Graduate Theses and Dissertations

8-2016

Social Media and Perceptions of Sexual Consent: Development and Psychometric Assessment of Two Consent Measures

Kelley Rhoads
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Social Media and Perceptions of Sexual Consent:
Development and Psychometric Assessment of Two Consent Measures

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Community Health Promotion

by

Kelley Rhoads
University of Florida
Bachelor of Science in Health Education, 2010
Florida Atlantic University
Master of Science in Exercise Science and Health Promotion, 2012

August 2016
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

_____
Dr. Kristen N. Jozkowski
Dissertation Director

_____   _____
Dr. Heather D. Blunt   Dr. Jacquelyn D. Mosley
Committee Member   Committee Member

_____
Dr. Wen-Juo Lo
Committee Member

Abstract

Background. Preliminary qualitative research suggests some college students believe sexual consent can be communicated and interpreted in social settings, such as parties or bars, and in contexts lacking face-to-face interaction like text messages and social media content. Previous sexual consent researchers have described perceptions of consent that occur in social settings as "outside the bedroom" consent. The belief that sexual consent can be interpreted from social media content or that accepting an alcoholic beverage from someone at a bar is indicative of sexual consent is problematic and warrants further study. Current validated consent scales are limited and do not assess perceptions or beliefs regarding "outside the bedroom" consent as they primarily focus on consent that occurs in the moments right before sexual behavior occurs.

Purpose. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to develop and psychometrically assess two sexual consent scales that measure consent beliefs and consent perceptions respectively. The Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) and the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) were rigorously developed utilizing a multi-phase research design consisting of a mixed methods approach with three phases of data collection.

Methods. In Phase 1, college students (N=104) pilot-tested both measures, with a subset of students (n=10) recruited to provide qualitative feedback via focus groups. Phase 2 (N=75) comprised additional item refinement for both measures. Phase 3 (N=695) constituted psychometric assessment of the measures via reliability and validity analyses.

Results. Results provide support for the validity and reliability of both newly developed scales. The SMCMS measures endorsement of the belief that consent can be derived based on a person's social media content. The ECSR measures how a person communicated their consent during their most recent consensual sexual experience.

Conclusions. Both the SMCMS and ECSR are valid tools that can be used to assess college students' beliefs and perceptions regarding consent in an effort to create sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) programs that are culturally relevant to students and address common false beliefs regarding consent. Additionally, these measures could be utilized as evaluative mechanisms to assess whether SAPE programs successfully change students' consent beliefs and behaviors.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Kristen N. Jozkowski, my dissertation supervisor, for her guidance and expertise during this process. Without her dedication to my development as a student and researcher, this dissertation would not have been possible. Dr. Jozkowski has provided me with her continual encouragement, support, and mentorship throughout my entire doctoral program. She has been a true inspiration to me, and I aspire to achieve the same level of scholarship and mentorship she has accomplished as I embark on my next journey into professorship.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Heather D. Blunt, Dr. Jacquelyn D. Mosley, and Dr. Wen-Juo Lo, for their invaluable time, feedback, and flexibility as I completed this dissertation. This was a huge undertaking for me that would not have come to fruition without their collective support. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Bart Hammig, my doctoral program advisor and department chair, for the guidance and wisdom he provided me as I progressed through my doctoral studies. Both Dr. Jean Henry and Dr. Ches Jones, professors in the Community Health Promotion program, played integral roles in preparing me academically during my time at the U of A and, for that, I thank them. Lastly, I want to thank my friends and family for their love and encouragement as I could not have accomplished anything without their unwavering confidence and support.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

I. Introduction

Researchers have found that about one-fifth (19%) of undergraduate college women have experienced an attempted or completed sexual assault since beginning college (Krebs, Lingquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). In a nationally representative sample of American adults, over two-thirds (37.4%) of female rape victims indicated they were assaulted between the ages of 18 and 24 (Black et al., 2011). Moreover, college women are at disproportionately higher risk for experiencing sexual assault as compared to women in the general population (e.g., Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2009).

In response to these overwhelming reports of sexual assault on college campuses, President Obama created the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault in January 2014. The Task Force is focused on increasing awareness related to sexual violence on college campuses, and partnering with universities to address the problem (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). The Task Force has thrust sexual violence into the foreground of political and public discourse with the emphasis being placed on sexual consent. The area of sexual consent remains understudied as researchers have called for more research to be conducted in order to assess proper prevention strategies to combat sexual violence on college campuses and among the general population (e.g., Muehlenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, & Peterson, 2016).

Sexual Consent

Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) defined sexual consent as "the freely given verbal or nonverbal communication of a feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity" (p. 259). When asked how students would define sexual consent, most responses mirrored the definition created by Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) by including elements such as a willingness to

engage in sex or an agreement between two people to have sex (Beres, Senn, & McCaw, 2014; Jozkowski, Peterson, Sanders, Dennis, & Reece, 2014). Although students have expressed the need for explicitness during sexual consent communication (Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), research suggests college students often communicate their external sexual consent (i.e., an outward expression of a person's willingness to engage in sexual activity) to potential partners by using nonverbal cues (e.g., flirting, non-sexual touching) (e.g., Burkett & Hamilton, 2012; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004). Some students even reported "no response" or not resisting their partner as a means to communicate sexual consent (e.g., Beres, Herold, & Maitland, 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski, Peterson, et al., 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders, Peterson, Dennis, & Reece, 2014; Jozkowski & Wiersma, 2015; Mcleod, 2015). Researchers have identified additional factors that influence consent communication between college students. Factors such as the actual sexual behavior (e.g., kissing, cunniligus, vaginal-penile intercourse) that occurs between partners (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), relationship type and duration of the partners (Beres et al., 2014; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), and gender (Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014) are reported to influence consent communication.

Sexual Consent as a Process

The definitions college students often provide for sexual consent (e.g., an agreement between partners, a willingness to engage in sexual activity) seem to conceptualize consent as a discrete event with a singular occurrence (Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). However, in discussing how they have previously communicated their consent to sexual partners and how they simultaneously interpret consent cues from their respective partners, students often

describe sexual consent as a fluid, ongoing process that gradually unfolds (Beres, 2010; 2014; Humphreys, 2004; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). More specifically, students communicate their consent, using various types of cues (e.g., words, behaviors), to their partners while simultaneously checking their partners' response for what students perceive to be their partners' consent communication. Beres (2010) described this process of communicating consent and receiving feedback as "active participation" (p. 8). Thus, some students perceive that a series of nuanced cues (e.g., words, behaviors), interpreted altogether, can be indicative of a person's sexual consent.

"Outside the Bedroom" Consent

Previous consent communication research has primarily focused on how people communicate their consent in the moments right before sexual behavior occurs (e.g., Beres, 2010; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014). Researchers have labeled this perceived consent as "inside the bedroom" consent (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Typically, "inside the bedroom" consent occurs in a private setting that constitutes the location where sexual behavior takes place and immediately precedes such behavior.

However, some research suggests college students perceive they can interpret and communicate sexual consent in social environments, such as bars or house parties (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Beres (2010) found that college students reported that context is important when trying to interpret consent from a potential partner and "this context included exhibiting certain behaviors in a bar, the nature of the relationship, and whether or not someone was willing to transition to a private location after the bar" (p. 6). Thus, Jozkowski and Hunt (2016) labeled perceptions of consent in social settings, such as parties and bars, as "outside the bedroom" consent. Themes emerging from qualitative studies with college students indicate

acceptance of an alcohol drink from a potential partner, increased physical contact with a potential partner (e.g., dancing closely, touching), and leaving a bar with a potential partner are commonly interpreted by students as "outside the bedroom" consent (Beres, 2010; Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; O'Bryne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008).

