely to be described in non-sexual characteristics such as passive, dependent, attractive, egotistical, intelligent, and sensitive (Donovan, 2011; Landrine, 1985; Niemann et al., 1994).

Difficulties have been identified regarding men accurately interpreting women's attempts to refuse sex. This issue also appears to be problematic for Black college women. Although equivalent rates of sexual violence have been found for Black and White college women (Collington, Carter, Tolliver, & Truner-Musa, 2019; Sinozich & Langton, 2014), studies also indicate relative to White college women, elevated rates of emotionally coercive and physically forced sex have been reported among Black college women (Gross, Winslett, Roberts, & Gohm, 2006). Moreover, Black women are significantly less likely to disclose incidents of sexual violence (Weist, Kinney, Taylor, Pollitt-Hill, Bryant, Anthony, & Wilkerson, 2014; Wyatt, 1992). The purpose of the present study was to examine how racial stereotypes affect perceptions of women's sexual refusals. Following a review of verbal and non-verbal sexual refusals, several contextual factors affecting the interpretation of sexual boundary communications are discussed. Sexual stereotypes of Black women are also examined.

Gender-Based Sexual Stereotypes

During sexual interactions, social scripts based on gender roles often guide male and female behavior. These sexual scripts influence less intimate forms of physical activities (e.g., kissing), as well as more intimate physical acts (e.g., sexual intercourse) (Frith, 2009). The traditional view is that women are responsible for controlling sexual activities as their partner makes attempts to further sexual intimacy (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Gagnon, 1990; Wiederman, 2005). In an examination of gendered sexual stereotypes, LaPlante,

McCormick, and Brannigan (1980) found that college students stereotyped sexual avoidance strategies as behaviors in which women engage. Siegel and Meunier (2019) found that stereotypes for women suggest them to be less sexually adventurous than men, assume the submissive role in sex, and as emotionally sensitive and primarily interested in long term relationships.

Male sexual stereotypes posit that men are more sexually adventurous, have the dominant role in sex, prefer unattached sexual relationships, and are emotionally detached (Siegel & Meunier, 2019). The gendered stereotype of women as sexual limit setters, and men as sexual initiators persistently seeking sex have been found across multiple studies (Rose & Frieze, 1989; Sanchez, Fetterolf, & Rudman, 2012). Although men are more likely to endorse gender sexual stereotypes compared to women (Jewell & Brown, 2013), Sanchez and colleagues (2012) found that despite movement towards egalitarian roles for men and women, men and women's intimate relationships are still governed by traditional gender stereotypes and roles.

Sexual Refusals

A recent national survey of undergraduate students found that 23.1% of undergraduate women experienced sexual assault through physical force, violence, or incapacitation (Cantor et al., 2015). Elevated rates of sexual assault on university campuses have resulted in an increased focus on how college students convey and understand sexual consent (Curtis & Burnett, 2017; Muehlenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, & Peterson, 2016). The Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network (RAINN) defines sexual consent as “an agreement between participants to engage in sexual activity” (2019).

Women's methods of conveying sexual refusal have been examined using qualitative research strategies. Kitzinger and Frith (1999) studied women's sexual refusals using a small

sample of female students. Women were asked a series of questions designed to assess how young women refuse unwanted sex. Qualitative analyses of interview data (e.g., conversation analyses) revealed commonalities across women's responses. Rather than using a directly explicit no, women commonly reported preferring to stop an unwanted advance using indirect verbalizations. The authors noted the women attempted to gently refuse the man's advance softening it with an excuse (e.g., "I'm not ready yet; can we wait a while?" or "I have a headache"). Moreover, in attempts to convey sexual boundaries women's refusals of sex were accompanied with other subtle stop cues such as pausing when speaking and hedging words (e.g., "uh" or "well"). The authors suggested that these efforts to establish sexual boundaries using indirect verbal behaviors may reflect women's concern for men's feelings, as well as an attempt to adhere to gender norms by avoiding being seen as rude.

Marcantino and Jozkowski (2020) conducted an exploratory qualitative study that investigated how college adults aged 18-24 in the United States and Canada have refused sexual activities in the past and how these refusals differ by level of sexual intimacy, participant's gender, and relationship status. Participants were assigned to one of two conditions in which they were either asked to indicate what they did to indicate that they were "not willing/did not consent" or how they "refused" various sexual acts (e.g., ranging from intimate touching to vaginal-penile sex). Follow-up questions regarding the relationship between the participant and the person they refused sex from were queried and included options such as first-time partner, friend/acquaintance, casual dating partner, or exclusive romantic partner. Their responses were coded using an inductive content analysis and five themes emerged. The authors found no differences between either the "not willing/did not consent" wording condition compared to the "refused" wording condition. Across both conditions, 53.4% of participants' responses included

variations of saying no (e.g., explicit no), 11.8% of participants mentioned implicit internal cues (e.g., mood/uncomfortable), 5.3% described implicit external excuses (e.g., general excuse), 14.8% reported active behavioral cues (e.g., pushing/moving), and 4.7% mentioned passive behavioral cues (e.g. body language). Results indicated that participants were more likely to use “variations of saying no” for more sexually intimate activities (i.e., vaginal-penile sex) compared to intimate touching. Additionally, participants did not differ by gender in terms of the different refusal cues utilized to cease sexual activity. Lastly, participants’ use of refusal cues differed by their relationship with the sexual partner and type of refusal cue. For college students refusing vaginal-penile sex, those who stated they were in a relationship were more likely to report using “variations of saying no” and “implicit internal excuses” than single college students, and single college students were more likely to report using “active behavioral cues” compared to students who reported being in a relationship. Authors hypothesized that use of verbal cues to refuse vaginal-penile sex may be due to university implemented sexual assault prevention initiatives that may prime college students to recognize the use of these cues for vaginal-penile sex, but not for other sexual acts such as intimate touching or oral sex.

In a follow-up study, Marcantonio, Valdez, and Jozkowski (2021) re-examined the Marcantino and Jozkowski (2020) dataset in an attempt to understand how young adults interpret or perceive sexual refusals. Researchers focused on a subset of the original sample who provided responses on sexual refusal interpretation cues. Inductive content analyses revealed five themes across both the non-consent and refusal conditions as 33.1% of participants endorsed using passive behavioral cues (e.g., general body language), 32.5% reported using variations of saying no (e.g., saying “no”), 31.4% endorsed using implicit verbal cues (e.g., mood or general excuse), 6.2% indicated using active behavioral cues (e.g., moving/pushing), and 12.5% reported

using other types of verbal and nonverbal refusals (e.g., vague form of refusal). Because participants' responses often relayed multiple themes, the percentages of total responses exceed 100%. Male college students were most likely to report interpreting sexual refusals by a partner through verbal methods such as "variations of saying no" (40%) or "implicit verbal cues" (31%), while female college students were most likely to report interpreting sexual refusals by a partner using "passive behavioral cues" (39%) or "implicit verbal cues" (31%). Authors discussed how traditional sexual scripts may influence male and female students' interpretations of sexual refusals, as men's perceptions of refusals relied on explicit and implicit verbal cues due to traditional sexual scripts dictating that it is the role of women to communicate sexual refusals. In contrast, authors discuss how women utilize nonverbal and implicit verbal cues as these are less uncomfortable for the partner who is being refused in sexual scenarios. It was suggested that differences observed in this study between men and women for interpretation of sexual refusals are due to men and women's use of different methods of communicating sexual refusals, as men use verbal methods to interpret refusals but women do not utilize these methods to convey their refusal in sexual encounters.

Righi and colleagues (2021) conducted a qualitative study on 29 adolescents to examine how high school students aged 14-19 perceive sexual consent. Participants were asked how adolescents define consent, how they convey consent to their partners, and what are the outcome expectations for future sexual situations if two adolescents have previously engaged in sexual activity. Using thematic analyses, three themes emerged which included (1) definition of consent as a verbal "yes" for sexual activity, (2) beliefs that various verbal and nonverbal strategies are used to obtain or communicate consent, and (3) expectations that consent would be communicated differently following an initial sexual encounter. Of note, researchers found that

although most adolescents identified the definition of consent as a verbal agreement (e.g., may include “yes,” “no,” “okay,” or “permission”), participants also discussed how adolescents rely on nonverbal actions and cues (e.g., light touching, kissing, removing clothing) to convey consent and how they navigate sexual situations. Moreover, authors noted that adolescents endorsed sexual scripts in which boys initiated and pursued sexual activities, while girls were responsible for conveying nonconsent or consent either through an explicit verbal refusal (e.g., “no”) or nonverbal cues (e.g., allowing it to proceed, silence), and the most common example participants endorsed of nonverbal consent was silence or not saying “no.” Additionally, gender differences emerged as male adolescents endorsed relying on their partner’s verbal refusals (e.g., verbal “no) while female adolescents who described using nonverbal cues to indicate sexual refusal (e.g., make a face, move away, push the person away). Most adolescents indicated that consent was not necessary if two individuals had previously engaged in sexual activities, and many female participants stated that sexual activities were expected if they had previously occurred. Authors emphasize that “if boys and men learn that sexual refusal is only communicated via the word ‘no,’ they may overlook many of the nonverbal indicators that girls and women report using to convey sexual refusal” (p. NP8307).

Marcantonio, Jozkowski, and Lo (2018) found that individuals in relationships are less likely to use direct nonverbal strategies than single individuals when attempting to establish sexual boundaries. In general, women’s sexual refusals are also complicated by their attempts to simultaneously preserve the relationship between themselves and their friend/partner (Lannutti & Monahan, 2004). Muehlenhard, Andrews, and Beal (1996) also found that the verbal refusal of “I really care about you, but I want to wait until the relationship is stronger” was reported by men

as likely to get a male partner to stop his advances while also maintaining a positive relationship between partners.

Jozkowski, Peterson, Sanders, Dennis, and Reece (2014) examined how college students refuse sex, as well as communicate sexual consent. Using an assortment of questions (e.g., “during the encounter, if you were not willing to engage in sex with your partner, how would you let your partner know?”), male and female college students were asked about how they communicate consent and refusals, as well as how they perceive their partner’s sexual consent and refusals in a typical sexual interaction. Responses were coded and analyses identified common themes. Women most commonly consented to sex through verbal behaviors while men most commonly consented to sex through nonverbal behaviors. Although men and women both reported expressing their refusal using a combination of verbal and nonverbal behaviors, some general gender differences emerged. Women reported conveying their sexual refusals verbally, and women reported refusing sex more often than do men. When men reported refusing sex, they most frequently used verbal behaviors. More importantly, men reported relying on women’s nonverbal behaviors to interpret the intent of her response to his sexual advance. It was suggested that there may be considerable opportunity for miscommunication if women verbally refuse sex to a partner who emphasizes nonverbal behavior to understand the women’s sexual communication. Similarly, Beres (2010) suggested that active participation (nonverbal) was the most common way participants signaled consent to their partner and inferred consent from their partner, and that participants believe that partners frequently intuitively “know” what consent is when their partner conveys it. These communication patterns suggest reliance on various indirect nonverbal cues to interpret both refusals and consent (e.g., not kissing, body language, pulling their partner closer).

Lofgreen, Mattson, Wagner, Ortiz, and Johnson (2021) sought to investigate contextual factors, varying communication methods, and dispositional factors that affect male college student's perceptions of women's sexual desire/consent in sexual situations. Using a sample of 145 male college students, researchers employed a factorial vignette design to examine a wide variety of methods communicating including consent, refusal, and passive responding, as well as contextual factors that may influence participants' perceptions of women's sexual desire/consent and including female attire, female sexual history, alcohol consumption, relationship sexual history, and level of intimacy in the sexual interaction. In addition, they administered dispositional-related measures of empathy, psychopathy, hostility toward women, rape myth acceptance, and hypermasculinity. Male participants were exposed to six randomized vignettes in which they had just been on a date with a female partner with varying communication styles, details on attire, sexual history, alcohol consumption, relationship sexual history, and level of intimacy in the sexual interaction that varied based on the assigned condition. Participants were asked to rate their perceptions of the hypothetical woman's level of sexual desire, consent to continue with the sexual interaction, and level of communication of willingness to have sex on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). After these ratings, participants completed dispositional measures which were also presented in randomized order.

Using a multivariate multilevel modeling results indicated that across various situations (e.g., sexual refusal; level of intimacy) and levels of those situations (e.g., nonverbal refusal, verbal refusal, combined verbal and nonverbal refusal; no intimacy, kissing, oral sexual contact), men did not endorse different perceptions of a woman's sexual desire, consent to advance in the sexual scenario, and consent to sex. Regardless of the type of refusal men were exposed to in the vignette men rated the sexual refusal similarly across conditions. Male participants who were

exposed to the passive response conditions (e.g., tenses up or does not respond) were more likely to rate the woman as having higher levels of sexual desire/consent compared to male participants in all three refusal conditions (e.g., nonverbal, verbal or combined verbal and nonverbal refusal). Additionally, men who endorsed higher levels of hypermasculinity were more likely to rate the woman's sexual desire/consent higher compared to men who endorsed lower levels of hypermasculinity and those who endorsed higher levels of rape myth acceptance were more likely to rate the woman's sexual desire/consent higher than men who endorsed lower levels of rape myth acceptance, while psychopathy, hostility towards women, and empathy did not significantly predict participants' ratings. Authors emphasized that men's consistent ratings of women's sexual desire/consent across conditions illustrate how men conflate their perception of a woman's sexual desire with sexual consent, and noted that men's use of perceiving consent by a partner through the use of indirect cues of his perception of her sexual desire is an potential target for intervention in future programming.

Marcantonio, Jozkowski, and Lo (2018) investigated patterns of behaviors that college men and women use to convey sexual refusal. A list of general verbal and nonverbal behaviors that may be used to refuse sex was provided to participants. Using a Likert type scale (e.g., 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *agree*, 4 = *strongly agree*), participants rated their level of agreement/disagreement concerning whether they would employ each of the following sexual refusal behaviors. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were performed and three factors were identified: indirect nonverbal refusals, direct nonverbal refusals, and direct verbal refusals. Data analyses further revealed that relative to men, women were more likely to endorse employing all three categories of sexual refusal behaviors. For example, women reported attempting to convey boundaries using body language (e.g., indirect nonverbal), saying that they

had no interest in engaging in sex (e.g., direct verbal), and stopping giving their partner attention (e.g., direct nonverbal). It was suggested that women's greater endorsement of all three refusal behaviors may be due to the traditional sexual script, as women largely bear the responsibility of determining whether the pair will engage in sex.