Some students perceive being able to communicate and interpret sexual consent in contexts that are devoid of face-to-face interaction, such as text messages (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016) and social media (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). During an interview with Jozkowski and Hunt (2016), one male college student described communicating consent via text message when he said, "*If I text her 'what's up' and it's two in the morning, she knows what it means . . . it means – 'want to have sex?'*" (p. 17). Another male college student described how sexual consent can be interpreted from social media content when he said:

> *Your* [online] *profile pictures, like, that's the representation of you, so if it's sexually explicit, you could probably figure that that person is kind of, you know, out there. Sexually out there. More willing to do sexual things than most people, so you all* [referring to men] *might think that you got a chance.* (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016, p. 10)

Interestingly, students who participated in Rhoads and Jozkowski's (2016) qualitative studies provided responses suggesting a woman's sexual consent could be interpreted from the content of her social media profile, but similar perceptions were not extended to men's social media profiles. These findings suggest students believe women's social media profiles are up for interpretation regarding sexual consent, more so, compared to men's profiles; thus, perceptions of consent interpretation derived from social media may embody the sexual double standard (i.e., the belief that men are afforded more sexual freedoms compared to women; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996).

It is important to note that Jozkowski and Hunt (2016) do *not* constitute "outside the bedroom" consent as sexual consent, but, rather, that college students perceive cues that take

place in social settings can be interpreted as a person's consent to sexual activity. Furthermore, "outside the bedroom" consent *does not* and *should not* trump any "inside the bedroom" refusals. Findings from previous research regarding "outside the bedroom" consent are problematic in nature and warrant additional exploration.

Sexual Consent Measures

In order to understand sexual consent communication in depth, researchers have developed and validated scales that measure constructs relevant to sexual consent (Humphreys & Brousseau, 2010; Humphreys & Herold, 2007) and how people communicate and interpret sexual consent (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014). Humphreys and colleagues (Humphreys & Brousseau, 2010; Humphreys & Herold, 2007) initially developed the Sexual Consent Scale (SCS) to measure consent attitudes and beliefs and later revised the SCS utilizing the Theory of Planned Behavior as a theoretical framework to create the Sexual Consent Scale – Revised (SCS– R) that incorporates both attitudinal and behavioral measures. Contrary to the SCS–R, most consent scales intend to measure global perceptions of sexual consent (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014). More specifically, Beres and colleagues' (2004) Same-Sex Sexual Consent Scale, Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale, and Jozkowski and Peterson's (2014) Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale (PCSS) ask participants to report how they think they typically communicate sexual consent to a potential partner. Additionally, fewer scales measure how participants, in general, would interpret external sexual consent from a potential partner (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). Though validated sexual consent scales are limited in general, there are even less that measure how a person communicated their consent during an actual sexual experience.

Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) developed dual measures of sexual consent that assess how a person felt internally when consenting to sexual activity and how that person externally communicated their consent to their partner. The Internal Consent Scale (ICS) and External Consent Scale (ECS) are currently the only event-level consent measures that assess consent behaviors during a previous consensual sexual experience. Only a few published articles have examined sexual consent at the event-level (Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Sanders, et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Wiersma, 2015; Mcleod, 2015), and all utilized the ICS and ECS to do so. Both the ICS and ECS instruct participants to reflect on their most recent experience of vaginal-penile intercourse and answer the items in accordance to the internal feelings they felt about consenting to sexual activity (e.g., safe, comfortable, ready) and how they communicated their external consent to their partner during that event.

A shared component of all the consent scales mentioned above, regardless of whether the scale is a global measure or an event-level measure, is that they do not incorporate "outside the bedroom" consent. Similarly to most previous consent research, all of the validated consent scales that measure consent perceptions (e.g., Same-Sex Sexual Consent Scale, Hickman and Muehlenhard's scale, PCSS) or consent behaviors (e.g., SCS–R, ICS, ECS) explicitly focus on "inside the bedroom" consent. Previous research has highlighted the important role context plays in consent communication and interpretation (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016), therefore, consent measures reflecting "outside the bedroom" consent are needed in order to address the contextual factors influencing consent. Given the limited number of validated sexual consent scales and the absence of consent scales that incorporate "outside the bedroom" consent, the purpose of the current study was address the gaps in consent literature by creating two new sexual consent measures.

The Current Study

      Two new sexual consent measures incorporating "outside the bedroom" consent perceptions were developed and validated for use among college students. The Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) measures endorsement of the belief that a person's sexual consent can be interpreted from their social media content. The External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) is a comprehensive event-level consent scale that measures the "inside the bedroom" and "outside the bedroom" cues a person utilized to communicate their consent during their most recent consensual sexual experience. Both scales were developed and rigorously evaluated utilizing a multi-phase research design that incorporated a mixed methods approach. Items for both scales were developed from formative qualitative research (interviews and open-ended survey elicitations) and were assessed across three separate phases of data collection that included both qualitative and quantitative evaluations.

References

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. I., Merrick, M. T., . . . Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Centers for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Burkett, M., & Hamilton, K. (2012). Postfeminist sexual agency: Young women's negotiations of sexual consent. *Sexualities, 15*(7), 815-833.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Lee, H. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Retrieved from http://titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/sites/titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/files/ccs-report.pdf

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/consent1.htm

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

Humphreys, T. P., & Brousseau, M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale – Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 46*, 1-9.

Humphreys, T. P., & Herold, E. (2007). Sexual consent in heterosexual dating relationships: Development of a new measure. *Sex Roles, 57*, 305-315.

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

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.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent? *International Journal of Sexual Health, 27*, 156–174.

Krebs, C. P., Linquist, 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*(6), 639-647.

Mcleod, L. (2015). *Towards a culture of consent: Sexual consent styles and contemporary social interventions* (Unpublished Undergraduate Honors Thesis). James Cook University, Carins, Australia.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Humphreys, T., Jozkowski, J. N., & Peterson, Z. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *Journal of Sex Research, 53*(4-5), 457-487.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Quackenbush, D. M. (1996). *The social meaning of women's condom use: The sexual double standard and women's beliefs about the meaning ascribed to condom use*. Unpublished manuscript.

O'Bryne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). 'If a girl doesn't say "no" . . .': Young men, rape and claims of 'insufficient knowledge.' *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 168-193.

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014). *Not alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*. Washington, DC: The White House.

II. Summary of the Evidence

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief summary of both empirical research and mainstream media articles that are relevant to sexual consent. Each topic included in this chapter directly relates to sexual consent communication and/or interpretation, examines factors that influence sexual consent communication and/or interpretation, or discusses sexual assault prevention strategies that are relevant to consent. This overview of the literature includes the following topics: rape culture on college campuses; sexual assault prevention education on college campuses; hooking up and college students; traditional heterosexual sexual scripts; the sexual double standard; token resistance to sex; rape myths; Greek fraternities and sororities; sexual consent; and sexual consent measures.

Rape Culture on College Campuses

- Articles in this topic area focus on the factors that synergistically create a rape supportive culture on college campuses

- Factors such as traditional sexual scripts, male aggression, power differentials, endorsement of rape myths, gendered residence housing, the Greek system, and excessive alcohol consumption are discussed in the articles below as they all influence sexual consent communication

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11/12), 359-375.

- Purpose: examine the sociocultural model of sexual aggression by synthesizing quantitatively the body of research that links masculine ideology to sexual violence

- Methods:
  - Literature search via PsycInfo, ERIC, and Medline using terms rape, coercion, sexual coercion, sexual aggression combined with attitudes, personality, hostility, masculinity, sex roles, gender roles or beliefs
  - Articles from researchers Abbey, Bart, Byers, Donnerstein, Fischer, Hall, Kanin, Koss, Linz, Lisak, Lottes, Malamuth, Mosher, Muehlenhard, and Quinsey were included
  - Articles needed to include associational statistics (i.e., Pearson correlation, means and standard deviations, t value, F statistic, chi-square, or percentages) between masculine ideology and sexual aggression to be included
  - Measures of masculine ideology: acceptance of interpersonal violence; attitudes toward women; dominance/power over women; hostile masculinity; hostility toward women; hyper-masculinity; masculine instrumental personal traits; rape myth acceptance; sex role conservatism; sex role stereotyping; sexual aggression (sexual experience survey, coercive sexuality scale, likelihood to rape a woman)
- Results:
  - 39 studies included in meta-analysis
  - All measures of masculine ideology (see above) were statistically significantly, except sex role conservatism, associated with sexual aggression
- Discussion:
  - Findings suggest hostile masculine ideology is moderately associated with sexual aggression

- To be sexually aggressive towards women, it makes sense a man would be accepting of violence in relationships, think women deserve to be treated with violence, and think men are responsible for dominating women
- Sociocultural model, including patriarchy ideology, may be useful in understanding sexual aggression
- Some situational models posit men may misinterpret women's friendliness as sexual interest – sexual miscommunication theory
- Some researchers suggest traditional gender role attitudes endorse sexual aggression because it maintains "societal propaganda" that women should be dominated by men
- Feminine gender roles teach women to gatekeep males' "uncontrollable" sexuality, and if they experience victimization, the woman is to blame
- Women placed in double bind and may experience harm by portraying traditional gender role or face rejection if they decide not to act according to society's expectations
- Education may need to focus on teaching "collectivism" (people should not dominate each other) and teach young boys skills that will harbor empathy to reduce male domination and entitlement in the future
- Cultural shift in thinking is required to achieve this

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problem, 53*(4), 483-499.