As noted, women frequently attempt to stop an unwanted sexual advance by including an excuse when saying no to her partner. Van Wie and Gross (2001) examined how men responded to different verbal explanations accompanying a women's refusal of his sexual advance. Male undergraduate students listened to an audiotape of a dating vignette similar to the script of Marx and Gross' (1995) DRDT audiotape. The audiotape begins with a couple engaged in consensual kissing and breast contact. The man attempts to obtain increasing levels of sexual intimacy. The woman tells the man she does not want to have intercourse and explains: that it is because it is either too early in their relationship, that due to religious beliefs she's waiting until marriage before engaging in sexual intercourse, or that she is concerned about pregnancy. Despite her stated refusal the man continues his sexual advances culminating in the man forcibly engaging in intercourse with the woman. Participants were instructed to signal when they believed the man in the vignette should stop his sexual advances. Analyses revealed that relative to men in the relationship length refusal condition, men who listened to the pregnancy or marriage/religion refusals displayed shorter latencies in determining when the woman wanted the man to stop his advance. The authors suggested that certain refusals are perceived as fixed non-negotiable boundaries while other refusals are seen by men as open to negotiation.

In a similar investigation, Byers and Wilson (1985) exposed college students to vignettes of a couple engaging in varying levels of sexual intimacy (e.g., kissing, fondling, genital touching). The woman in the scenario attempted to stop the man's sexual advance by simply

saying no, refusing with an accompanying explanation (e.g., “my roommate may come back”), or refusing with an explanation regarding the relationship between the two (e.g., don’t know you well enough). Depending on their gender, male and female participants were asked to imagine being either the man or woman in the vignette and role-play his or her response to the partner, as well as indicate along a 5 item continuum whether the woman in the scenario wanted the man to stop his sexual advance (e.g., [1] stop what he is doing, [2] try again another time, [3], try again later this evening, [4] try again right away, or [5] continue his sexual advance). Analyses showed that compared to men who heard the refusal accompanied with an explanation, men who heard the explicit no without an explanation were more likely to believe that the woman in the scenario wanted the man to stop his advances. An interaction between type of verbal refusal and intimacy level indicated that in the moderate or high levels of intimacy (e.g., fondling or genital touching) conditions, participants were most likely to believe that the woman wanted the man to try again later that evening when her refusal was accompanied with an explanation (e.g., my roommate is coming back soon) compared to the ‘no’ refusal or when the refusal was accompanied with a relationship explanation. The authors suggested that type of refusal was more influential than intimacy level when interpreting a woman’s refusal. While most men and women interpreted the woman’s refusal as a genuine desire for her partner to stop, some male and female participants believed that the woman wanted her partner to continue making sexual advances despite her voicing a refusal.

Byers, Giles, and Price (1987) examined whether level of intimacy and level of romantic interest influenced women’s sexual refusals, as well as men’s interpretation of women’s sexual refusals. Women listened to one of nine audiotaped dating vignettes that varied in the couple’s level of progression in sexual intimacy level (e.g., *low intimacy*: progress from necking to breast

fondling, *medium intimacy*: progress from breast fondling to genital fondling, and *high intimacy*: progress from genital fondling over clothes to undressing) and romantic interest (e.g., *low*: not romantically interested, *medium*: somewhat romantically interested, or *high*: very romantically interested). Women were asked to imagine being the woman in the audiotape and role-play their response to the man in the scenario (e.g., “what would you say or do?”) to stop the man’s sexually advancing behavior at the conclusion of the tape. In each of the vignettes, the man attempted to increase the level of intimacy for each of the low, medium, or high sexually intimate conditions (e.g., necking to breast fondling) while the woman had only agreed to the lower intimacy behavior within each condition. Verbal and nonverbal roleplayed responses were coded (verbal refusal: 1= *no clear verbal refusal*, 2= *refusal implying advances at some other time/place in present may be acceptable*, 3= *refusal implying advances might be acceptable on a future date*, 4= *unqualified refusal*, 5= *refusal with anger or threat that date leave*; nonverbal refusals: 1= *no physical refusal*, 2= *blocked or did not perform sexual activity*, 3= *moved away/pushed man away*, 4= *got up/slapped/hit man*). Analyses showed that intimacy level played a role in how women refused sex. In contrast to the less sexually intimate conditions (e.g., unwanted breast fondling), women offered an unqualified refusal in more sexually intimate conditions (e.g., genital fondling). Additionally, definiteness of women’s refusals was affected by romantic interest. Participants in conditions where the women were romantically interested in her partner gave less definite verbal refusals than participants in conditions where the women were not as romantically interested in her partner. It was suggested that in contrast to women uninterested in cultivating romantic interest from her date, women wanting to maintain a potential partner’s romantic interest may be less likely to attempt to stop a sexual advance with a strong physical and verbally explicit refusal.

Byers, Giles, and Price (1987) exposed men to audio taped dating vignettes. Participants were asked to imagine being the man in the vignette and rate how effective the woman's sexual refusal response would be at stopping his sexual advances. In the audiotape vignette, the woman in the dating scenario utilized refusal responses that were characterized by low, medium, or high levels of verbal definiteness. The refusal occurred at low levels of sexual intimacy (e.g., necking to breast fondling) or high levels of sexual intimacy (e.g., genital fondling over the clothes to undressing). Relative to the less definite refusal conditions, men in the high definite stop conditions rated verbal refusals as likely to be more effective at stopping the sexual advance. Participants also rated less verbally definite responses as more effective for sexual scenarios involving low intimacy compared to high intimacy.

Studies suggest that it is common for a woman's refusal of sex to be seen as insincere or perceived as token resistance. Marx and Gross (1995) exposed college men to an audiotape of a date rape. The Date Rape Discrimination Task (DRDT) begins with the couple in the man's apartment following a date discussing the movie they have just seen. Physical intimacy is initiated with kissing and escalates, despite her attempts to stop the man, through completed intercourse. The woman refuses sexual contact beyond kissing using reasoning, refusals, pleading, and crying. Prior to listening to the audiotape, participants were given the couple's dating history that varied on level of prior sexual intimacy (e.g., breast contact, genital contact), and whether prior sexual intimacy had been preceded during the encounter by the woman initially saying no before consenting to the sexual activity (perceived token resistance). Participants listened to the tape and signaled when the woman in the vignette wanted the man to stop his sexual advances. Results demonstrated that relative to men in the no perceived token resistance condition, men in the perceived token resistance condition took significantly longer to

identify when the male in the vignette should stop making sexual advances. The authors suggested that despite women's direct verbal refusals, men who have experienced being with a woman who stops resisting his sexual advances, regardless of whether it is because she changed her mind regarding sex, or out of fear for her safety, may subsequently have difficulty accurately discerning a woman's sexual refusals. Similarly, Mills and Granoff (1992) reported that 50.9% of college male participants in their sample believed that female partners sometimes say no while actually meaning yes. Several authors report similar findings (Osman, 2003). Moreover, Van Wie, Gross, and Marx (1995) replicated Marx and Gross' (1995) effect of perceived token resistance with female participants.

In the dating context when women attempt to establish a sexual boundary it is often in an intimate situation and the couple is engaged in an early stage of sexual intimacy. Unfortunately, data reveal that it is common for men to interpret some verbal refusals during lower levels of physical intimacy as a cue to temporarily discontinue engaging in the act and try to pursue additional sexual activity later during that date. Winslett and Gross (2008) examined how sexual boundary discussions prior to physical intimacy might influence perceptions of sexual refusals. College men and women were exposed to the Date Rape Discrimination Task (DRDT) (Marx & Gross, 1995). Participants in the control condition were exposed to the original DRDT in which the audio-tape begins with the couple in the man's apartment following a date discussing the movie they have just seen. Those in the experimental condition were exposed to a slightly modified DRDT in which the discussion of the movie was replaced with a brief discussion in which the woman expresses her sexual boundary and makes clear that she only wants to kiss. Participants listened to the audiotape and were instructed to signal when the man should stop his sexual advances. Analyses revealed that relative to controls, men and women in the sexual

boundary condition displayed shorter latencies in determining when the man should stop his sexual advances. The authors suggested that discussions of sexual boundary parameters prior to any physical intimacy may decrease men's misperception of women's sexual intent.

In their attempts to control sexual intimacy women display combinations of verbal and nonverbal refusal behaviors. Faulty discriminations, misperceptions, and cultural stereotypes may contribute to men disregarding women's sexual refusal behaviors. Gross, Weed, and Larson (1998) examined men and women's perceptions of women's sexual refusals in a date-rape situation. A date rape audio-tape (DRDT; Marx & Gross, 1995) was divided into 15 second segments. In the first experiment, college men and women listened to each audiotape segment in the original story line order. Using a magnitude estimation scaling procedure, participants were asked to rate the intensity of the woman's sexual refusal after listening to each segment. In a second experiment, the audiotape segments were presented in random order. Participants were again asked to rate each segment for intensity of the woman's sexual refusal. Surprisingly, absolute magnitude estimates and mean intensity ratings were especially similar across both sequential and random presentation orders. The authors suggested that participants are able to recognize a woman's sexual refusal behaviors with or without storyline contextual cues.

In sum, research indicates that women communicate their sexual boundaries through a combination of verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski et al., 2014; Marcantonio, Jozkowski, & Lo, 2018). Data suggest that although men and women can identify refusal behaviors, personal and cultural contextual variables appear to influence men's perceptions of women's refusals. These factors include the couples current and or prior sexual intimacy level, romantic interest, when discussions of sexual boundaries occur, as well as cultural gender role sexual stereotypes.

Black Stereotypes

Stereotypes are a type of behavioral generalization defined as “a belief about a group of individuals” (Kanahara, 2006). These beliefs can lead to inaccurate assumptions about group members. Stereotypes refer to cognitive representations of culturally held beliefs about outgroup members (Hamilton & Sherman, 1989). Considerable research has examined the impact of racial stereotypes on perceptions of African-Americans. In particular, a number of authors have found that relative to Whites, Blacks are commonly seen as loud (Donovan, 2011; Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, & Sullivan, 1994), oversexed/promiscuous (Collins, 2000; Ferber, 2007), and angry (Harris-Perry, 2011). Being unemployed, unintelligent, and engaging in criminal activities are also characteristics that have typically been attributed to Black individuals (Niemann, O’Connor, & McClorie, 1998).

Duncan (1976) examined how perceptions of African Americans are influenced by racial stereotypes (e.g., stereotype that Black individuals are violent and impulsive). White participants watched a videotape of an ambiguous interaction between two men where one man shoves the other. Circumstances regarding the “shove” were ambiguous, and the race of the men in the video was varied (e.g., Black or White aggressor, Black or White victim). Participants were asked to determine the meaning of the ‘shove’, as well as the nature of the interaction (e.g., degree to which they were playing around, engaging in aggressive behaviors, or engaging in violent behaviors). Results revealed that 73% of participants rated the ‘shove’ performed by the Black man to the White character as violent behavior, but only 12.5% rated the same behavior by the White character to the Black character as violent. When the ‘shove’ was performed by the White character toward the Black character, it was most frequently identified as a form of horseplay. Moreover, relative to the White character the display of the ‘shove’ behavior by the

Black character to the White man was rated as an aggressive act. The author suggested that racial stereotypes affect how Black men are perceived. Similar findings concerning the impact of racial stereotypes on perception of Blacks have been reported by other investigators (Ford, 1997; Sagar & Schofield, 1980).

A number of racial stereotypes are associated with Black women. As noted, these include the nurturing Mammy who is the strong matriarch that cares for children and is an obedient household servant. The Black welfare queen who is depicted as single, poor, unwilling to work, and has children in order to qualify for government social programs is another stereotype (Collins, 2000; West, 2017; Woodard & Mastin, 2005). The Sapphire character stereotype is an aggressive, domineering, angry, and loud Black woman. Finally, there is the promiscuous light-skinned Jezebel stereotype who is a Black woman with an inappropriate and insatiable sexual appetite (Collins, 2000).

Sexual Stereotypes

The Black woman sexual stereotype (i.e., Jezebel) is commonly depicted in mainstream media (Tyree, 2011). Television and online platforms (e.g., music videos) frequently present Black women dressed in sexually provocative clothing engaging in sexually suggestive behaviors in order to gain the attention of men (Coleman, Butler, Long, & Fisher, 2016). This stereotype suggests Black women as hyperfocused on sex and unable to control their substantial sexual desires (Mitchell & Herring, 1998). Historically, the Jezebel Black women stereotype was used to argue that Black women could not be raped (West, 2017).

Givens and Monahan (2005) examined the impact of Black stereotypes on perceptions of Black women. A sample of predominantly White college students served as participants. Participants were told that they were going to be participating in two small studies. However, the

first experiment served as a priming task for the true experiment. As part of the ostensible first experiment, participants were shown a short video. This prime consisted of one of three videos: a Black woman housekeeper/nanny working for a White family (Mammy stereotype prime), a sexualized Black woman singer (Jezebel stereotype prime), or a White man retrieving his newspaper from the front lawn (control prime). Following the prime, participants were exposed to a second video depicting a Black or White woman performing a job interview. Participants were asked to rate (e.g., Likert scale) the woman in the job interview on a list of positive and negative personal adjectives and job suitability traits. Response latencies to descriptor items were examined as the dependent variable. Analyses revealed that in comparison to participants who rated the White female interviewee, participants who watched the Black female interviewee displayed shorter response latencies for negative adjectives than for positive adjectives, while participants who viewed the White female interviewee showed shorter response latencies for positive than negative adjectives. When participants were asked to apply stereotype-related words to the Black interviewee in the employment video, participants in the Jezebel prime condition displayed shorter response latencies to Jezebel traits (e.g., sexual, seductive) than Mammy traits (e.g., loyal, nurturing) relative to participants in the Mammy prime or control conditions. Authors suggested young college students' modern media consumption likely most frequently exposes them to images reflecting the Jezebel stereotype, and that this stereotype may influence the perception of Black women.