- Purpose: Demonstrate how individual, organizational, and interactional processes work in combination to create higher rates of sexual assault on college campuses

- Methods:

    o Data were collected at a large Midwestern university via individual and group interviews, ethnographic observation, and publicly available information.

    o Authors and research assistants resided in a known "party dorm" in order to observe night and weekend behaviors of women

    o Conducted surveys and interviews with women who lived on the dorm floor

    o Group interviews with women and men with a shortened version of the survey the dorm women took

    o Gathered publicly available information from student affairs, instructors, student writings, e-mails, and a survey about sexual assault experiences

- Results:

    o Gendered selves, organizational arrangements, and interactional expectations work together to contribute to the party scene and sexual assault on campuses

    o Gendered selves: single and childless; upper middle class standing; belief that you are "supposed" to party in college; women socialized by sharing meals together partying together; partying as a way to meet men; men's sexual interest as source of self-esteem and status; women worked hard to maintain appearances by doing their hair, tanning, exercising, dieting, and buying new clothes (looking "hot", but not "slutty"); women judged other women's appearance, but men were the important audience; men derived status from securing sex, while women derived status from getting attention

- University and Greek processes: clustering homogeneous student together strengthens student peer norms and promotes partying; strict restrictions on alcohol possession and consumption in residence halls pushing students to go to bars, off-campus residences, or fraternities; university lacks full authority over fraternities as the houses are privately owned; fraternities control all components of their parties including making themes that place women in subordinate positions (CEOs and Secretary Hoes); fraternity pledges would transport women to the parties, but there was no guarantee for transportation home; fraternity members would ultimately decide who was admitted into the house for the party; alcohol was used as a tool to lure women into private spaces

- Interactions: partying happens by script (getting ready, pre-gaming, go to party, drink, flirt/sex, go home, tell tales); partiers drink, are happy, are expected to like and trust other partiers; gendered expectations at parties: women wear revealing outfits, women are guest therefore do not control turf, transportation, or alcohol, women should be nice to their male hosts; women are left vulnerable to men exploiting sexual situations (feeding women alcohol, blocking doors, denying transportation); forces women into gatekeeper roles thus relieving men from the responsibility of obtaining authentic consent; party rape is carried out with alcohol, persuasion, not allowing women to leave, and sometimes force

- Resiliency of the party scene: negative consequences of partying are due to women's mistakes (victim blaming); blaming women avoids criticizing the party scene and male behavior; sexual assault prevention strategies that place responsibility on the woman to avoid harm (don't walk alone, watch your drink,

don't drink too much) perpetuates victim-blaming; "if you act like a whore, you'll get treated like a whore" – erotic hierarchy

- Discussion:
  - Results provide framework to identify risks for sexual assault in party situations
  - Change is needed on the institutional level in order to enact cultural change
  - Sexual assault education should shift from teaching prevention strategies to women to teaching men and women about men's coercive behaviors and victim blaming

Macur, J., & Schweber, N. (2012, December 16). Rape case unfolds on web and splits city. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/17/sports/high-school-football-rape-case-unfolds-online-and-divides-steubenville-ohio.html

- Mainstream media example of sexual assault and rape culture's extension into social media
- Pictures and videos popped up on social media suggesting an unconscious girl had been allegedly sexually assaulted over several hours by two Steubenville football players while others watched

Social media served a dual purpose in the Steubenville rape case: (1) informed the victim that an assault had occurred because she couldn't remember the events of the evening because she was unconscious for most of it and (2) became a way for the football players' defensive attorneys to victim blame the girl because she had previously posted provocative comments and pictures on her Twitter to which the attorneys argued they demonstrated that the girl was sexually active and engaged in at risk behaviors

Graham, K., Bernards, S., Osgood, D. W., Abbey, A., Parks, M., Flynn, A., . . . Wells, S. (2014).

"Blurred lines?" Sexual aggression and barroom culture. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 38*(5), 1416-1424.

- Purpose: analyze the extent to which sexual aggression in bars involves: (1) male vs females initiators and targets; (2) intentional harassment or aggression by the initiator (such as rubbing against an unwilling stranger), including invasive contact and unwanted persistence; (3) aggressive and nonaggressive responses by targets of sexual advances; (4) intervention by staff and patron third parties; and (5) intoxication of initiators and targets

- Methods:
  - Observational data were collected as part of an evaluation for a program to prevent bar violence
  - 1,057 incidents occurred with 24.4% or 258 incidents involved sexual aggression
  - Data were collected by male-female pairs of observers on Friday and Saturday nights between 12am and 3am
  - Observers were trained to spot and record possible aggression that included both verbal and physical aggression
  - Incidents included in analyses involved sexual overture or sexual behavior and at least one person was judged as having probably or definite intent to harm
  - Measures: gender; staff/patron status; initiator, target, or third party; intoxication of initiator and target; aggressive intent; level of invasiveness and persistence of aggressive sexual advances; responses of targets

17

- o Analyses: HLM
- Results:
  - o 89.9% of incidents had male initiators and female targets; 3.5% female initiators and male targets; 4.3% male-male; 2.3% female-female; limited analyses to male-female
  - o Initiators: 65.1% had probable aggressive intent; 34.1% had definite aggressive intent; 61.2% engaged in invasive contact; 56.9% engaged in persistent advances following a refusal; 17.7% made sexually suggestive or threatening acts without physical contact; 9.1% engaged in general sexual harassment
  - o Targets: on average engaged in 3.55 acts to show overture was unwanted; 55.4% engaged in evasive maneuver; 26.7% gave direct responses; about 25% left the area or bar entirely
  - o Third parties: 10 incidents involved staff with 1 incident in which the initiator was ejected; 20.8% of incidents involved a third party patron
- Discussion
  - o Majority of incidents included male initiators and female targets
  - o Ambiguity and permissiveness of bar environments is an ideal setting for opportunistic offending
  - o Targets were rarely aggressive when responding to initiators
  - o Third party friends would help target evade initiator, whereas, friends of the initiator would "egg" initiator on
  - o Cultural changes related to sexual harassment and aggression in bars is needed

Sexual Assault Prevention Education (SAPE) on College Campuses

- Articles in this topic area examine current sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) programs on college campuses, affirmative consent policies, and make recommendations for updating and making SAPE programs reflective of college norms

Senn, C. Y. (2011). An imperfect feminist journey: Reflections on the process to develop an effective sexual assault resistance programme for university women. *Feminism & Psychology, 21*(1), 121-137.

- Purpose: create an effective sexual assault prevention program for women that was created upon feminist and social psychological theories and disseminate the struggles experienced during the process of during such a program

- Discussion:
  - Program challenges: (1) focus on responsibility of male perpetrators while creating a program for women; (2) empowerment for males and females; (3) using and individual approach to change a socio-cultural issue; and (4) align with grant funding agency expectations
  - Effective rape resistance programs would include three stages: access, acknowledge, and act
  - Access unit provided knowledge to better assess risk for sexual assault in situations and men's behavior; emphasized danger is inherent around coercive men, but situations that are higher risk allow men to be more coercive and controlling

- Acknowledge unit helped women face the fact they may encounter a threat from a man they are acquainted with and what barriers they may face in those situations; feelings of wanting to be nice, not wanting to hurt the man's feelings, thinking they are miscommunicating (teaching women that men can hear refusals), teaching alternatives to traditional "no" statements
- Act unit focuses on preparing for women to face situations they may have to fight back in; self-defense that doesn't include victim blaming, teaching women that their sexual desires are normal and experienced by other women

Jozkowski, K. N., & Humphreys, T. P. (2014). Sexual consent on college campuses: Implication for sexual assault prevention education. *Health Education Monograph, 31*(2), 30-36.