Anderson, Holland, Heldreth, and Johnson (2018) exposed White participants to images of White or Black women dressed in a sexualized (e.g., bikini) or non-sexualized (e.g., top and pants) clothing. Eye tracking technology was used to assess location and duration of visual gaze. Additionally, participants completed the Go/No-Go Association Task (GNAT; Nosek & Banaji,

2001), a computer-based implicit association task in which the above images were presented along with words describing human, animal, and object related attributes. Participants were asked to judge whether the image corresponded (e.g., was associated) with the presented attribute. Analyses revealed that relative to the sexualized images of White women, participants spent longer periods of time looking at the sexualized images of Black women. Participants also looked longer at the breasts and hips of Black women images relative to the White women images. Black women images were also associated with animals and objects to a greater degree compared to White women images. The authors noted that these findings suggested a higher rate of sexual objectification of Black women relative to White women consistent with the Black Jezebel stereotype.

Rosenthal and Lobel (2016) examined the influence of pregnancy on perceptions of Black and White women. Undergraduate participants read a vignette involving a White or Black woman who was pregnant or not pregnant accompanied by a corresponding photograph of the woman. Using a Likert type scale, participants rated the woman in the vignette on a range of characteristics including her likely relationship history (e.g., such as being married, in a serious relationship), sexual history (e.g., uses birth control, has previously been pregnant, has children), and other personal behaviors (e.g., drinks regularly, will follow doctor's instructions). Results revealed that relative to the White vignette character, participants rated the Black woman as likely having a higher number of sexual partners, less likely to use birth control regularly, more likely to have previously been pregnant, and more likely to have children. It was noted that these data suggest the impact of the Black women stereotypes on perceptions of Black women.

Black men also have been found to be viewed in sexually stereotyped ways compared to White men. For example, Ghavami and Peplau (2013) examined commonly reported stereotypes

of various groups of individuals (e.g., men, women, Black men, Black women, White men, White women). College students were asked to list ten characteristics that reflected the cultural stereotypes of these groups (e.g., Black or Latino, men or women). Compared to White and Asian men, participants were more likely to ascribe traits to Black men such as “hypersexual,” “violent,” and “dangerous.” Black women were also ascribed a more sexual stereotype of “promiscuous” in comparison to White women who were ascribed the characteristic of “sexually liberal.” Authors discussed how compared to other groups of men, the traits attributed to Black men were based on historical stereotypes.

Calabrese and colleagues (2018) asked a community sample of men and women to identify cultural stereotypes associated with sexual orientation and race. Participants were asked to write down five sexual, cultural stereotypes for one of the six presented groups (e.g., Black men, Black gay men, White men, White gay men). Results showed that compared to White gay men who were frequently described in terms including “deviant/unnatural” and “kinky”, the most common sexual stereotypes for Black men, Black heterosexual men, and Black gay men included characteristics such as “promiscuous,” “aggressive,” “strong,” “oversexed/insatiable,” “reckless/irresponsible,” and “sexual.” The authors did not report on comparisons between Black men and White men due to their interest in the overlap of race and sexual orientation. It was suggested that Black men are commonly sexually stereotyped and authors discussed the need for intersectional interventions that include both race and sexual orientation.

Findings suggest that hypersexual and aggressive are common stereotypes associated with Black men. A series of focus groups conducted with Black men also revealed that masculinity is commonly rooted in the notion that Black men should simultaneously maintain multiple sexual partners (Bowleg, Teti, Massie, Patel, Malebranche, & Tschann, 2011). In

qualitative interviews with twelve gay and bisexual Black men, a common theme of being stereotyped as hypersexual by others was reported (Bowleg, 2013).

In addition to the hypersexual Black male stereotype, Black men are also frequently stereotyped as being intimidating and capable of harming others (Wilson, Hugenberg, & Rule, 2017). These stereotypes contribute to making it likely for others to identify Black men as a threat. Miller (2019) found that participants exposed to heterosexual sexual scenarios involving a White, Hispanic, or Black man most identified the Black man with stereotypes such as “will assert his right to have sex.” For sexual scenarios involving Black men and White women, Black men were seen as particularly menacing.

Ugwuegbu (1979) examined perpetrator culpability and sentencing decisions for a rape scenario when the victim and defendant race varied. College participants were asked to read a sample vignette of a hypothetical forcible rape between a man (Black or White) and a woman (Black or White) and asked to rate the level of culpability for the defendant. The Black man was assigned higher rape culpability ratings than the White man, and the Black man who raped a White woman was assigned higher culpability relative to a White man who raped a Black woman, which reflected a general view that there is a need to safeguard a White woman from a Black man. These findings are consistent with data indicating that compared to White men, Black men receive harsher sentencing for rapes against White women (George & Martinez, 2002; Wolfgang & Riedel, 1975).

II. SUMMARY AND PRESENT STUDY

Contextual factors influence how women and men communicate and interpret sexual boundaries. This review also suggests that racial stereotypes characterize Black women as hypersexual and that Black women experience sexual victimization at higher rates than White, Asian, and Latina women (Black et al., 2011; Breiding et al., 2015; Planty, Langton, Krebs, Berzofsky, & Smiley-McDonald, 2013). Relative to White and other men, Black men are negatively viewed as hypersexed and aggressive (Ghavani & Peplau, 2013; Wilson, Hugenberg, & Rule, 2017). The purpose of the present study was to examine the influence of Black sexual stereotypes on the perception of women's verbal refusals of a man's sexual advances.

Participants were exposed to a vignette depicting a date between a man (Black versus White) and a woman (Black versus White) in which the man attempts to obtain increasing levels of sexual intimacy. In response to his sexual advance, the woman will offer one of two explanations as to why she does not want to engage in sex and desires only to kiss. Participants were asked to identify when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances. It was hypothesized:

H₁. There would be a main effect for victim race: when the woman in the vignette is White compared to Black, shorter latencies will be observed in recognizing when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances.

H₂. There would be a main effect for perpetrator race: when the man in the vignette is Black compared to White, shorter latencies to identify when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances will be observed.

H₃. There would be a main effect for refusal type: when the refusal includes the marriage/religious beliefs explanation compared to a relationship-based explanation,

shorter latencies for participants to recognize when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances would be observed.

H₄. It was hypothesized that there would be an interaction between victim race and perpetrator race regarding when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances.

H₅. It was hypothesized that there would be an interaction between victim race and refusal type regarding when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances.

H₆. Lastly, it was hypothesized that there would be an interaction between victim race, perpetrator race, and refusal type regarding when the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances.

III. METHOD

Participants

Participants were adults aged 18-25 recruited through the online research recruitment platform Prolific and financially compensated for their participation. An a-priori analysis through G*Power revealed that using a medium effect size of $d = 0.5$ and an alpha of 0.05, a sample size of 351 participants was needed to obtain a power level of 0.8. However, in order to ensure equivalent cell size, a minimum of 352 participants was established. Due to challenges with missing and incomplete data within online recruitment pools, additional participants were recruited.

Stimulus Materials

Participants read a vignette depicting a dating scenario between a man and a woman (adapted from the audiotape from Marx & Gross, 1995 and Van Wie & Gross, 2001). In the date vignette, the man and woman have returned from a movie and are alone at the man's apartment. While alone, the man attempts to engage in various sexual acts that begin with kissing and fondling and escalates to sexual intercourse. The couple begins by engaging in consensual kissing. The woman first verbally objects to his fondling of her breasts and then her buttocks. Despite her verbal refusals, he continues to escalate his sexual advances. She attempts to get her partner to stop his advances with a sexual refusal that is accompanied with an explanation (e.g., religious beliefs or relationship), but he continues his advances and physically holds her down while engaging in sexual intercourse. In the marriage/religious beliefs refusal condition, the woman verbally states that she does not want to have sex due to her religious beliefs regarding not wanting to have sex before marriage. In the relationship explanation refusal condition, she

informs her partner that she does not want to have sex due to concerns about it being too early in their relationship.

In order to convey the race of the vignette characters, the White woman in the vignette is named Lauren, the Black woman LaToya (based on Katz & McKinney, 2018), the White man Brett, and the Black man Jamal (based on Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004). Name manipulations have been successfully utilized in previous studies involving race manipulations (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Katz & McKinney, 2018).

Measures

Demographics. Participants completed questions concerning their individual background including education level, socioeconomic status, gender identity, age, marital status, sexual orientation, and alcohol consumption in the past 30 days.

Social Desirability. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) is a 33-item measure that examines whether participants are presenting themselves in an overly favorable light in order to gauge social desirability bias. Participants responded to each item (e.g., “I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake”) in a true or false format. Of these items, 15 are reverse scored and scores range from 0 to 33 (see Appendix C). Higher scores indicate concern with social approval and lower scores indicate that participants’ responses reflect less concern with desirable responding. A meta-analysis revealed that the MC-SDS’s internal consistency score reliability is acceptable with women (.797) and men (.704; Beretvas, Meyer, & Leite, 2002) with a test-retest reliability ranging from .84 (Fisher, 1967) to .88 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this study was poor, $\alpha = .482$ (George & Mallery, 2003).

Sexual Experiences Survey. The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982) examines whether a person has experienced unwanted sexual acts and the types of coercion that the perpetrator used to obtain these sexual acts. The self-report 13-item scale assesses whether sexual acts of escalating severity (e.g., unwanted kissing, oral sex, sexual intercourse) have occurred through the use of specific acts or threats (e.g., verbal sexual coercion, physical force). The first item asks about wanted sexual intercourse (although the score is not included in the sum) while the second item queries about misinterpreted, desired sexual intimacy. Items 3-12 ask about unwanted sexual acts acquired through various perpetrator behaviors, though items 8-9 inquire about forced sexual intercourse that had been attempted by the perpetrator, but did not occur. Item 13 asks about whether the participant explicitly acknowledges whether he/she has been previously raped. Past studies have utilized the SES and similar versions of the SES by scoring participants on their most severe sexual aggression or victimization such as sexual contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape, or rape (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). However, this study was interested in whether participants had experienced any level of unwanted sexual experience. As item 1 asks about wanted sexual intercourse, it was not included in the scoring criteria. Items 2-13 were summed to indicate whether the participant had experienced any prior unwanted sexual contact.

In a sample of college men and women, the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the SES was found to be .74 with a one-week test-retest reliability of 93% (Koss & Gidycz, 1985). One challenge of the SES is the inclusion of gendered pronouns which are heteronormative and overlook potential male victims and female perpetrators. As such, the SES was modified to use gender-neutral pronouns that allow for greater inclusivity of incidents of sexual violence (see Appendix B). This measure was included to determine if prior unwanted

sexual experience affects perceptions of sexual refusals. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this study was good, $\alpha = .837$ (George & Mallery, 2003).

Anti-Black Attitudes. The Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986) is a 7-item scale that examines anti-Black attitudes that participants may hold, particularly of beliefs that are more subtle compared to past measures examining racism towards Black Americans (see Appendix D). The scale includes items such as "discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in the United States" and "over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve." Each item is rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), and item 2 (i.e., "it is easy to understand the anger of black people in America") is reverse scored. The items are summed and higher scores indicate stronger subtle anti-Black attitudes. Past studies have found Cronbach alphas in samples of White, college participants to be good (e.g., .79-.89; Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow; 2000; Pauker, Carpinella, Meyes, Young, & Sanchez; .86). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the present study was acceptable, $\alpha = .763$ (George & Mallery, 2003).

Latency Measure. Prior research in this area has employed variations of the date rape discrimination task and utilized an audiotape to determine when participants identify a sexual refusal in a dating scenario between a man and a woman (Gross, Weed, & Larson, 1998; Marx & Gross, 1995; Van Wie & Gross, 2001). This task involves playing an audio tape of a date rape scenario and asking participants to signal when the woman in the scenario wants the man to stop his sexual advances. The duration of time the participant listens to the vignette prior to signaling when they think the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances has served as the dependent measure in prior studies.

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in significant challenges regarding in-person social science research. To maintain the safety of both participants and researchers the present study was adapted from an in-person to an online experiment. As such, latency to determine when the woman wants the man to stop making sexual advances involved a word for word translation of the date rape audiotape (see Steinfeld, 2019, who found no differences between written and video mediums). Participants read the dialogue presented in single line segments. At the end of each line of dialogue participants had the opportunity to indicate if the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances (clicking STOP). Rather than using listening duration as employed by previous researchers (Gross, Weed, & Larson, 1998; Marx & Gross, 1995; Van Wie & Gross, 2001), line segment served as the latency indicator. The only words changed across experimental conditions were the names of the woman and man in the dating scenario, so line segments were identical and equivalent across conditions. In total, there were 40 line segments and for a transcript of the vignettes used and their corresponding line segments, see Appendix A. The stopping point was recorded digitally on the Qualtrics platform and served as the dependent variable of interest. At the conclusion of the entire vignette, participants were also prompted to press STOP if they had read through the vignette but had not previously pressed STOP to determine that participants had been attending to the vignette directions and stimulus materials.

Qualitative Refusal Markers. In order to facilitate a better understanding of verbal and nonverbal behaviors contributing to participants' concluding that the woman wants the man to stop making sexual advances, at the point in which participants made this identification they were asked the following question: "What occurred at this point in the interaction that led you to

conclude the woman wanted the man to stop his sexual advances?" Qualitative responses were recorded on Qualtrics and coded according to thematic analysis.

Manipulation Check. An attention check was utilized in the latter portion of the study to ensure that participants had read through the study materials and not engaged in random responding. Participants read through a lengthy question prompt which stated:

People often vary on how well they are able to talk to their romantic/sexual partner about their sexual satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Factors relating to a wide range of different characteristics may vary from person to person and affect how well people can communicate their sexual needs. Please check the response "Agree Somewhat" in the following response options. Communication of sexual needs has been found to be related to other personal variables. In regard to sexual communication, how important is communication of sexual needs with your romantic/sexual partner?