- Purpose: provide a brief literature review relevant to sexual consent, critique consent-based programming, and make recommendations for future SAPE programs
- Discussion:
  - Consent-based programs focus on what women can do to protect themselves against becoming victims and negates the role men play as perpetrators
  - Victim blaming is engrained in consent-based programs
  - Consent-based programs promote verbal consent communication, but ignore the dilemma women are placed in because women who say "yes" are considered "sluts" and women who say "no" don't really mean "no"
  - Consent-based programs don't include socio-cultural factors, such as masculine ideology and patriarchy, which are critical in shaping the current rape culture of college campuses

- Suggestions for future SAPE programs: promote collectivism (people shouldn't dominate other people); teach men at young ages empathy; and deconstruct societal acceptance of sexual violence, male domination, and male entitlement as the social norm

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). "Yes means yes?" Sexual consent policy and college students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 47*(2), 16-23.

- Purpose: examine cultural messages regarding sexual consent influencing college students
- Discussion:
    - California passed first legislation requiring public institutions of higher learning to implement affirmative consent policies in September 2014
    - Affirmative consent policies require students to obtain verbal consent from potential partners in addition to receiving verbal consent for each sexual behavior they engage in
    - Critics of affirmative consent policies say these policies ignore larger social constructs such as sexism, patriarchy, and hegemonic masculinity
    - Yale's "no means yes, yes means anal" chant in 2010 executed by Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity members and pledges
    - USC's "gullet report" circulating Kappa Sigma fraternity in 2011 that includes a game on how to report and rate women the fraternity men engage in sexual behaviors with

- o University of Miami, OH flier posted in men's restrooms in 2012 that read "top ten ways to get away with rape"

- o University of Kansas sexual assault perpetrator in 2013 was found guilty but received minor punishment even though he stated the victim said "no" and "stop" before he forced himself on her

- o All these incidences found on mainstream media have the same message: consent doesn't matter

- o Affirmative consent policies require students to engage in verbal consent agreements, but this is at odds with the socially accepted way that consent is negotiated among college students (nonverbal cues) – women are disadvantaged because saying "yes" makes them seem like a slut, but if they say "no" they still really mean "yes" (token resistance)

- Implications

  - o Affirmative consent policies are challenging the current norms for negotiating consent among college students; however, they are neglecting the underlying social and cultural changes that need to occur before verbal consent can become mainstream practice on college campuses

  - o SAPEs should include education relevant to gender norms, sexual scripts, and victim blaming and shift away from putting the pressure on women to "protect" themselves from becoming victims

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Beyond the dyad: An assessment of sexual assault prevention

education focused on social determinants of sexual assault among college students.

Violence Against Women, 21(7), 848-874.

- Purpose: evaluate the effectiveness of an alternative approach (semester course on sexual violence) compared with the standard 60 minute sexual assault prevention education workshop; examine student's ability to: (1) recognize sexual assault in a vignette, (2) recognize proximal and distal factors contributing to sexual assault in a vignette, and (3) engagement in victim blaming or rape myth endorsement about a sexual assault in a vignette

- Methods:
  - 1-on-1 interviews were conducted with students who completed the semester-long sexual violence course and with students who completed the standard 60 minute sexual assault prevention education workshop
  - 4 months elapsed between the end of the course and interviews so as not to pressure students into participating in the study or thinking their grade was dependent upon study participation
  - Students (N = 20; n course = 10, n workshop = 10) received a $20 gift card as incentive for participating in the study
  - Students listened to 5 scenes that combine to complete an overall vignette situation involving Vicki and Pete, who were interacting a social event that led to sexual assault
  - After each scene, students were asked: (1) can you tell me what is going on in the scene? and (2) what do you think each of characters is thinking?

- o Data were coded by the author and two research assistants looking for embedded concepts (token resistance, victim blaming, etc.) and for emerging themes

- Results:
  - o Students who had taken the semester-long course identified embedded concepts more often than students who had taken the 60 minute workshop; they also were more likely to use the term for the embedded concept
  - o Every student who had taken the semester-long course identified the situation as sexual assault, but the students who had taken the 60 minute workshop did not even if they were cued for it (asked if a sexual assault happened)
  - o All students who had taken the semester-long course identified victim blaming and rape myths more than the students who had taken the 60 minute workshop
  - o Themes around "no means no" and "victim blaming" emerged from student responses
  - o Students who took the course endorsed "no means no" while students who took the workshop did not
  - o Students who took the workshop victim blamed Vicki by saying she was naïve, dumb, stupid, behaving badly
  - o Students who took the course engaged in mild victim blaming by saying Vicki should be worried about herself and not what Pete wants and that she should do more to protect her reputation

- Discussion:
  - o Findings indicate an alternative approach to sexual assault education may be more effective than traditional models

- o SAPEs focus on the ideal of miscommunication between partners, therefore they focus on clear communication to prevent rape, even though Vicki clearly said "no" and "stop" students who took the workshop did not recognize her communication as clear or the situation as sexual assault
  - o SAPEs focus on what women can do to "protect" themselves from becoming victims, but ignore the man's role in the situation as perpetrators
  - o SAPEs focus on verbal communication, but previous research shows students are primarily interpreting consent from nonverbal cues
  - o Need for SAPEs to conform to the cultural atmosphere on campuses to be useful
  - o More research needed to determine whether more intensive courses would be useful tools for sexual assault prevention education

Hooking Up and College Students

- Articles in this topic area are specific to the hooking up culture taking place on college campuses
- Topics include how a hook-up is defined, factors that make hooking up salient among college students, and the double standards for men and women participating in hook-up culture

Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York: New York University Press.

- Purpose: describe college culture in terms of interpersonal relationships mainly focused on sexuality and dating relationships

- Methods:
  - 1-on-1 interviews and group interviews with both men and women enrolled at a state university and private, religious college
- Discussion:
  - Women were interested in hooking up hoping it would turn into a relationship; whereas, men were primarily interested in hooking up for the sex and not interested in a relationship
  - Students believed college was a time to party because they weren't in a rush to get married
  - Women articulated a maximum age by which they wanted to married, but men articulated a minimum age to start considering getting married
  - The overwhelming number of women on college campuses compared to the number of men gives women the sense that men are at a premium and they should "hold onto" them, but men don't have any incentive to be in an exclusive relationship because there are so many women around
  - The collective mentality that college students aren't strangers because they belong within the underlying college structure makes hooking up easy
  - Residence halls and off-campus housing are close to local bars making it easier to walk about rather than having to get in a car with a stranger to go back to their place to hook up
  - Generally, there is a hooking up script that students loosely "follow;" often it includes using alcohol as a social lubricant and a series of nonverbal cues to interpret whether a potential partner is interested in sex

- Non-heterosexual students find it difficult to participate in the hook up culture on college campuses because it so overwhelmingly heterosexual

- Students are watching what everyone else is doing, thus a fishbowl type of scenario is created

- Male students watch other male students to derive the acceptable social norms: being preoccupied with sex all the time

- Women believe other women participate in hook up culture in order to gain relationships

- Men believe women want more than just a hook up, women want exclusive relationships, and some women even want to find a potential marriage partner

- Women believe a few men may be looking for relationships, but the majority are just looking for sex, especially without feeling or attachment

- Some women believe fraternity men purposely mistreat women in order to manipulate them and maximize their sexual conquests

- Virginity is found to be a "curse" among both men and women, with men being more stigmatized for being virgins (hurry up and get rid of it mentality)

- A common misconception that everyone is hooking up, even though the term hooking up is very ambiguous

- Both men and women tended to overestimate the number of partners their peers had compared to themselves

Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 161-176.