Participants were asked to select one specific response item (e.g., agree somewhat) from the five choices (e.g., disagree, disagree somewhat, neither disagree nor agree, agree somewhat, or agree). Individuals who did not accurately select the response item were excluded from data analysis.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through the online platform Prolific website and offered a rate of \$10.91/hour for their participation. The study was advertised as an examination of how individuals understand dating interactions and participants provided their informed consent at the start of the experiment. As the study withheld mention of participants reading an incident of sexual assault to determine how individuals perceive sexual refusals (as supported by the University's IRB committee), participants were additionally debriefed at the conclusion of the study and asked to re-consent to the study.

Procedures were evaluated using a 2 (victim race: Black or White) X 2 (perpetrator race: Black or White) X 2 (refusal type: marriage/religious beliefs or relationship) between subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions through the Qualtrics randomizer. After completing the demographics section, participants were told that they would read a vignette of a dating interaction between a man and a woman who have just returned to the man's apartment after a date. Similar to the protocol established by Marx and Gross (1995), all subjects were given the following instructions:

Your task is to read the following vignette and signal, by pressing the STOP button located on the bottom of each webpage, if and when the man should refrain from making further sexual advances. If you decide to press the STOP button, you will be able to continue to read through the entire interaction from start to finish if you want.

Participants read a vignette depicting a dating scenario involving a sexual interaction presented one line at a time. Depending on the experimental condition, the woman in the vignette offered one of two explanations (marriage/religious beliefs or relationship refusal) when refusing the man's sexual advance. Participants pressed the STOP button when they determined that the woman wants the man to stop his sexual advances. In order to identify what occurred during the couple's interaction that prompted participants to conclude the woman wanted the man to stop making sexual advances, after pressing the STOP button participants reported in a text box what was occurring in the vignette that resulted in their decision to press stop when they did.

Following the vignette segment of the experiment, participants completed the attention check, MC-SDS, and SES. These three measures were presented in a counterbalanced format. At the conclusion of the study, participants were debriefed on the nature of the study, asked to re-consent, and provided with information regarding various mental health resources (e.g., RAINN National Hotline and website) if they experienced distress due to stimulus materials in the study.

IV. RESULTS

Data Preparation

Four hundred and twenty-three individuals completed the experiment on Prolific. Participants were removed from the analysis if they were duplicates ($n = 5$), did not consent to having their data used after the true purpose was revealed at the conclusion of the study ($n = 23$), if they did not pass the attention check item ($n = 5$), if they did not respond to the experimental vignette ($n = 4$), or if they did not complete significant portions of questions ($n = 12$). In regard to outliers greater than 3 standard deviations from the mean of each measure, 5 participants were removed when examining Koss' SES measure, 1 on the Modern Racism Scale, and 1 was removed when examining the Marlow Crowne Scale of Social Desirability measure. Little's MCAR analyses for the SES, Modern Racism Scale, and MC-SDS measures were conducted and revealed to be non-significant, indicating that missingness was not an issue. After these outliers were removed from the analysis, Mahalanobis distance identified no multivariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), resulting in a final sample of $n = 367$. Data indicated violations of skewness due to 9 participants who did not press STOP when reading the experimental vignette, (but did press the button after the vignette had concluded to ensure that they had read the vignette and were paying attention to instructions). The dataset was log transformed in the effort to address skewness, but the dataset remained significantly skewed. Due to these issues, the 9 participants' data were recoded as scores that are one unit greater (e.g., 32) than the next most extreme score (e.g., 31) in the distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 77).

Descriptive Statistics

Participant demographics are reported in Table 1. Participants selected racial identities and could select multiple ethnicities, and 60.5% identified as White/Caucasian, 23.2% identified as Asian, 15.3% identified as Latino/a, 11.7% identified as Black/African American, 0.01% identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native, 0.005% identified as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 0.005% selected Other, and 0.005% preferred not to answer. For age of participants, 3.5% were 18 years old, 12% were 19 years old, 14.2% were 20 years old, 11.4% were 21 years old, 16.3% were 22 years old, 15.5% were 23 years old, 13.6% were 24 years old, and 13.4% were 25 years old. Regarding sexual orientation, 60.2% identified as heterosexual, 24% as bisexual, 3.8% as gay, 5.2% as lesbian, 3% as queer, and 3.8% as “other.” For gender identity, 42.4% identified as male, 51.2% identified as female, 0.8% identified as transgender male, 0.5% identified as transgender female, 4.6% identified as Gender-Variant/Non-conforming/Non-Binary, and 0.5% selected Other.

For marital status, 66.8% of participants stated that they were single, 24% indicated that they were a member of an unmarried couple, 9% stated that they were married or in a domestic partnership, and 0.3% were widowed. To assess for socioeconomic status, participants reported their family’s total income in the past year, as well as their parents’/caregivers’ highest level of education completed. Participants indicated that 4.6% earned less than \$5,000, 5.4% earned between \$5,000-\$11,999, 6% earned between \$12,000-\$15,999, 7.1% earned between \$16,000-\$24,999, 10.9% earned between \$25,000-\$34,999, 12.3% earned between \$35,000-\$49,999, 19.1% earned between \$50,000-\$74,999, 9.8% earned between \$75,000-\$99,999, 20.4% earned \$100,000 and more, and 4.4% did not respond to the question. For parents’/caregivers’ highest level of education, 3.8% did not complete high school, 0.8% did not complete high school but completed a technical/vocational program, 18.5% completed high school or obtained their GED,

3.8% completed high school and a technical/vocational program, 8.4% completed less than 2 years of college, 14.7% obtained an Associate's degree or 2 years of college, 27.2% graduated from college, 15.3% obtained a Master's degree, and 7.4% obtained a doctoral degree.

Participants' alcohol use was determined by the number of days that they consumed one or more alcoholic beverages (0-30) in the last 30 days and is reported in Table 2.

Correlations

A correlation matrix of dependent measures was computed (see Table 3). The Modern Racism Scale was correlated with social desirability (MC-SDS) and negatively correlated with past unwanted sexual experiences (Koss' SES). Past unwanted sexual experiences was also negatively correlated with social desirability (MC-SDS). No correlations were found between the measures and the DRDT stop point.

Analyses of Variance

A 3-way ANOVA using latency as the dependent measure was conducted with refusal type, victim race, perpetrator race as independent variables and the line of the vignette that participants pressed STOP at served as the dependent variable. Prior to conducting the ANOVA, assumptions were examined and indicated that no overall assumptions were violated. The Levene's test of equality was non-significant and tests for heteroskedasticity were also non-significant. For full between subjects ANOVA results, please see Table 4.

No main effects were observed as refusal type [$F(1, 359) = 0.358, p = .55, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$], victim race [$F(1, 359) = 3.218, p = .074, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .009$], and perpetrator race [$F(1, 359) = 0.072, p = .788, \text{partial } \eta^2 < .001$] were not significant. As such, the first, second, and third hypotheses were not supported. The three way interaction for victim race, perpetrator race, and refusal type also was not significant, $F(1, 359) = .229, p = .633, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$, indicating

that hypothesis six was not confirmed. The two-way interaction for refusal type by victim race [$F(1, 359) = .049, p = .825, \text{partial } \eta^2 < .001$], as well as victim race by perpetrator race [$F(1, 359) = .402, p = .526, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$] also were found to be not significant. As such, predictions 4 and 5 were not confirmed.

Qualitative Analyses

Qualitative responses were separately examined and coded based on frequently occurring commonalities. Across respondents, commonalities (e.g., more than ten times) regarding what participants reported as cues that signal when the woman wanted the man to stop his sexual advances were recorded. As discussed, research suggests that women's sexual boundaries are conveyed through verbal and physical behaviors. Common responses were grouped into categories as to whether they identified verbal or physical behaviors of either the man or the woman, and condensed if there was significant overlap between commonalities. For example, "not ready/wait" commonly overlapped with the marriage refusal or relationship refusal and was subsequently removed. With the exception of the category of relationship refusal (an experimental variable), low frequency categories (i.e., less than 10%) were removed.

Two researchers independently coded all participant responses. Discrepancies were deliberated between coders and adjusted based on ongoing discussions leading to unanimous agreement of coded responses. This method of identifying themes, coding responses according to emerging themes, and condensing themes is commonly used in qualitative statistical research (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014; Sabina, Verdiglione, Zadnik, 2017).

The most commonly reported response category was the woman's verbal refusals (81.56%). Within this category, four themes emerged including the woman's use of the words "stop" (21.5%), "no" (16%), her marriage/religious beliefs refusal (17.04%), and her

relationship-based refusal (3.07%). The second common category among participant responses included the man's physical actions (e.g., man put his hands under her clothing, 41.34%). Although the man in the vignette had engaged in physical sexual advances prior to this point in the vignette, participants frequently referred to this behavior violating the woman's previously verbalized sexual boundary when offering a reason why they concluded she wanted the man to stop his sexual advances. The third category identified was participants' reference to how the woman "does not want" the sexual advance (25.98%). The last theme participants described was that the woman's refusal was "clear" (10.1%). Additionally, participants infrequently utilized terms such as "consent" (5.59%) or "boundary" (3.07%) when explaining why they believed the woman in the vignette wanted the man to stop. Qualitative responses may include multiple categories and were coded to capture all relevant categories.

V. DISCUSSION

Research reveals that in sexual interactions women commonly attempt to establish their sexual boundaries via verbal refusals (e.g., explicit no, general excuse) of the man's sexual advances (Marcantonio & Jozkowski, 2020). It is also reported that men interpret some verbal refusals from women as negotiable (e.g., too early in the relationship for sex; Van Wie & Gross, 2001) rather than as fixed boundaries (e.g., fear of pregnancy). Sexual stereotypes have also been demonstrated to influence how a woman's refusal of a sexual advance is interpreted. For example, the stereotype suggesting Black women as being promiscuous (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013) has been shown to adversely impact the recognition of her sexual refusal. Similarly, sexual stereotypes about Black men as being hypersexual (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013) may affect perceptions of how Black men respond to a woman's sexual refusals in a dating scenario.

Based on these findings several hypotheses were examined in the current study. We predicted that when exposed to a dating scenario and asked to identify when the woman in the vignette wanted her date to stop making sexual advances, victim race, perpetrator race, and verbal refusal explanation would influence this determination. In particular, participants would indicate that the woman in the vignette wanted the man to stop the sexual advance earlier in their interaction when the woman was White, the man was Black, and her refusal explanation was based on her religious beliefs. Contrary to expectations, no main effects or interaction effects were observed.

The stimulus vignette used in the current study was based on the DRDT (Gross, Weed, & Lawson, 1998; Marx & Gross, 1995; Van Wie & Gross 2001; Winslett & Gross, 2008). However, unlike in prior investigations where the vignette was presented in an audio format

(e.g., two actors depicting a date rape), participants read the vignette. The vignette was presented in this manner due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions that prevented conducting in-person research studies. All data were collected online. Rather than hearing the interaction proceed in real time, participants were asked to read and advance the vignette one line at a time. This presentation may have limited the impact of this date rape analog procedure accounting for our lack of significant findings. That is, it's possible that *level* of participant engagement with written versus audio vignettes differs. Past literature has demonstrated that varying emotional responses are evoked by different stimulus presentation formats. For example, in a comparison of written and audiovisual presentations of a date rape scenario, Slead, Durrheim, Kriel, Solomon, and Baxter (2002) found that participants exposed to the written vignette were less likely to define the situation as rape.

Related to the above point, requiring participants to read the vignette one line at a time artificially introduced pauses into the stimulus presentation. As noted, rather than the vignette progressing automatically at the end of each line, participants clicked a "next" button to progress to the next line of the vignette. Before advancing the vignette they had the opportunity to indicate that the woman wanted the man to stop making sexual advances. This procedure introduced stopping points (pauses) after each actor's line. In prior work (e.g., Marx & Gross, 1995) participants were asked to indicate when the woman wanted the man to stop his sexual advances while hearing the scenario progress in real time. In the present study, participant's control over stimulus presentation resulted in longer opportunities to reflect on, or process the couple's interaction at the end of each line of dialogue allowing extra time to identify and interpret each actor's behavioral cues. It's possible this method of stimulus exposure adversely affected the realism of this analog scenario. In a critique of written vignettes, Parkinson and

Manstead (1993) noted how text-based vignettes have limited applicability to complex social interactions in daily life, stating “you can turn away from and stop reading a story, get more or less involved in it; not so with life which you are stuck in the thick of, and which does not stop happening if you pause for a moment. Stories can be taken at their own pace; life sets a pace of its own” (p. 306). Gidycz, McNamara, and Edwards (2006) suggested how inconsistencies across studies of women’s perceptions of risk and sexual victimization may be due to how some studies are based on written vignettes while others use audio vignettes.

It is less clear as to why no effect was found for victim and assailant race. Considerable data indicate that Black women are more likely to be perceived as promiscuous (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013; Rosenthal & Lobel, 2016) and experience a higher rate of sexual objectification than White women (Anderson et al., 2018), while Black men are commonly perceived to be hypersexual, aggressive, violent, and capable of harming others (Bowleg, 2013; Calabrese et al., 2018; Ghavami & Peplau, 2013; Wilson, Hugenberg, & Rule, 2017). Analyses revealed that victim race approached significance (p -value of 0.07).

At the conclusion of data collection participants were asked to re-consent to participation in the study. This procedure was required by IRB as the initial recruitment and informed consent procedures did not explicitly state that the vignette would depict a nonconsensual dating scenario. Research suggests that for women with a history of sexual victimization who are exposed to an audiotape of a sexual assault scenario, the majority report negative reactions including discomfort, anger, and anxiety (Silver, Anderson, & Brouwer, 2022). Twenty-three participants did not re-consent to participation and their data were excluded from analyses. It is possible that exclusion of this subset of the sample may have impacted our findings.

Qualitative analyses suggested several verbal and behavioral cues identified by participants as contributing to their concluding that the woman wanted the man to stop making sexual advances. Within the category of women's verbal refusals, frequently occurring themes included the use of the words "stop" or "no," as well as her refusal explanation (e.g., either marriage/religious based or relationship based). These findings are consistent with prior studies that have illustrated how women typically attempt to verbally convey sexual refusals (Anderson, 2005; Gunby, Carline, & Beynon, 2012; Marcantino & Jozkowski, 2020; Van Wie & Gross, 2001).

Interestingly, many participants described how they used the combination of behaviors of the woman and the man in the vignette leading up to the point at which they determined the woman wanted the man to stop his sexual advance. For example, participants referenced the woman's prior verbal refusal along with the man's physical actions (ignoring her refusal) as prompting them to choose the subsequent verbal refusal as the stopping point. This finding is consistent with prior literature suggesting that individuals draw from a range of verbal and physical actions when interpreting a sexual interaction (Righi et al., 2021). That is, within a sexual interaction sexual refusals occur in a context of other pertinent behavioral cues (information) which influence whether someone views a refusal to be indicative of an individual's sexual boundary.

Approximately 10.1% of respondents indicated that the woman's refusal of the man's sexual advance was "clear," but frequently did not include an explicit explanation in their qualitative response for why they viewed her refusal as "clear." Past literature examining sexual consent has shown that many young adults commonly report they just "know" when their partner is consenting (Beres, 2010). Winslett and Gross (2008) found that relative to college students

who listened to a vignette that included a couple discussing the woman's sexual boundaries *prior* to their sexual interaction identified the woman's sexual refusal more quickly than students who listened to the discussion of the woman's sexual boundary *during* the sexual interaction. These data suggest that in the determination of sexual consent men and women utilize various behavioral and contextual cues.

Analog research materials (e.g., vignettes) are created to approximate real life situations. It has been suggested that while such studies are often characterized by high levels of internal validity, they frequently are of limited external validity (Cook & Rumrill, 2005). Borkovec and Rachman (1979) noted problems concerning the generalizability of analog research findings. Cook and Rumrill (2005) have suggested that these limitations are the result of an inability to adequately approximate real life complexity in stimulus scenarios/manipulations. These issues are particularly salient in sexual violence in dating violence research.

Studies of nonconsensual sex in a dating situation employing analog methods may be further complicated when conducted over the internet. Comparisons of laboratory versus online produced data have found that relative to in lab participants, online participants may be less accurate on a problem-solving task (Dandurand, Shultz, & Onishi, 2008) and more likely to have their data excluded from analyses due to failure to follow study instructions (Finley & Penningroth, 2015). Moreover, Skitka and Sargis (2006) have expressed concern regarding the potential impact on responding of the variability of contexts of participants providing data in response to experimental manipulations.

Although analog research poses a number of research challenges, ethical considerations make this strategy necessary in attempts to better understand sexual violence in a dating situation. Although our data failed to confirm experimental hypotheses, our qualitative findings

suggest possible directions for future work. In-depth qualitative research (e.g., focus groups) may help identify more clearly the individual or combination of verbal and physical behaviors associated with effective sexual communication. Such studies might also help pinpoint environmental contextual cues important to effective sexual communication. This type of work may subsequently contribute to the development of sexual dating violence vignettes that enhance the external validity of analog research necessary to understanding this important social issue (e.g., Winslett & Gross, 2008).

TABLES

Table 1. *Participants' descriptive statistics (n= 367)*

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18	13	3.5%
19	44	12%
20	52	14.2%
21	42	11.4%
22	60	16.3%
23	57	15.5%
24	50	13.6%
25	49	13.4%
Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	155	42.2%
Female	188	51.2%
Transgender	5	1.4%
Gender-variant/non-conforming/non-binary	17	4.6%
Other	2	0.5%
Sexual Orientation	Frequency	Percentage
Heterosexual	221	60.2%
Bisexual	88	24%
Gay	14	3.8%
Lesbian	19	5.2%
Queer	11	3.0%
Other	14	3.8%
Year in College	Frequency	Percentage
Not in college	155	42.4%
Freshman	26	7.1%
Sophomore	52	14.2%
Junior	51	13.9%
Senior	60	16.3%
Other	23	6.3%
Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	245	66.8%

Member of unmarried couple	88	24%
Married, or in a domestic partnership	33	9%
Widowed	1	0.3%
SES – family income	Frequency	Percentage
Less than \$5,000	17	4.6%
\$5,000 through \$11,999	20	5.4%
\$12,000 through \$15,999	22	6%
\$16,000 through \$24,999	26	7.1%
\$25,000 through \$34,999	40	10.9%
\$35,000 through \$49,999	45	12.3%
\$50,000 through \$74,999	70	19.1%
\$75,000 through \$99,999	36	9.8%
\$100,000 and greater	75	20.4%
Did not respond	16	4.4%
SES- Parent/Caregiver highest education level	Frequency	Percentage
Didn't Finish High School	14	3.8%
Didn't Finish High School, but completed a technical/vocational program	3	0.8%
High School Graduate or GED (General Education Diploma)	68	18.5%
Completed High School and a technical/vocational program	14	3.8%
Less than 2 Years of College	31	8.4%
2 Years of College or more/ including associate degree or equivalent	54	14.7%
College graduate (4 or 5 year program)	100	27.2%
Master's degree (or other post-graduate training)	56	15.3%
Doctoral degree (PhD., MD, EdD, DVM, DDS, JD, etc)	27	7.4%

Table 2.

Alcohol Use in Last 30 Days

Number of Days Participant consumed one or more alcoholic beverages	Frequency	Percentage
0	156	42.5%
1	34	9.3%
2	34	9.3%
3	30	8.2%
4	24	6.5%
5	35	9.5%
6	5	1.4%
7	10	2.7%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
10	13	3.5%
11	0	0%
12	2	0.5%
13	0	0%
14	2	0.5%
15	5	1.4%
16	0	0%
17	1	0.3%
18	1	0.3%
19	0	0%
20	4	1.1%
21	0	0%
22	1	0.3%
23	0	0%
24	0	0%
25	1	0%

Table 3.

Correlation Table of SES, MC-SDS, MRS, and DRDT Stop Point

	(1) Modern Racism Scale	(2) MC-SDS	(3) Koss SES	(4) DRDT
1	--	0.181**	-0.127*	0.094
2	--	--	-0.113*	-0.059
3	--	--	--	0.026
4	--	--	--	--

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4.

Between-subjects ANOVA Results

Predictor	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	Partial η^2
(Intercept)	153600.549	7	153600.549	13836.403	<.001	38.093	0.975
Refusal type	3.977	1	3.977	.358	.550	0.001	0.001
Victim race	35.727	1	35.727	3.218	.074	0.009	0.009
Perpetrator race	.802	1	.802	.072	.788	<.001	<.001
Refusal type*victim race	.546	1	.546	.049	.825	<.001	<.001
Refusal type*perpetrator race	.222	1	.222	.020	.888	<.001	<.001
Victim race*perpetrator race	4.466	1	4.466	.402	.526	0.001	0.001
Refusal type*victim race*perpetrator race	2.541	1	2.541	.229	.633	.001	0.001
Error	3985.327	359	11.101				

Table 5.

Means and standard deviations of Modern Racism Scale, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Koss' Sexual Experiences Scale, and DRDT vignette stop point

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Modern Racism Scale sum score	11.81	5.11	367
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale sum score	14.95	5.16	366
Koss' SES sum score	1.87	2.45	367
DRDT Stop point	20.69	3.32	367

Table 6.

Means and standard deviations of DRDT vignette stop points

Refusal Type	Victim Race	Perp Race	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Marriage Refusal	White female	White male	20.28	3.948	43
		Black male	20.18	2.604	39
		Total	20.23	3.357	82
	Black female	White male	20.93	2.950	45
		Black male	20.94	3.687	53
		Total	20.94	3.352	98
	Total	White male	20.61	3.469	88
		Black male	20.62	3.278	92
		Total	20.62	3.363	180
Relationship Refusal	White female	White male	20.79	4.217	42
		Black male	20.25	3.155	52
		Total	20.49	3.657	94
	Black female	White male	20.95	2.608	57
		Black male	21.19	3.232	36
		Total	21.04	2.851	93
	Total	White male	20.88	3.366	99
		Black male	20.64	3.203	88
		Total	20.76	3.284	187
Total	White female	White male	20.53	4.067	85
		Black male	20.22	2.917	91

Table 7.

Qualitative Analysis Themes

Theme	Subcategory	Participants' Example Responses	Percentage
Verbal Refusal		“she said”	81.56%
	Stop	“she said stop”	21.5%
	No	“the woman said no”	16%
	Marriage/Religious beliefs refusal	“she told him she wanted to wait till marriage”	17.04%
	Relationship-based refusal	“...they agreed that things wouldn't keep advancing until they got to know each other more but then...”	3.07%
Man's actions following woman's boundary		“she literally told him to get his hands out of her pants, after explicitly telling him that she did not want to sleep together that night”	41.34%
Does not want [the sexual advance]		“she didn't want his hand in her pant”	25.98%
Woman's refusal being “clear”		“the woman made it clear that she did not want...”	10.1%

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abramowitz, J.S., Fabricant, L.E., Taylor, S., Deacon, B.J., McKay, D., & Storch, E.A. (2014). The relevance of analogue studies for understanding obsessions and compulsions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 34*, 206-217. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2014.01.004
- Anderson, J.R., Holland, E., Heldreth, C., & Johnson, S.P. (2018). Revisiting the Jezebel stereotype: The impact of target race on sexual objectification. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 42*, 461-476. doi: 10.1177/0361684318791543
- Anderson, M.J. (2005). Negotiating sex. *Southern California Law Review, 78*, 1401-1438.
- Banaji, M.R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A.J. (1993). Implicit stereotyping in person judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 272-281.
- Beres, M.A. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality, 12*, 1-14.
- Beres, M.A. (2014). Rethinking the concept of consent for anti-sexual violence activism and education. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*, 373-389. doi: 10.1177/0959353514539652
- Beretvas, S.N., Meyers, J.L., & Leite, W.L. (2002). A reliability generalization study of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*, 570-589.
- Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review, 94*, 991-1013. doi: 10.3386/w9873
- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Borkovec, T. & Rachman, S. (1979). The utility of analogue research. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 17*, 253-261.
- Bowleg, K. (2013). "Once you've blended the cake, you can't take the parts back to the main ingredients": Black gay and bisexual men's descriptions and experiences of intersectionality. *Sex Roles, 68*, 754-767. doi: 10.1007/s11199-012-0152-4

- Bowleg, L., Teti, M., Massie, J.S., Patel, A., Malebranche, D.J., & Tschann, J.M. (2011). 'What does it take to be a man? What is a real man?: Ideologies of masculinity and HIV sexual risk among Black heterosexual men. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality, 13*, 545-559. doi: 10.1080/13691058.2011.556201
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 32*, 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Basile, K.C., Walters, M.L., Chen, J., Merrick, M.T. (2015). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization-national intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(4):e11–2. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2015.302634
- Brief, A.P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R.R., Pugh, S.D., & Vaslow, J.B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 72-97. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1999.2867
- Buchanan, N.T., Settles, I.H., & Woods, K.C. (2008). Comparing sexual harassment subtypes among Black and White women by military rank: Double jeopardy, the Jezebel, and the cult of true womanhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 347-361.
- Byers, E.S. (1980). Female communication of consent and nonconsent to sexual intercourse. *New Brunswick Psychology, 5*, 12-18.
- Byers, E.S., Giles, B.L., & Price, D.L. (1987). Definiteness and effectiveness of women's responses to unwanted sexual advances: A laboratory investigation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 321-338.
- Byers, E.S. & Heinlein, L. (1989). Predicting initiations and refusals of sexual activities in married and cohabitating heterosexual couples. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 210-231.
- Byers, S. & Wilson, P. (1985). Accuracy of women's expectations regarding men's responses to refusals of sexual advances in dating situations. *International Journal of Women's Studies, 8*, 376-387.
- Caetano, R., Field, C., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Lipsky, S. (2009). Agreement on reporting of physical, psychological, and sexual violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1318-1337. doi: 10.1177/0886260508322181
- Calabrese, S.K., Earnshaw, V.A., Magnus, M., Hansen, N.B., Krakower, D.S., Underhill, K., Mayer, K.H., Kershaw, T.S., Betancourt, J.R., & Dovidio, J.F. (2018). Sexual stereotypes ascribed to Black men who has sex with men: An intersectional analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*, 143-156. doi: 10.1007/s10508-016-0911-3

- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Rockville, Maryland: Westat.
- Coleman, M.N., Butler, E.O., Long, A.M., & Fisher, F.D. (2016). In and out of love with hip-hop: Saliency of sexual scripts for young adult African American women in hip-hop and Black-oriented television. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality, 18*, 1165-1179. doi: 10.1080/13691058.2016.1175029
- Collet, J. L., & Childs, E. (2011). Minding the gap: Meaning, affect, and the potential shortcomings of vignettes. *Social Science Research, 40*(2), 513–522. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.008
- Collington, D., Carter, M., Tolliver, A., & Turner-Musa, J. (2019). Sexual assault among college students attending a Historically Black College/University. *American Journal of Undergraduate Research, 15*, 37-45.
- Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cook, B.G. & Rumrill Jr., P.D. (2005). Using and interpreting analogue designs. *Work, 24*, 93-97.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 27-36.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York: Wiley.
- Curtis, J.N. & Burnett, S. (2017). Affirmative consent: What do college student leaders think about “yes means yes” as the standard for sexual behavior? *American Journal of Sexuality Education, 12*, 201-214. doi: 10.1080/15546128.2017.1328322
- Dandurand, F., Shultz, T.R., & Onishi, K.H. (2008). Comparing online and lab methods in a problem-solving experiment. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 428-434. doi: 10.3758/brm.40.2.428.
- Davis, S. & Tucker-Brown, A. (2013). Effects of Black sexual stereotypes on sexual decision making among African American women. *The Journal of Pan African Studies, 5*, 111-128.
- DeMatteo, D., Galloway, M., Arnold, S., & Patel, U. (2015). Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21*, 227-238.