- Purpose: examine the influence of sexual culture in terms of biological motivation, sexual scripts, and how people adapt to their environment on hookup culture
- Discussion:
    - Term "hookup" focuses on the relationship (uncommitted sex) rather than the behaviors that occur during the event
    - Sexual scripts dictate hooking up behaviors with men following a script that prefers uncommitted sex and consistently trying to obtain sex, whereas women follow a script that portrays them as sexual objects, passive, and sexual gatekeepers
    - Women have trouble navigating between being a "good girl," but also being expected to have sex know-how like Samantha from Sex in the City (Madonna-whore dichotomy)
    - Some hookups may turn into relationships, which fits the needs of both human sexual desire and desire for romantic intimacy
    - Hookups have been extensively examined within heterosexual culture; however, the "hookup" also extends to causal sexual encounters among men who have sex with other men
    - Greater alcohol use has been associated with penetrative sex during hookups, with less alcohol use associated with non-penetrative sex during hookups, and no alcohol use being associated with not hooking up
    - Individuals tend to overestimate other peoples' comfort for engaging in hookup behavior because of the ideal that everyone is doing it so they must be comfortable with it

- o Women feel more negative feelings towards a hookup afterwards as compared to men

- o Large numbers of unwanted sex are more often reported as part of engaging in hooking up than in other sexual situations

Traditional Heterosexual Sexual Scripts

- Articles in this topic area focus on traditional sexual scripts among heterosexual individuals

- Specifically, articles discuss how men and women are conditioned to play either initiator or gatekeeper roles

Wiederman, M. W. (2005). The gendered nature of sexual scripts. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 13*(4), 496-502.

- Purpose: apply social scripting theory to understand why differences exist between males and females

- Discussion:

  - o Social scripting theory assumes people follow internalized scripts when constructing meaning out of behavior, responses, and emotions

  - o Social scripts reduce individual anxiety and provide guidance in how to navigate sexual situations so long as everyone follows their script

  - o Boys learn that handling their penises feels good and is acceptable (lots of exploration of self-pleasure); girls learn that their vaginas are dirty and should not be touched (no exploration of self-pleasure)

- o Women are constrained to not be sexually aggressive because they run the risk of being seen as masculine which would be deviant; conversely, this presents a challenge for men to attempt to wear women down to get the sex they want rather than "giving in" to women's refusals

- o Higher number of sexual partners boosts self-esteem and status for men; whereas, higher number of sexual partners for women decreases status

- o Women are expected to be "good" and not engage in sexual activity so when they say "no" men may think they are only saying "no" but really want sex anyway (token resistance)

- o Men who don't play an assertive or initiator role in sexual situations may create anxiety for women because traditional scripts lend women to being more passive

- o A woman who is more assertive runs the risk of hurting a man's egos because the man may feel as if their male role as "initiator" was taken over by the woman

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523.

- • Purpose: examine qualitative descriptions of how consent is communicated among heterosexual college students for different behaviors and by gender

- • Methods:
  - o Students answered 16 open-ended questions regarding how they would conceptualize and define consent, communicated consent and non-consent to their partner, interpret consent and non-consent from their partners, and indicate consent for specific behaviors

- Sample only included heterosexual students (N = 185)

- Themes were assessed across all items to examine how students indicate and interpret consent and for any emerging themes

- Results:

    - 4 themes emerged: (1) endorsement of traditional sexual script; (2) women performed oral sex; (3) male aggression toward women; and (4) male deception to obtain sex

    - Endorsement of traditional sexual scripts: both men and women responses endorsed traditional sexual scripts that men initiate sex and women are responsible for gatekeeping and determining whether sex will happen; men always want to engage in sexual activity

    - Women perform oral sex: men answered how they would consent to receive oral sex and women answered how they would consent to perform oral sex

    - Male aggression: men indicated they would use aggressive tactics to indicate consent; some men reported using force or strength to get women to perform oral sex; women did not mention using aggression as means to indicate consent

    - Male deception: men indicated using deceptive techniques to obtain sex by "accidentally" putting their penises in women's vaginas or anuses; women did not report using deception as a means of consent

- Discussion:

    - Some college students still subscribe to traditional sexual scripts (men as initiators and women as gatekeepers)

31

- Traditional sexual scripts disadvantage women because (1) they may not make their refusals loud enough and thus be blamed for forced sex, (2) they may be called a "tease" for engaging in some sexual behaviors but stopping before penetrative sex occurs, and (3) if they say "yes" too quickly or eagerly they may be labeled as a "slut"

- Traditional sexual scripts disadvantage men also because men are perceived to always want sex so some men may engage in unwanted sex in order to follow what society deems as normative behavior

- Interpretation of the oral sex item calls into question that students may perceive that male sexual satisfaction is held above female sexual satisfaction since both male and female responses placed females in the performative role and male in the receptive role

- Use of deceptive techniques by men to gain sex alludes to the ideal that men only consider their consent as a way to obtain sex from their partner while negating their partner's feelings

- Consent is often conceptualized as getting that "yes," whereas non-consent is conceptualized as being told "no;" however, situations where a person is not able to give the verbal "yes" or "no," constitute a gray area that may lead to victim blaming if forced sex occurs

The Sexual Double Standard

- Articles in the topic area examine the presence of the sexual double standard (the belief that men are allowed more sexual freedoms/more permissive sexuality and sexual expression as compared to women)

- Topics include difficulties men and women face while trying to behave as society expects them

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Quackenbush, D. M. (1996). *The social meaning of women's condom use: The sexual double standard and women's beliefs about the meaning ascribed to condom use*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Purpose: developed the Sexual Double Standard Scale (SDSS) to measure the extent to which respondents endorse traditional sexual double standards (men have more sexual freedom compared to women)

- Discussion:
  - SDSS contains 26 items on a 4-point scale (disagree strongly = 0 to agree strongly = 3)
  - 6 items compared men and women's sexual behaviors directly; 20 items are parallel and are specific to either men's or women's sexual behaviors
  - Previous studies have found reliability coefficients to range between 0.73 and 0.78 for women's items, 0.76 and 0.80 for men's items, and 0.57 for the comparison items
  - Scales that measure token resistance and traditional gender role attitudes have been used to assess construct validity of the SDSS

Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double binds

and flawed options. *Gender & Society, 23*(5), 589-616.

- Purpose: assess how gender and class shape sexuality in college culture

- Methods:

  o Conducted longitudinal, ethnographic interviews with women attending a

    Midwest university

  o Researchers resided in the residence hall with the study participants

  o Interviews were conducted each year (freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior)

    ranging from 45 minutes to 2 and ½ hours

- Results:

  o Women complained about the sexual double standard in hooking up situations;

    fear of being stigmatized as a "slut"

  o Women experienced disrespect during hookups because of the notion that it was

    acceptable for men to engage in hookups, but not women; specifically, fraternity

    men exerted power over women by controlling party transportation, admittance,

    and alcohol distribution

  o The sexual double standard justified the negative treatment of women in the party

    scene; women were treated as "sex objects"

  o Expectation that women should want relationships forced women to justify being

    single; women pressured to enter relationships; ideal about scarcity of men lead to

    women staying in unhappy relationships

  o Men held the power in relationships by exerting control over who the woman

    spent time with and even what women would wear

- o Upper-class women were expected to postpone marriage in order to pursue education and a career; relational double bind because relationships took time away from pursuing education and career, but women felt pressure to be a "good girl" and a "good student"

- o Sexual double bind: hookups worked well with pursuing education and career, but power is given to men in hookup situations because of the double standard (mistreat women, slut stigma, shame)

- o Less privileged women did not find hookup culture to be appealing and did not hold the same idea that college is a time to focus only on education and career; less desire to postpone adulthood led to some women leaving college to go back to their hometown boyfriends; double bind between wanting to stay true to their "roots" or move up in social status by focusing on education and career

- Discussion:
  - o Hookups provided a way for upper-class women to focus on education and career, but served as a delay to adulthood for less privileged women

  - o Relationship commitments that threaten a woman's ability to meet a man with elite credentials in the future, prevent women from moving up in status, especially since a woman's education and earning potential have become important characteristics when considering marriage

  - o Above lead to upper-class marrying each other, middle-class marrying each other, and lower-class not being able to marry, and thus increases the economic gap within the class structure

o Research is needed to investigate men's perspectives on relationships and how those plans integrate with their future plans

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016A). *'Who wants a quitter? . . . so you just keep trying':* *Gendered perspectives of college students' perceptions of sexual consent*. Manuscript under review.