- DeSouza, E.R. & Hutz, C.S. (1996). Reactions to refusals of sexual advances among U.S. and Brazilian men and women. *Sex Roles, 34*, 549-565.
- Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.
- Donovan, R.A. (2011). Tough or tender: (Dis)similarities in White college students' perceptions of Black and White women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*, 458-468. doi: 10.1177/0361684311406874
- Duncan, B.L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of Blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 590-598.
- Fantasia, H. (2011). Really not even a decision any more: Late adolescent narratives of implied sexual consent. *Journal of Forensic Nursing, 7*, 120-129. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-3938.2011.01108.x
- Ferber, A.L. (2007). The construction of Black masculinity: White supremacy now and then. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 31*, 11-24. doi: 10.1177/0193723506296829
- Finley, A. J., & Penningroth, S. L. (2015). Online versus in-lab: Pros and cons of an online prospective memory experiment. In A. M. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research, vol. 113* (pp. 135-162). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Fisher, G. (1967). Normative and reliability data for the standard and the cross-validated Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Psychological Reports, 20*, 174.
- Fishfader, V.L., Howells, G.N., Katz, R.C., & Teresi, P.S. (1996). Evidential and extralegal factors in juror decisions: Presentation mode, retention, and level of emotionality. *Law and Human Behavior, 20*, 565-572.
- Ford, T.E. (1997). Effects of stereotypical television portrayals of African-Americans on person perception. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*, 266-278.
- French, B.H. (2013). More than Jezebels and freaks: Exploring how Black girls navigate sexual coercion and sexual scripts. *Journal of African American Studies, 17*, 35-50. doi: 10.1007/s12111-012-9218-1
- Frith, H. (2009). Sexual scripts, sexual refusals and rape. In Horvath, M.A.H. & Brown, J.M. (Eds.), *Rape: Challenging contemporary thinking* (pp. 99-122). Portland, OR: Willian Publishing.
- Gagnon, J.H. (1990). The explicit and implicit use of the scripting perspective in sex research. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 1*, 1-44.

- Gagnon, J.H. & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Garcia, L.T. (1998). Perceptions of resistance to unwanted sexual advances. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, *10*, 43-52. doi: 10.1300/J056v10n01_03
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- George, W.H. & Martinez, L.J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*, 110-119.
- Ghavami, N. & Peplau, L.A. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnic stereotypes: Testing three hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *37*, 113-127. doi: 10.1177/0361684312464203
- Gidycz, C.A., McNamara, J.R., & Edwards, K.M. (2006). Women's risk perception and sexual victimization: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *11*, 441-456.
- Givens, S.M.B. & Monahan, J.L. (2005). Priming Mammies, Jezebels, and other controlling images: An examination of the influence of mediated stereotypes on perceptions of an African American woman. *Media Psychology*, *7*, 87-106.
- Gross, A.M., Weed, N.C., & Lawson, G.D. (1998). Magnitude scaling of intensity of sexual refusal behaviors in a date rape. *Violence Against Women*, *4*, 329-343.
- Gross, A. M., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. L. (2006). An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women*, *12*, 288-300.
- Gross, E.F. & Hardin, C.D. (2007). Implicit and explicit stereotyping of adolescents. *Social Justice Research*, *20*, doi: 10.1007/s11211-007-0037-9
- Gunby, C., Carline, A., & Beynon, C. (2012). Regretting it after? Focus group perspectives on alcohol consumption, nonconsensual sex and false allegations of rape. *Social & Legal Studies*, *22*, 87-106.
- Gutzmer, K., Ludwig-Barron, N.T., Wyatt, G.E., Hamilton, A.B., & Stockman, J.K. (2016). "Come on baby. You know I love you": African American women's experiences of communication with male partners and disclosure in the context of unwanted sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *45*, 807-819. doi: 10.1007/s10508-015-0688-9
- Hall, D.S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality*, *1*, 1-17.
- Hamilton, D.L. & Sherman, S.J. (1989). Illusory correlations: Implications for stereotype theory and research. In Bar-Tal, D., Graumann, C.F., Kruglanski, A.W., & Stroebe, W. (Eds.),

- Stereotyping and prejudice. Changing conceptions* (pp. 59-82). New York, NY: Springer-Verlang.
- Harris-Perry, M.V. (2011). Myth. In M.V. Harris-Perry (Ed.) *Sister citizen: Shame, stereotypes, and Black women in America* (pp. 51-97). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Heidt, J.M., Marx, B.P., & Forsyth, J.P. (2005). Tonic immobility and childhood sexual abuse: A preliminary report evaluating the sequela of rape-induced paralysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *43*, 1157-1171. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2004.08.005
- Henrick, S. (2013). A hostile environment for student defendants: Title IX and sexual assault on college campuses. *Northern Kentucky Law Review*, *40*, 49-91.
- Hickman, S.E. & Muehlenhard, C.L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom:" How young men and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *36*, 258-272.
- Hughes, R. (1998). Considering the vignette technique and its application to a study of drug injecting and HIV risk and safer behaviour. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *20*, 381-400.
- Jewell, J.A. & Brown, C.S. (2013). Sexting, catcalls, and butt slaps: How gender stereotypes and perceived group norms predict sexualized behavior. *Sex Roles*, *69*, 594-504. doi: 10.1007/s11199-013-0320-1
- Jozkowski, K.N., Peterson, Z.D., Sanders, S.A., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Gender differences in heterosexual college students' conceptualizations and indicators of sexual consent: Implications for contemporary sexual assault prevention education. *Journal of Sex Research*, *51*, 904-916. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.792326
- Jozkowski, K.N., Manning, J., & Hunt, M. (2018). Sexual consent in and out of the bedroom: Disjunctive views of heterosexual college students. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *41*, 117-139. doi: 10.1080/07491409.2018.1470121
- Jozkowski, K.N., Marcantonio, T.L., Rhoads, K.E., Canan, S., Hunt, M.E., & Willis, M. (2019). A content analysis of sexual consent and refusal communication in mainstream films. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *56*, 754-765.
- Judd, C.M. & Park, B. (1993). Definition and assessment of accuracy in social stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 109-128.
- Kanahara, S. (2006). A review of the definitions of stereotype and a proposal for a progressional model. *Individual Differences Research*, *4*, 306-321.
- Katz, J. & McKinney, M. (2018). White female undergraduates' perceptions of Black pregnant adolescents: Does control over pregnancy matter? *Stigma and Health*, *3*, 69-76. doi: 10.1037/sah0000074

- Katz, J., Merrilees, C., Hoxmeier, J.C., & Motisi, M. (2017). White female bystanders' responses to a Black woman at risk for incapacitated sexual assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 41*, 273-285. doi: 0.1177/0361684316689367
- Kitzinger, C. & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 293-316.
- Koss, M.P. & Gidycz, C.A. (1985). The sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 442-443.
- 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. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457.
- Krebs, C.P., Barrick, K., Lindquist, C.H., Crosby, C.M., Boyd, C., & Bogan, Y. (2011). The sexual assault of undergraduate women at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*, 3640-3666. doi: 10.1177/0886260511403759
- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). *Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study* (Report No. 221153). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice.
- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol- or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health, 57*, 639-649. doi: 10.3200/JACH.57.6.639-649
- Landrine, H. (1985). Race x class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles, 13*, 65-75.
- Lannutti, P.J. & Monahan, J.L. (2004). Resistance, persistence, and drinking: Examining goals of women's refusals of unwanted sexual advances. *Western Journal of Communication, 68*, 151-169. doi: 10.1080/10570310409374794
- LaPlante, M.N., McCormick, N., & Brannigan, G.G. (1980). Living the sexual script: College students' views of influence in sexual encounters. *The Journal of Sex Research, 16*, 338-355.
- Lofgreen, A.M., Mattson, R.E., Wagner, S.A., Ortiz, E.G., & Johnson, M.D. (2021). Situational and dispositional determinants of college men's perception of women's sexual desire and consent to sex: A factorial vignette analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*, NP1064–1097NP. doi: 10.1177/0886260517738777

- Marcantonio, T.L. & Jozkowski, K.N. (2020). Assessing how gender, relationship status, and item wording influence cues used by college students to decline different sexual behaviors. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *57*, 260-272. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2019.1659218
- Marcantonio, T.L., Jozkowski, K.N., & Lo, W. (2018). Beyond “just saying no”: A preliminary evaluation of strategies college students use to refuse sexual activity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *47*, 341-351. doi: 10.1007/s10508-017-1130-2
- Marcantonio, T.L., Valdez, D., & Jozkowski, K.N. (2021). An assessment of the cues college students interpret from a sexual partner to determine they are refusing. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi: 10.1177/0886260521997930
- Marx, B.P. & Gross, A.M. (1995). Date rape: An analysis of two contextual variables. *Behavior Modification*, *19*, 451-463.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Academic Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, A.K. (2019). “Should have known better than to fraternize with a Black man”: Structural racism intersects rape culture to intensify attributions of acquaintance rape victim culpability. *Sex Roles*, *81*, 428–438. doi: 10.1007/s11199-019-1003-3
- Mills, C.S. & Granoff, B.J. (1992). Date and acquaintance rape among a sample of college students. *Journal of the National Association of Social Workers*, *37*, 504-509.
- Mitchell, A. & Herring, K. (1998). The mule of the world and other myths: How stereotypes of Black women contribute to depression. In Mitchell, A. & Herring, K. (Eds.), *What the blues is all about: Black women overcoming stress and depression* (pp. 51-75). New York, NY: Berkley Publishing Group.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Andrews, S.L., & Beal, G.K. (1996). Beyond “just saying no”: Dealing with men’s unwanted sexual advances in heterosexual dating contexts. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, *8*, 141-168. doi: 10.1300/J056v08n01_10
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Humphreys, T.P., Jozkowski, K.N., & Peterson, Z.D. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *53*, 457-487. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2016.1146651

- Muehlenhard, C.L. & Linton, M.A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 186-196.
- Muehlenhard, C.L. & Rodgers, C.S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspectives on an old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 443-463.
- Newcomb, M.E., Ryan, D.T., Garofalo, R., & Mustanski, B. (2015). Race-based sexual stereotypes and their effects on sexual risk behavior in racially diverse young men who have sex with men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*, 1959-1968. doi: 10.1007/s10508-015-0495-3
- Niemann, Y.F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R.M., Baxter, J.C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4*, 379-390.
- Niemann, Y.F., O'Connor, E., & McClorie, R. (1998). Intergroup stereotypes of working class Blacks and Whites: Implications for Stereotype Threat. *The Western Journal of Black Studies, 22*, 103-108.
- Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The go/no-go association task. *Social Cognition, 19*, 625–666. doi: 10.1521/soco.19.6.625.20886
- O'Byrne, R., Rapley, M., & Hansen, S. (2006). 'You couldn't say "no", could you?': Young men's understandings of sexual refusal. *Feminism & Psychology, 16*, 133-154. doi: 10.1177/0959-353506062970
- Osman, S.L. & Davis, C.M. (1994). Belief in token resistance and type of resistance as predictors of men's perceptions of date rape. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 24*, 189-196.
- Osman, S.L. (2003). Predicting men's rape perceptions based on the belief that "no" really means "yes". *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 683-692.
- Parkinson, B. & Manstead, A.S.R. (1993). Making sense of emotion in stories and social life. *Cognition & Emotion, 7*, 295-323. doi: 10.1080/02699939308409191
- Pass, M., Benoit, E., & Dunlap, E. (2014). 'I just be myself': Contradicting hyper masculine and hyper sexual stereotypes among low-income Black men in New York City. In Slatton, B.C. & Spates, K. (Eds.) *Hyper Sexual, Hyper Masculine?: Gender, Race, and Sexuality in the Identities of Contemporary Black Men*. New York, NY: Routledge Publishing.
- Pauker, K., Carpinella, C., Meyes, C., Young, D.M., & Sanchez, D.T. (2018). The role of diversity exposure in Whites' reduction in race essentialism over time. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 9*, 944-952. doi: 10.1177/1948550617731496

- Peffley, M., Hurtwitz, J., & Sniderman, P.M. (1997). Racial stereotypes and Whites' political views of Blacks in the context of welfare and crime. *American Journal of Political Science, 41*, 30-60.
- Pitagora, D. (2013). Consent vs. coercion: BDSM interactions highlight a fine but immutable line. *The New School Psychology Bulletin, 10*, 27-36.
- Planty, M., Langton, L., Krebs, C., Berzofsky, M., and Smiley-McDonald, H. (2013). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010*. (NCJ #240655.) Available: <http://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fvsv9410.pdf> [April 2013].
- Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano, R., & McGrath, C. (2007). Sexual aggression among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S.: Alcohol use, physical assault, and psychological aggression as its correlates. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 33*, 31-43. doi: 10.1080/00952990601082639
- Riek, B.M., Mania, E.W., & Gaertner, S.L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 336-353.
- Righi, M.K., Bogen, K.W., DPhil, C.K., & Orchowski, L.M. (2021). A qualitative analysis of beliefs about sexual consent among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*, NP8290–NP8316. doi: 10.1177/0886260519842855
- Rose, S. & Frieze, I.H. (1989). Young singles' scripts for a first date. *Gender and Society, 3*, 258-268.
- Rosenthal, L. & Lobel, M. (2016). Stereotypes of Black American women related to sexuality and motherhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 414-427. doi: 10.1177/0361684315627459
- Sabina, C., Verdiglione, N., & Zadnik, E. (2017). Campus responses to dating violence and sexual assault: Information from university representatives. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 26*, 88-102, doi: 10.1080/10926771.2016.1225143
- Sagar, H.A. & Schofield, J.W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in Black and White children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 590-598.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd edition). SAGE Publications: Los Angeles, CA.
- Sanchez, D.T., Fetterolf, J.C., & Rudman, L.A. (2012). Eroticizing inequality in the United States: The consequences and determinants of traditional gender role adherence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 49*, 168-183. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2011.653699