- Purpose: examine college students' sexual consent to vaginal-penile intercourse during a hookup (casual sexual encounter)
- Methods:
  o 1-on-1 interviews with 30 college students; 17 women and 13 men
  o Thematic analysis using "truth claims" done by both authors separately then discussed together
- Results:
  o Three overarching themes: (1) endorsement of the sexual double standard; (2) sex as an exchange; and (3) sex as a game
  o Endorsement of the sexual double standard: good girls don't have sex – women are expected to not engage in sexual activity so as not to be a "slut," but men are free to engage in sexual activity because it boosts their status; women care-take men's egos – women often provide reasons during refusals that don't relate to the man so as not to hurt his feelings
  o Sex as an exchange: men put in the 'work' and women 'owe' sex – men purchase drinks for women and, thus, women are expected to give them sex in return for the drinks

- - Sex as a game: obtaining sex and consent as a game – men's language aligned with a game indicating there was a winner (men) and a loser (women) during casual sexual encounters; men try to convince women – men try to change women's minds so they will have sex with them
- Discussion:
  - College students endorse a conceptualization of consent and sexual encounters that privilege men while disenfranchising women
  - Consent-based programs focus on the "need" for women to provide clear consent or refusal to sex, which places the burden on women to avoid being sexually assaulted
  - These programs perpetuate the disenfranchisement of women during hookups

Token Resistance to Sex

- Articles included in this topic area focus on token resistance to sex, which is the belief that women say "no" to sex even though they intend on saying "yes" and consenting to sex
- Token resistance is often cited as one of the components to compose miscommunication theory
- Topics below include examining token resistance behaviors among women, endorsement of token resistance among men, and the refute of miscommunication theory

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean

yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 54(5), 872-879.

- Purpose: investigate women's token resistance to sex in terms of prevalence and attitudes

- Methods:

    o An open-ended pilot survey was administered to women (n = 47) and men (n =

    47) about whether they or their partner had ever engaged in token resistance and

    why

    o Close-ended survey measures: prevalence of token resistance, ranking of reasons

    why they engaged in token resistance, attitudes toward women, sex role

    stereotyping, adversarial sex beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and

    erotophobic-erotophilic attitudes

- Results:

    o 39.3% (n = 240) reported engaging in token resistance

    o MANOVA was used to compare attitudes of (1) women who had engage in token

    resistance; (2) women who were sexually experienced, but did not engage in

    token resistance; and (3) women who were not sexually experienced, and did not

    engage in token resistance

    o Token resistance group: intermediate on traditionality; agreed most strongly that

    women engaged in token resistance; rated male-female relationship as most

    adversarial; highest on acceptance of interpersonal violence; highest on belief that

    women enjoy it when men use force

    o Sexually experienced, but no token resistance group: least traditional;

38

- o Not sexually experienced, and no token resistance group: most traditional; most erotophoic
- Discussion:
  - o 19% of women who engaged in token resistance reported inhibition-related items (emotional, religious, moral, physical discomfort) as moderately to very important
  - o 23% of women who engaged in token resistance reported manipulative items (playing a game, angry with partner, wanting to be in control) as moderately to very important
  - o 23% of women who engage in token resistance reported practical items ("slut" stigma, concerns about relationship, STI contraction) as moderately to very important
  - o Women may think it is more acceptable for them to be forced or talked into sex rather than deviating from their sexual script of not being too eager or "slutty"
  - o Token resistance discourages honest communication between partners, makes women appear manipulative which can in turn lower their self-esteem if they label themselves as manipulative, make women miss out on sexually fulfilling experiences if partner's listen to their refusal, or it could even possible encourage men to ignore women's refusals all together leading to rape if the "no" actually means "no"

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Rodgers, C. S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspectives on an

old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 443-463.

- Purpose: examine token resistance for different behaviors (not just VP sex) and homosexual experiences (not just heterosexual)

- Methods:

  o Open-ended survey administered to college students (65 women and 64 men)

  o Three situations: (1) never had sex with the partner before, said "no" but meant "yes"; (2) had previously had sex with the partner, said "no" but meant "yes"; and (3) gender neutral partner, any sexual behavior, said "no" but meant "yes"

  o Participants provided frequencies for each of the three situations; listed reasons for why they wanted to engage in the sexual behavior; listed reasons why they did not want to engage in the sexual behavior; asked why they said "no" even though they meant "yes"

- Results:

  o Men (83%) reported engaging in token resistance significantly more than women (68%) in at least one situation; men higher in situations A and C; women higher in situation B

  o Open-ended responses indicated that participants did not understand the questions, thus, the previous stats aren't accurate; responses coded as either token resistance or not; only 11% of participant narratives actually encompassed token resistance; situation A, 1 man and 1 woman; situation B, 6 men and 9 women; situation C, 2 men and 1 woman

  o Participant responses showed confusion about: (1) desires and intentions – wanted to engage in sexual activity but did not intend to; (2) indicating "no" and meaning "yes" simultaneously – most meant "no" but then changed their minds; (3) sexual

activity that was refused and sexual activity that was intended – sexual activity participants said "no" to was not the same sexual activity they intended to engage in; (4) misunderstanding the definition – some reported about partners' not wanting to engage in sexual activity, felt reservations afterwards, said "no" and meant "no"

- o Five major themes emerged from descriptions that actually included token resistance: (1) moral concerns and discomfort with sex – "being good"; (2) adding interest to boring relationships; (3) not wanting to be taken for granted; (4) testing a partner's response; and (5) power and control over partner – 3 men and 1 woman described wanting to be manipulative or hostile with their partner
- Discussion:
  - o Men as well as women engage in token resistance
  - o Too simple to conceptualize sex as either wanted or unwanted because wanting is not an "all or nothing" state
  - o Saying "no" and meaning "yes" and saying "no" and wanting to say "yes" perpetuates women's refusals as not being serious

Osman, S. L. (1995, April). *Predispositional and situations factors influencing men's perceptions of date rape*. Paper presented at the Eastern Regional Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Atlantic City, NJ.

- Purpose: develop a measure to assess the belief that women engage in token resistance (say "no" to sex even though they mean "yes" and intend to consent to the sex)
- Discussion:

- o 8 item measure using a 7-point scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 7)

- o Reliability coefficients range between 0.83 to 0.87

- o Scale has been used as a form of construct validity for other scales measuring endorsement of traditional gender scripts, the sexual double standard, rape myth acceptance, and sexual consent communication

O'Byrne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). "If a girl doesn't say 'no' ...": Young men, rape and claims of "insufficient knowledge." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 168–193.

- Purpose: explore how male college students account for rape

- Methods:

  - o Two focus groups conducted with 9 men; conducted by a male moderator for gender congruence

  - o Discursive psychology includes conversation analysis and discourse analysis to interpret participant responses; victim precipitation, social structure, and miscommunication theory were specifically examined

- Results:

  - o Men provided responses about "not knowing" when a woman refuses right after discussing how they can interpret and understand women's verbal and non-verbal refusals; clear and direct refusals can still be understood as ambiguous signals by men

- o Men suggest that women who provide a clear, verbal "no" will not be raped; this construct was later overruled by the concepts that women just also provide clear non-verbal signals in addition to their verbal "no" in order to not be raped

- o Men brought up the concept of token resistance as being confusing, leading to miscommunication between men and women; men state that women's communication is almost impossible to understand

- o Men conceptualize rape victims as having the power to say "no" and "stop" to prevent rape from occurring, but this contrasts what they said earlier that saying those things don't necessarily prevent women from being raped

- o Men state that it's on the woman if the communication is ambiguous (victim-blaming)

- o Men also stated that women who put themselves in positions of being raped are at fault (RMA)

- Discussion:

  - o Even though men previously stated they have the ability to hear and understand women's verbal and non-verbal refusals, they state otherwise when the topic of accountability for rape comes into the discussion

  - o May be these men are simply providing these contrasting statements because they don't want to accept that men are primarily perpetrators of rape

  - o Miscommunication theory should be conceptualized and taught as a rape myth in SAPE programs

Rape Myths

- Articles in this area examine what rape myths are, endorsement of rape myths, and scales that measure rape myth acceptance

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.

- Rape myths are prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists
- Purpose: explore attitudinal, personality, experiential, and demographic antecedents of rape myth acceptance
- Methods:
    - Random sampling of adults over the age of 18 living in Minnesota
    - Survey measures: own sex role satisfaction, self-esteem, romantic self-image, experience with intrafamilial violence, victim of an attempted or completed sexual assault, number of sexual assault victims know, exposure to media treatment of sexual assault, sex role stereotyping, sexual conservatism, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence
- Results:
    - Multiple regression was used in order to identify the factors that most strongly predicted rape myth acceptance
    - None of the personality variables produced a significant direct effect on RMA
    - Acceptance of interpersonal violence was the strongest predictor of RMA, followed by sex role stereotyping, and adversarial sexual beliefs

- Model was run separately for males and females and roughly paralleled the full model
- RMA forms part of larger and complexly related attitude structure that includes sex role stereotyping, feelings about sexuality, and acceptance of interpersonal violence
- Discussion:
  - Many Americans endorse rape myths
  - Attitudes about rape are strongly connected to other deeply held and pervasive attitudes related to sex
  - Findings suggest a long-term strategy to combat sex role stereotyping at young ages before those beliefs become more salient in adolescence
  - Sex role stereotyping is the precondition for targeting women as potential victims and acceptance of interpersonal violence is the attitudinal releaser of assaultive action – stereotyping leads to targeting women and acceptance of violence leads to actual victimization of women

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.

- Purpose: investigate the structure of rape myth and develop a valid measure of rape myth acceptance – Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) Scale
- Methods:

- o Researchers created a pool that included 120 items based on previous literature and experts in the field; 19 categories were created with 5 items in each totaling 95 items; 9 "filler" items were included

- o Responses were on a 7-point scale (not at all agree = 1 to very much agree = 7)

- o Data were collected from 604 college students (women = 320 and men = 284)

- Results:

  - o 40 items represented 5 of the original 7 categories plus 5 additional "filler" items constituted the 45-item scale; overall reliability was 0.93 with subscale reliability ranging between 0.74 and 0.84

  - o Due to the length of the scale, researchers opted to create a "short form" that included 17 items plus 3 additional "filler" items constituting a 20-item scale; the overall scale reliability was 0.87

  - o A subsequent study was conducted in order to assess "known groups" validity in which responses from students training to be peer facilitators of rape education were compared to students in training at a police academy; students training to be peer educators had significantly lower RMA compared to the students training to be police officers

- Discussion:

  - o Results of these studies provide valid and reliable measures of RMA for future researchers to use rather than creating ad hoc items to measure the complex construct

  - o One limitation is that these measures may require updating in the future because colloquial phrases may become outdated and no longer relevant

Greek Fraternities and Sororities

- The article included below focuses on Greek culture specifically related to hooking up, relationships, sexual scripts, sexual assault, parties, and alcohol consumption

Sanday, P. R. (1996). Rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures. *Violence Against Women, 2*(2), 191-208.

- Purpose: describe rape-prone fraternities and contrast those factors with what a rape-free culture looks like

- Discussion:
  - "Rape-prone" society is "one in which the incidence of rape is reported by observes to be high, or rape is excused as a ceremonial expression of masculinity, or rape is an act by which men are allowed to punish or threaten women
  - "Rape-free" societies do not lack rape at all, but rather view sexual aggression as socially disapproved and punished severely
  - Rape-prone behavior associates: environmental insecurity; women viewed as objects to be controlled; men struggle to retain their control
  - Fraternities: insecure men; bond over homophobia and having sex; use porn to get information about sex; think it is okay to force women to have sex; use of alcohol and drugs to force women to have sex is common; brothers watch other brothers have sex without woman's consent to being watched
  - Previous research: fraternity men often use physical force or verbal coercion to get sex from women; higher numbers of fraternity men are engaging in sexual

47

aggression across college campuses; peer support for coercing women to have sex using alcohol and perpetrators own alcohol consumption are predictors of victimizing women; 15% of women experienced completed rape across 32 college campuses

- o Rape-free societies: value sexes equally; respect women; no power differential between men and women; some even have inheritance through matriarchal family lines rather than patriarchal
- o Rape-free campuses: treat women with respect; don't always drink to get drunk; women are friends, not objects; acceptance of homosexuality

DeSantis, A. (2007). *Inside Greek U: Fraternities, sororities, and the pursuit of pleasure, power, and prestige*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

- Purpose: examine relationships, social scripts, and sexuality in the context of Greek life
- Methods:
  - o Individual and group interviews were conducted with both men and women involved in the Greek fraternity and sorority system at a major university
- Discussion:
  - o Men viewed women in two ways: (1) as sisters needing protection or (2) as sex objects
  - o Cunnilingus is often described as gross and a sign of weakness (because pleasuring a woman is giving up too much power)
  - o Homophobic is rampant among Greek men and they often strived to participate in activities that reassured one another that they weren't gay

- Men often felt jealous for loss of attention from their male friends when they have a girlfriend
- Women are not afford the same freedom with their sexuality as their male counterparts are; sororities often police the women's behavior and if a woman were to engage in questionable behavior, she may have to go before the judicial board of conduct
- Women did not want promiscuous women pledging their sorority because it would ruin the sorority's reputation; oral sex was acceptable to perform in moderation, but vaginal-penile sex was not acceptable outside the confines of a relationship
- Women are expected to perform for the boys during events
- Men must display hyper-masculine and aggressive personas, while women are expect to be hyper-feminine, "good girls"
- Women talked about date rape/sexual assault experiences freely because they thought if a male professor reported then people would actually listen
- Men did not want to talk about date rape because it could give their fraternity a bad reputation
- Alcohol consumption is a given as all fraternity events and usually the frat brothers drink alcohol prior to the events
- The ideal woman that the frats boys described would be marriage material included characteristics that weren't part of traditional gender roles for women, but rather they mentioned characteristics that were masculine traits

- o Women described their ideal marriage partner to the be the epitome of masculine, aggressive, and romantic

Sexual Consent

- Articles in this topic area focus on defining sexual consent, communication of external sexual consent, interpretation of sexual consent, and differences in sexual consent (gender, relationship status, and behaviors)
- Samples primarily include heterosexual college students or young adults with minimal including same-sex relationships

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/ consent1.htm

- Purpose: examine consent behaviors among college students
- Methods:
  - o 310 students, 118 men and 192 women, completed paper and pencil surveys
  - o Measures: dating behaviors; permission giving; describe their most recent sexual experience in which they said "yes" and meant "yes"; rank sexual behaviors in order of occurrence; token resistance and reasons for saying "no" but wanting "yes"
- Results:
  - o 62.5% of women and 59.3% of men indicated using both verbal and non-verbal cues to indicate they wanted to participate in sexual activity

- o More women indicated "did not move away" as a non-verbal permission cue as compared to men
- o Less than 20% of permission granted for engaging in VP intercourse and oral sex were verbal
- o No significant difference in men and women using verbal cues for permission
- Discussion:
  - o Much of the behaviors proceeded without specific permission to continue; falls in line with the thinking that once sexual activity begins, it is consensual until someone says "no"
  - o Most permission giving was non-verbal
  - o No significant gender differences

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

- Purpose: examine how college students communicate and interpret sexual consent
- Methods:
  - o Pilot study with 44 students, 22 women and 22 men, using open-ended survey about how they would indicate consent and how their partner indicated consent in their most recent VP intercourse experience
  - o Participant responses were used to create items for a scale that measured consent behaviors