- Sanchez, D.T., Phelan, J.E., Moss-Racusin, C.A., & Good, J.J. (2012). The gender role motivation model of women's sexually submissive behavior and satisfaction in heterosexual couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 528-539. doi: 10.1177/0146167211430088
- Schaller, M. (1991). Social categorization and the formation of group stereotypes: Further evidence for biased information processing in the perception of group-behavior correlations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 25-35.
- Shotland, R.L. & Goodstein, L. (1992). Sexual precedence reduces the perceived legitimacy of sexual refusal: An examination of attributions concerning date rape and consensual sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 756-764.
- Skitka, L.J. & Sargis, E.G. (2006). The internet as psychological laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 529-555. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190048
- Siegel, K. & Meunier, E. (2019). Traditional sex and gender stereotypes in the relationships of non-disclosing behaviorally bisexual men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48, 333-345. doi: 10.1007/s10508-018-1226-3
- Silver, K.E., Anderson, R.E., & Brouwer, A.M. (2022). Emotional responses to a sexual assault threat: A qualitative analysis among women with histories of sexual victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37, 9-32. doi: 10.1177/0886260520908019
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1969). Psychosexual development. *Society*, 6(5), 9-17. doi:10.1007/BF02806366
- Sinozich, S., & Langton, L. (2014, December). *Victimization among college-age females, 1995-2013* (NCJ 24847). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Sleed, M., Durrheim, K., Kriel, A., Solomon, V., & Baxter, V. (2002). The effectiveness of the vignette methodology: A comparison of written and audio vignettes in eliciting responses about date rape. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32, 21-28. doi: 10.1177/008124630203200304
- Smith, B., Tomasone, J.R., Latimer-Cheung, A.E., & Martin-Ginis, K.A. (2015). Narrative as a knowledge translation tool for facilitating impact: Translating physical activity knowledge to disabled people and health professionals. *Health Psychology*, 34(4), 303-313. PubMed ID: 25133831 doi:10.1037/hea0000113
- Steinfeld, N. (2019). To be there when it happened: Immersive journalism, empathy, and opinion on sexual harassment. *Journalism Practice*, Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1080/17512786.2019.1704842

- Szedlak, C., Smith, M.J., Callary, B., & Day, M.C. (2019). Using written, audio, and video vignettes to translate knowledge to elite strength and conditioning coaches. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 6, 199-210. doi: 10.1123/iscj.2018-0027
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- TeBockhorst, S.F., O'Halloran, M.S., & Nylene, B.N. (2015). Tonic immobility among survivors of sexual assault. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 7, 171-178. doi: 10.1037/a0037953
- Thomas, A., Hacker, J., & Hoxha, D. (2011). Gendered racial identity of Black young women. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 64, 530-542. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9939-y
- Tyree, T. (2011). African American stereotypes in reality television. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 22, 394-413.
- Ugwuegbu, D.C. (1979). Racial and evidential factors in juror attribution of legal responsibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15, 133-146.
- Van Wie, V.E. & Gross, A.M. (2001). The role of woman's explanations for refusal on men's ability to discriminate unwanted sexual behavior in a date rape scenario. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16, 331-344.
- Van Wie, V.E., Gross, A.M., & Marx, B.P. (1995). Females' perceptions of date rape: An examination of two contextual variables. *Violence Against Women*, 1, 351-365.
- Watson, L.B., Robinson, D., Dispenza, F., & Nazari, N. (2012). African American women's sexual objectification experiences: A qualitative study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36, 458-475. doi: 10.1177/0361684312454724
- Weist, M.D., Kinney, L., Taylor, L.K., Pollitt-Hill, J., Bryant, Y., Anthony, L., & Wilkerson, J. (2014). African American and White women's experience of sexual assault and services for sexual assault. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, 23, 901-916. doi: 10.1080/10926771.2014.953715
- West, C.M. (1995). Mammy, Sapphire, and Jezebel: Historical images of Black women and their implications for psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Theory Research & Practice*, 32, 458-466.
- West, C.M. (2017). Mammy, Sapphire, Jezebel, and the bad girls of reality television: Media representations of Black women. In J. Chrisler and C. Golden (Eds.), *Lectures on the psychology of women*, 5th ed. (pp. 139-158). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

- What consent looks like. (2019, August 28). Retrieved from <https://www.rainn.org/articles/what-is-consent>
- Wiederman, M.W. (2005). The gendered nature of sexual scripts. *The Family Journal-Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 13, 496-502. doi: 10.1177/1066480705278729
- Wilson, J.P., Hugenberg, K., & Rule, N.O. (2017). Racial bias in judgments of physical size and formidability: From size to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113, 59-80. doi: 10.1037/pspi0000092
- Winslett, A.H. & Gross, A.M. (2008). Sexual boundaries: An examination of the importance of talking before touching. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 542-562. doi: 10.1177/1077801208315527
- Wolfgang, M.E. & Riedel, M.(1975). Rape, race, and the death penalty in Georgia. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 45, 658-668.
- Woodard, J.B. & Mastin, T. (2005). Black womanhood: “Essence” and its treatment of stereotypical images of Black women. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36, 264-281.
- Wright, M.O., Norton, D.L., & Matusek, J.A. (2010). Predicting verbal coercion following sexual refusal during a hookup: Diverging gender patterns. *Sex Roles*, 62, 647-660. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9763-9
- Wyatt, G.E. (1992). The sociocultural context of African American and White American women’s rape. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 77-91.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A.
Vignette Transcript and Line Segment

Directions: Your task is to read the following vignette and signal, by pressing the STOP button located on the bottom of each webpage, if and when the man should refrain from making further sexual advances. If you decide to press the STOP button, you will be able to continue to read through the entire interaction from start to finish if you want.

Brett/Jamal and Lauren/LaToya enter into Brett's/Jamal's apartment after going to dinner and a movie.

Line 1	M: Please excuse my apartment. It's a real mess right now.
Line 2	W: Oh, that's all right. I don't mind.
Line 3	M: Would you like to sit down on the couch?
Line 4	W: Sure.
Line 5	M: I'm going to put on some music if that's all right.
Line 6	W: That's fine with me.
Line 7	M: I don't know about you, but I really enjoyed that movie. Jack Nicholson is one of my favorite actors.
Line 8	W: Yeah, I thought it was good too, but it was a little too long.
Line 9	M: That's true, but for me the best part of the movie was being with you.
Line 10	W: You're so sweet, I like being with you, too (They briefly kiss). Did anybody ever tell you that you're a great kisser?
Line 11	M: Millions of people (they both laugh). You're sitting too far away from me, mind if I move a little closer? (Brett/Jamal moves over to Lauren's/LaToya's side of the couch.) Now, that's much better, this makes it a little easier to kiss you. (The couple kisses more passionately).
Line 12	W: I'm glad you like it (kiss briefly), need some help there? (laughs)
Line 13	M: (laughs) I seem to be having some trouble with these buttons on your shirt.
Line 14	W: There, how's that?
Line 15	M: Much better, you have such a beautiful body.
Line 16	W: It feels good when you touch me like this.
Line 17	M: It feels good to me, too. You have incredible breasts (they kiss passionately again).
Line 18	W: Brett/Jamal, before we go any further, I think you should know that I want to wait until I'm married before I sleep with someone. My religion is really important to me and saving myself for my husband is a part of that.
Line 19	M: Well, if it's more time you want, then it's more time you'll get.
Line 20	W: Oh Brett/Jamal, I knew you'd understand. Come here. (couple resumes kissing)
Line 21	M: I love you, Lauren/LaToya.
Line 22	W: No, Brett/Jamal! Get your hands out of my pants!

Line 23	M: Lauren/LaToya, if you don't let me do this, I don't know what I'll do. I think I might have to stop seeing you. I know you don't want that to happen, so why don't we just sleep together.
Line 24	W: I don't want that to happen, but...
Line 25	M: Then why don't we just remove these jeans since that will make things a lot easier.
Line 26	W: Please don't do this, Brett/Jamal! I don't think you understand, I don't want sex right now!
Line 27	M: Well you act as if you want it! But if you feel that strongly about it, then stay away from me. You know Lauren/LaToya, you're nothing but a big tease!
Line 28	W: Wait Brett/Jamal. Don't be upset with me. I know you don't want to wait but I do really care about you. I just think we should slow down. Hold me and kiss me like this. (The couple kiss again).
Line 29	M: You know you want it, Lauren/LaToya.
Line 30	W: *yells* NO, Brett/Jamal! Get away from me!
Line 31	M: Don't push it Lauren/LaToya! If you don't sleep with me right now, I'll have to hurt you! And I know you don't want that to happen!
Line 32	W: Just stay away from me! Don't you dare touch me, Brett/Jamal!
Line 33	M: One way or the other you are going to give it to me! (The couple begins to engage in a physical altercation)
Line 34	W: Brett/Jamal, STOP!
Line 35	M: These pants are coming off right now and you are going to have sex with me. Don't fight it Lauren/LaToya. I know you want it!
Line 36	W: *yells* Brett/Jamal, get off of me! (They continue to engage in physical altercation and Brett/Jamal forces sexual intercourse)
Line 37	M: Yeah, that's more like it. (Brett/Jamal grunts)
Line 38	W: Brett/Jamal, how could you? I can't believe you did that. You raped me! You raped me and I never want to see you again.
Line 39	M: I didn't rape you. You wanted it and you know it!
Line 40	M: You just changed your mind, but I didn't rape you.

Appendix B.

SES - Victimization (Koss & Oros, 1982)

<p>The following are questions about experiences you may or may not have had in your lifetime. Please read the questions carefully and answer to the best of your ability.</p>		
<p>Have you had sexual intercourse with another person when you both wanted to?*</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you had a situation where a person misinterpreted the level of sexual intimacy you desired?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you been in a situation where another person became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop them even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you had sexual intercourse with a person even though you did not really want to because they threatened to end your relationship otherwise?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you had sexual intercourse with another person when you did not want to because you felt pressured by their continual arguments?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you found out that a person obtained sexual intercourse with you by saying things they did not really mean?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you been in a situation where another person 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 did not want to?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you been in a situation where another person tried to get sexual intercourse with you when you did not 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?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you been in a situation where another person used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse with them when you did not want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?</p>	Yes	No
<p>Have you had sexual intercourse with another person when you did not want to because they threatened to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate?</p>	Yes	No

Have you had sexual intercourse with a person when you didn't want to because they used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?	Yes	No
Have you been in a situation where another person obtained sexual acts with you such as anal or oral intercourse when you did not want to by using threats or physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?	Yes	No
Have you ever been raped?	Yes	No

*Indicates an item not included in the final sum score

Appendix C.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is *true* or *false* as it pertains to you personally.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.	T	F
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.	T	F
*3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	T	F
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.	T	F
*5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.	T	F
*6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	T	F
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.	T	F
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.	T	F
*9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.	T	F
*10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.	T	F
*11. I like to gossip at times.	T	F
*12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	T	F
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	T	F
*14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.	T	F
*15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	T	F
16. I'm always willing to admit when I make a mistake	T	F
17. I always try to practice what I preach.	T	F
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.	T	F
*19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	T	F
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.	T	F
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	T	F
*22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.	T	F
*23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.	T	F
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.	T	F
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.	T	F
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	T	F
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.	T	F
*28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	T	F

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.	T	F
*30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	T	F
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.	T	F
*32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune that only got what they deserved.	T	F
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	T	F

Note: Items marked with an asterisk are keyed negatively.

Appendix D.
Modern Racism Scale

Please rate each statement on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

1. Discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in the United States.
2. It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America.**
3. Blacks have more influence upon school desegregation plans than they ought to have.
4. Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.
5. Blacks should not push themselves where they are not wanted.
6. Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve.
7. Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to blacks than they deserve.

**reverse scored item

VITA

Lavina Y. Ho, M.A.

EDUCATION

- Ph.D. University of Mississippi** ant. August 2022
Clinical Psychology
Dissertation: *Perceptions of Sexual Refusals: Not so Black and White*
Advisor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.
Internship: Sepulveda Ambulatory Care Center Veteran Affairs 2021 - 2022
- M.A. University of Mississippi** August 2019
Clinical Psychology
Thesis: *Gender Roles, Sexual Assertiveness, and Sexual Coercion in LGBTQ Individuals*
Advisor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.
- M.A. Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg** May 2014
Applied Clinical Psychology
Thesis: *A Cross-Cultural Literature Review of Suicide in Schizophrenia*
Advisor: Thomas Bowers, Ph.D.
GPA: 3.9
- B.A. University of California, Irvine** June 2012
Major in Psychology; Major in Anthropology
GPA: 3.797, Cum Laude

CERTIFICATIONS

- Examination for the Professional Practice of Psychology 2017
Passed at the Doctoral Level

HONORS & AWARDS

- APA Conference Division 52 Student Poster Award 2014
Penn State Harrisburg Outstanding Graduate Student 2014
Penn State Los Angeles Alumni Endowed Scholarship 2013
Penn State Bunton Waller Fellowship 2012-2014

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

- VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System** 2021-2022
Sepulveda Ambulatory Care Center, North Hills, CA
APA Accredited Pre-Doctoral Internship, Psychology Intern
Training Director: Alexis Kulick, Ph.D.

Major Rotations: Primary Care Mental Health Integration, Behavioral Medicine, Addictive Behaviors Clinic

Minor Rotations: Trauma Recovery Services, Neuropsychology, Couples Clinic

Primary Care Mental Health Integration (PCMHI)

Aug 2021-Dec 2021

Supervisors: Kaddy Revolorio, Psy.D., Austin Grinberg, Ph.D., & Sarah Duman Serrano, Ph.D., BCB

- Completed intake assessment with patients initiating mental health care and reviewed medical records
- Provided treatment recommendations and referrals to appropriate clinics within the VA system and care in the community
- Provided brief evidence-based interventions including Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Motivational Interviewing (MI), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), Mindfulness, and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Insomnia (CBT-I)
- Co-led ACT for Chronic Pain group in the Women's Health Clinic for female veterans
- Co-led MOVE! Group and Introduction to Relaxation and Meditation groups
- Worked within an interprofessional primary care team and consulted with other primary care practitioners

Health Psychology: Behavioral Medicine

Dec 2021 - ant. March 2022

Supervisors: Sarah Duman Serrano, Ph.D., BCB, J. Greg Serpa, Ph.D., Kaddy Revolorio, Psy.D., & Austin Grinberg, Ph.D.

- Completed bariatric surgery evaluations, provided consultation to interdisciplinary team, provided feedback, and provided time-limited psychotherapy if clinically indicated
- Provided biofeedback-based individual psychotherapy for veterans
- Co-led CBT/ACT based Coping with Chronic pain group and Coping with Medical Illness group
- Co-facilitated Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction through Center for Integrative Medicine and Healing for individuals with a variety of presenting issues
- Provided individual psychotherapy for individuals with comorbid physical and mental health issues including ACT for Chronic Pain, CBT for Chronic Pain

Addictive Behaviors Clinic (ABC)

ant. March 2022 - July 2022

Supervisors: Melissa Lewis, Ph.D.

- Administered and interpreted self-report measures
- Co-led Matrix Model IOP group (based on CBT, MI, 12-step)
- Co-led Aftercare group (based on Matrix Model), Emotions Management group (based on DBT), and Mindfulness-Based Relapse Prevention Group
- Provided individual psychotherapy with Veterans with substance use disorders as well as comorbidities in an Intensive Outpatient Program (IOP)
- Worked within an interdisciplinary team to provide comprehensive care to Veterans

Trauma Clinic

2021-2022

Supervisors: Alex Barrad, Psy.D., Rosy Benedicto, Ph.D., & Shana Spangler, Psy.D.

- Completed CAPS-5 intake and administer measures including PHQ-9 and PCL-5

- Provided individual evidence-based interventions for trauma and related challenges including Prolonged Exposure (PE), Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT), and Motivational Interviewing (MI)
- Participated in weekly didactics and group supervision

Neuropsychology Clinic

2021-2022

Supervisor: Alexis Kulick, Ph.D., ABPP

- Administered cognitive and neuropsychological assessments
- Conducted clinical interviews and review medical records
- Determined assessment batteries based on specific consultation questions and related factors
- Scored assessments and interpret results with considerations for cultural issues
- Completed integrative written reports and conducted sessions providing feedback and recommendations
- Referral questions include distinguishing between major and minor neurocognitive disorders, understanding Veterans' strengths and weaknesses, and level of cognitive impairment
- Provided and sought consultation in an interdisciplinary setting with other health care providers

Couples Clinic

2021-2022

Supervisor: Falguni Chauhan, Ph.D.

- Conducted initial intake sessions for Veterans and their partners
- Administered couples-oriented measures such as the Weekly Questionnaire
- Provided Integrative Behavioral Couples Therapy (IBCT) to Veterans and their partners
- Participated in weekly didactics and group supervision

University of Mississippi Law School

2020-2021

Wellness Counselor

Supervisor: Todd Smitherman, Ph.D.

- Conducted semi-structured intake interviews and administered/interpreted measures
- Provided individual evidence-based psychotherapy treatments including CBT, ACT, MI, and DBT
- Facilitated mindfulness group for anxiety and stress
- Conducted outreach with law school organizations and provided psychoeducation

Communicare

2017- 2018

Provisionally Licensed Mental Health Therapist

Supervisor: Scott A. Gustafson, Ph.D., ABPP

- Conducted intake interviews and administered/interpreted measures
- Provided individual evidence-based psychotherapy treatments including CBT, ACT, MI, and DBT
- Adapted evidenced-based treatments for rural, low SES, and Black community patients
- Provided and sought consultation in an interdisciplinary setting with other health care providers

- Worked with community-based such as Department of Human Services (DHS), Medicare Transportation, and local faith-based organizations to facilitate treatment

University of Mississippi Counseling Center

2016- 2017

Graduate Student Therapist

Supervisor: Quinton Bud Edwards, Ph.D.

- Conducted semi-structured intake interviews (MINI) and administered/interpreted measures
- Provided individual evidence-based psychotherapy treatments including CBT, ACT, MI, and DBT
- Co-led Sexual Assault Support group for female college students, with CPT integration
- Co-led Women of Color group for female college students of color
- Conducted outreach with campus organizations to raise awareness of sexual assault

University of Mississippi Psychological Assessment Center

2016- 2017

Graduate Assessment Team Member

Supervisor: Scott Gustafson, Ph.D., ABPP

- Determined assessment batteries based on specific consultation questions and related factors
- Conducted semi-structured intake interviews (MINI, SCID-II) and administered/interpreted measures
- Scored assessments and interpreted results with considerations for cultural issues
- Administered assessments including WAIS-IV, WIAT-IV, WJ-IV, Connors Continuous Performance Task, Millon Behavioral Medicine Diagnostic (MBMD)
- Completed integrative written reports and conducted sessions providing feedback and recommendations
- Referral questions included determining ADHD, learning disabilities, psychodiagnostic clarification, fitness of duty evaluations for police officers, bariatric evaluations

University of Mississippi Psychological Services Center

2016-2021

Graduate Therapist

Supervisors: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D., Todd Smitherman, Ph.D., Scott Gustafson, Ph.D., ABPP, Kelly Wilson, Ph.D., Sarah Bilsky, Ph.D., Laura Dixon, Ph.D.

- Conducted semi-structured intake interviews (MINI, SCID-II) and administered/interpreted measures
- Provided individual evidence-based psychotherapy treatments in an outpatient setting including CBT, ACT, MI, and DBT
- Adapted evidenced-based treatments for rural, low SES, and Black community patients
- Co-led LGBTQIA+ support group for University of Mississippi undergraduate students

Holy Spirit Hospital (A Geisinger Affiliate)

2014

Behavioral Health Therapeutic Intern

Supervisors: Thomas Bowers, Ph.D. & Gina Brelsford, Ph.D.

- Provided individual psychotherapy for individuals within an inpatient setting
- Co-led groups on emotion regulation, risk reduction, safety planning, and distress tolerance

- Worked within an interprofessional healthcare team and consulted with other health providers such as psychiatric nurses, psychiatrists, occupational therapists, and social workers

TrueNorth Wellness Services

2013-2014

School Psychology Intern

Supervisors: Thomas Bowers, Ph.D. & Gina Brelsford, Ph.D.

- Administered Applied Behavioral Analysis interventions and assessments
- Co-led evidenced-based groups for school-aged children with various mental health issues
- Provided individual evidence-based psychotherapy for children targeting social skills, emotion regulation, and mindfulness

PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS

Journal Articles

1. **Ho, L.Y.**, Ehman, A.C., & Gross, A.M. (2021). Gender roles, sexual assertiveness, and sexual coercion in same-sex individuals. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25(4), 1469-1489. doi: 10.1007/s12119-021-09819-8
2. Sabina, C., Cuevas, C.A., & **Ho, L.Y.** (2021). Multiple dimensions of acculturation and the victimization of Latino adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 27(2), 280–295. doi: 10.1037/cdp0000338
3. Patihis, L., **Ho, L.Y.**, Loftus, E.F., & Herrera, M.E. (2021). Memory experts' beliefs about repressed memory. *Memory*, 29(6), 823-828. doi: 10.1080/09658211.2018.1532521
4. Gross, A.M. & **Ho, L.Y.** (2016). Understanding college sexual assault survivors beyond victimhood [Review of the book *Campus sexual assault: College women respond*, by L.J. Germain]. *PsycCRITIQUES*, 61(35). doi: 10.1037/a0040503
5. Harrison, M.A., Murphy, E.A., **Ho, L.Y.**, Zambrana, A.L., & Bowers, T.G. (2015). Female serial killers in the United States: Means, motives, and makings. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 26, 383-406. doi: 10.1080/14789949.2015.1007516
6. Patihis, L., Lilienfeld, S.O., **Ho, L.Y.**, & Loftus, E.L. (2014). Unconscious repressed memory is scientifically questionable. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1967–1968. doi: 10.1177/0956797614547365
7. Sabina, C., & **Ho, L.Y.** (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence: Disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15, 201-226. doi: 10.1177/1524838014521322
8. Patihis, L., **Ho, L.Y.**, Tingen, I.W., Lilienfeld, S.O., & Loftus, E.L. (2014). Are the "Memory Wars" over? A scientist-practitioner gap in beliefs about repressed memory. *Psychological Science*, 25, 519-530. doi: 10.1177/0956797613510718
9. **Ho, L.Y.** (2013). "Ma vie en graduate school": Advice for future students and for student futures. *The General Psychologist*, 48, 25.

PUBLICATIONS UNDER REVIEW

Journal Articles

1. Weber, M. C., Pavlacic, J. M., Torres, V. A., **Ho, L. Y.**, Buchanan, E., & Schulenberg, S. E. (under review). Collective efficacy and threat perception predict COVID-19 pandemic preparedness and response behaviors among marginalized university students and their partners. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*.

BOOK CHAPTERS

Ho, L.Y., Ehman, A.C., & Gross, A.M. (*In press*). Sexual want and consent. In A. Lykins (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sexuality and Gender*.

Ehman, A.C., **Ho, L.Y.**, & Gross, A.M. (*In press*). Sexual cyberbullying. In A. Lykins (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sexuality and Gender*.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

Oral Presentations

1. **Ho, L.Y.**, & Gross, A.M. (2019). *Gender roles, sexual assertiveness, and sexual coercion in same-sex individuals*. Data blitz presentation at the 6th Annual Psychology Department Research Day at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS.
2. **Ho, L.Y.**, & Gross, A.M. (2018). *Gender roles, sexual assertiveness, and sexual coercion in same-sex individuals*. Talk presentation at the Southeastern Psychological Association (SEPA) Annual Meeting, Charleston, SC.
3. **Ho, L.Y.**, Weber, M., Gawlik, E. & Schulenberg, S.E. (2018). *Student preparedness and perceptions of violence in higher education*. Interest group presentation conducted at the Southeastern Psychological Association (SEPA) Annual Meeting, Charleston, SC.
4. **Ho, L.Y.**, Martinez, S., Debski, S., Patihis, L., Loftus, E.F. (2012). *Memory beliefs of the public, clinical psychologists, and criminal justice system professionals*. Oral presentation at University of California, Irvine Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) Symposium. Irvine, CA.

Poster Presentations

1. **Ho, L.Y.** & Kang, M. (2021). *A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Sexual Assault Interventions on Knowledge/Identification of Sexual Consent*. Poster presentation at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT) Conference, New Orleans, LA.
2. **Ho, L.Y.** & Gross, A.M. (2019). *Gender roles, sexual assertiveness, and sexual coercion in same-sex individuals*. Poster presentation at the Louisiana and Mississippi Association for Contextual Behavioral Science (LaMiss ACBS) Conference, Oxford, MS.
3. **Ho, L.Y.**, Johnson, J.R., Assenga, S., Courson, C.S., Schulenberg, S.E., & Karim, Z.N. (2016).

Measuring perceived meaning in life among Tanzanian youth and emerging adults. Poster presentation at the Association of Psychological Science (APS) Conference, Chicago, IL.

4. **Ho, L.Y.,** & Bowers, T. (2014). *A cross-cultural literature review of suicide in schizophrenia.* Poster presentation at the American Psychological Association (APA) Conference, Washington, D.C.
5. **Ho, L.Y.,** & Harrison, M. (2014). Perceptions, punishments, and prevention of sexual assault. Poster presentation at the Association of Psychological Science (APS) Conference, San Francisco, CA.
6. Murphy, E.A., **Ho, L.Y.,** Harrison, M.A., & Hughes, S.M. (2014). *Female Serial Killers in the U.S.: Motives, means, and meanings.* Poster presentation at the Association of Psychological Science (APS) Conference, San Francisco, CA.
7. **Ho, L.Y.,** Martinez, S., Debski, S., Patihis, L., Loftus, E.F. (2012). *Memory beliefs of the public, clinical psychologists, and criminal justice system professionals.* Poster presentation at the Western Psychological Association (WPA) Conference, San Francisco, CA.

GRANTS & FUNDING

UM Division of Diversity and Community Engagement	<i>Awarded</i>
Diversity Incentive Fund advancing diversity, equity, & inclusion Award Amount: \$500, submitted September 2020	
APF Drs. Rosalee G. & Raymond A. Weiss Research Grant	<i>Not Awarded</i>
Award Amount: \$1000, submitted September 2020	
APF Dr. Christine Blasey-Ford Grant	<i>Not Awarded</i>
Award Amount: \$1500, submitted February 2020	

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE & SERVICE

Subcommittee Member	2021-2022
Greater Los Angeles VA: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Training Committee Greater Los Angeles VA: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Staff Development Committee	
Diversity Committee Member	2019-2021
University of Mississippi Psychology Department <i>Founded the Peer Mentorship Program 2020-2021</i>	
Vice President	2016-2018
Autism Speaks U, University of Mississippi	
Vice President	2013-2014
Psi Chi, Penn State Harrisburg	
President	2013-2014

OUTREACH EXPERIENCE

LAMBDA: LGBTQ+ Support Group <i>Co-Leading Graduate Student Therapist</i> Supervisor: Laura Johnson, Ph.D.	2018-2021
The Trevor Project: Trevor Chat Counselor <i>Online Volunteer</i>	2016-2017
International Ladies Club <i>Graduate Student Therapist</i> Supervisor: Laura Johnson, Ph.D.	2015- 2016

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Graduate Research Assistant, University of Mississippi Advisor: Alan M. Gross, Ph.D.	2015-2021
Graduate Research Assistant, University of Mississippi Clinical Disaster Research Center Advisor: Stefan E. Schulenberg, Ph.D.	2015-2017
Graduate Research Assistant, Penn State Harrisburg Advisor: Chiara Sabina, Ph.D.	2012-2013
Undergraduate Research Assistant, UC Irvine Advisor: Lawrence Patihis, Ph.D., Elizabeth Loftus, Ph.D.	2010-2012
Undergraduate Research Assistant, UC Irvine Learning and Cognition Laboratory Advisor: Sean Kao, Ph.D., Lindsey Richland, Ph.D., and Michael Martinez, Ph.D.	2011-2012

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<i>Instructor of Record, University of Mississippi</i>	
PSY 201, Introduction to Psychology	Spring 2020
PSY 201, Introduction to Psychology	Fall 2019
PSY 201, Introduction to Psychology	Spring 2019
PSY 201, Introduction to Psychology	Fall 2018
<i>Adjunct Instructor, Penn State Harrisburg</i>	
PSY 238, Introduction to Personality Psychology	Spring 2015
PSY 100, Introduction to Psychology	Spring 2015
PSY 100, Introduction to Psychology	Fall 2014
WMNST 100, Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies	Fall 2014

Adjunct Instructor, Harrisburg Area Community College

PSYC 209, Lifespan Development

Spring 2015

PSYC 101, Introduction to Psychology (2 sections)

Fall 2014

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Graduate Peer Mentorship Program

2020-2021

University of Mississippi Psychology Department

Mental Health Awareness Day

2014

Penn State Harrisburg

Updated July 2022