- o 378 heterosexual college students, 188 women and 190 men, completed surveys in which they received 4 gender congruent scenarios: partner verbally initiated sex, they verbally initiated sex, partner non-verbally initiated sex, and they non-verbally initiated sex

- o After each scenario, participants were asked to rate on a 0 (does not show consent to sexual intercourse) to 6 (definitely shows consent to sexual intercourse) scale whether specific behaviors indicated sexual consent or not (consent by their partner and consent of themselves)

- o Participants were asked to provide the frequency of which they engaged in the 34 behaviors (one ended up being dropped) as indicators of consent in their own sexual history to obtain an actual self-consent rating

- Results:

  - o Participants rated 33 behaviors on a 7-point scale three times: (1) frequency of use of the behaviors to indicate consent; (2) how indicative each behavior would be of their own consent; and (3) how indicative each behavior would be of their partner's consent

  - o PCA with varimax rotation produced a 7-factor solution: direct verbal signals, direct non-verbal signals, indirect verbal signals, indirect non-verbal signals, intoxication signals, direct refusal, and no response; reliability coefficients ranged 0.69 to 0.95 for the factors

  - o Men and women reported they showed consent most often by making no response

- o Men reported indirect non-verbal signals, intoxication signals, and no response more frequently as compared to women; small effect size indicating minimal gender differences

- o Men rated all factors, except direct refusal, as more indicative of their partner's consent as compared to women; small effect size indicating minimal gender differences

- o Men rated indirect verbal, indirect non-verbal, no response, and intoxication signals as more indicative of their own consent as compared to women; small effect size indicating minimal gender differences

- Discussion:
  - o Men and women reported using different behaviors to indicate consent: both direct and indirect verbal and non-verbal behaviors
  - o Reported not resisting their partner frequently as a form of consent
  - o Minimal differences between men and women were identified
  - o Women and men rated direct refusal as being unindicative of sexual consent – both men and women stated saying "no" meant themselves or their partner was not consenting to sexual activity

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

- Purpose: investigate heterosexual students' perceptions of consent specifically focusing on gender differences, relationship differences, and importance of consent

- Methods:

  o Focus groups were used to develop a measure related to sexual consent; two groups of females and one group of males; Canadian

  o Themes were identified and items were constructed around three sets of questions: (1) attitudes toward Antioch's sexual consent policy; (2) attitudes toward sexual consent; and (3) sexual consent behaviors

  o Finalized questionnaire was mailed to stratified random sample of Canadian undergraduate students

  o 514 surveys were usable, 330 women and 184 men

- Results:

  o Focus groups: definitions of sexual consent centered around mutual understanding and willingness for both partners to engage in sexual activity, both in clear states of mind without drugs or alcohol; some females made reference to a gatekeeping role; some men conceptualized consent as a discrete event or a process

  o Men mentioned the presence of verbal consent occurring minimally, but that there are many non-verbal signals that occur

  o Women viewed consent as a process more often as compared to men

  o Participants reported that consent wasn't discussed with friends or partners

  o Majority of participants indicated verbal consent as being awkward; possibly kills the mood

  o Creating policies telling students that they must engage in verbal consent doesn't align with the contextual influences of consent negotiation

- o Participants acknowledged that obtaining verbal consent would be best practices, but it would be hard to apply in the "real world" – focus groups
- o On the contrary, students who completed the surveys preferred verbal consent rather than assuming consent until their partner said "no"
- o Men and women reported using non-verbal consent cues as primary ways of indicating consent, but that verbal consent is needed more in newer relationships; some participants indicated that verbal consent may only be obtained at first sexual intercourse and implied for subsequent intercourses
- o Some indicated consent is often assumed until the partner says "no" in one-night stand situations
- Discussion:
  - o Students prefer non-verbal consent cues over using verbal consent cues
  - o Relationship length dictates the extent to which verbal and non-verbal cues are used

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.

- Purpose: assess heterosexual, male college students' ability to perform and interpret refusals
- Methods:
  - o Two focus groups conducted with 9 men; conducted by a male moderator for gender congruence

- o Discursive psychology includes conversation analysis and discourse analysis to interpret participant responses

- Results:

  - o Men reported the "fear of rejection" as being why people don't provide direct refusals in sexual situations; men labeled rejections as either direct or subtle

  - o Men's responses acknowledge that "no" typically isn't found in refusals, but refusals could still be accomplished without it

  - o Men provided examples of how they could accomplish refusals through non-verbal means and interpret non-verbal refusals as well; purposely "kill the mood" when they didn't want to engage in intercourse with a specific woman

  - o Men described actively refusing sex which contrasts women who protect men's egos and even engage in unwanted sex

  - o Men described how they were able to read women's both verbal and non-verbal refusals

  - o Men tried to clarify the best way a woman should provide a refusal for sex, but none of the examples included actually saying "no"

  - o Men said if women provide no reaction, are cold, and make certain gestures, those types of refusals are loud and clear; indicated women only need to make mildly obvious behaviors for a refusal to be picked up on

- Discussion:

  - o Men clearly articulated their ability to pick up on women's verbal and non-verbal refusals

- Date rape may not result from miscommunication, but rather men's intention to coerce women into unwanted sex even if all signals point to "no" from women

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

- Purpose: examine whether relationship history and gender have effects on consent communication
- Methods:
  - 415 college students, 64% women and 36% men, in Canada completed the survey
  - Participants were randomly assigned to three groups based on the relationship history in the vignette: first date; dating 3 months; or married 2 years
  - After reading their assigned vignettes, students answered 17 question relating to perceptions of consent, appropriateness of behaviors, clarity of intentions, and alternate behaviors (should haves); 7-point scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 7)
  - A set of 11 questions relevant to sexual behaviors required students to check off the behaviors that required "a clear and explicit indication of consent" in a new dating relationship and a committed dating relationship
- Results:
  - 11 of 17 items showed significant differences on basis of relationship history suggest that less verbal communication was needed to indicate consent in longer relationships

- o 15 of 17 items showed significant differences based on the participant's gender; women agreed more that more explicit communication was necessary as compared to men
- o Participants preferred to assume consent more rather than asking for it before engaging in sexual behaviors; women were more likely to prefer obtaining consent prior to sexual activity compared to men who preferred to assume consent unless their partner indicates otherwise
- o Participants reported that more explicit consent was needed in newer relationships and when engaging in behaviors that were considered more intimate

- Discussion:
  - o Relationship history influences perceived need for consent, with length of relationship and sexual involvement dictating the level of explicitness needed for consent
  - o Women were more likely to perceive explicit consent more necessary as compared to men; may be because women's traditional sexual script places them in a permission-giving role, but men are placed an initiator role
  - o Students responded that they prefer to assume consent during sexual interactions unless their partner states otherwise; aligns with previous research indicating students primarily use non-verbal consent cues

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

- Purpose: investigate the ways young adults communicate with their heterosexual casual sex partners and they understand and construct consent within these experiences

- Methods:

  - 1-on-1 unstructured interviews, 11 women and 10 men

  - Theoretical thematic analysis focused on participants understood their own consent and how they understood their partner's willingness to engage in casual sex

  - Explored possible gender differences

- Results:

  - Three themes: (1) tacit knowing; (2) refusals; and (3) active participation

  - Tacit knowing: concept that participants just knew that their partner wanted to engage in casual sex; context, in terms of location and relationship, was identified as important in understanding this concept; knowledge about communication for social situations was applied to sexual situations meaning participants thought their partners would accept or refuse and invitation for casual sex in the same way they would accept or refuse an invitation to a social event

  - Refusals: concept that cues of discomfort meant the partner did not want to engage in casual sex; both men and women discussed assessing cues of discomfort or signals of disinterest: becoming tense or stiff, pulling away slightly, or even stopping behavior for a slight moment

  - Active participation: concept that certain behaviors indicate that a partner wants to engage in casual sex; "pushing into their partner, pulling their partner closer, sighing, breathing and moaning" were mentioned by both men and women

59

- Some women describe situations in which the consented to sex but were ambiguous about their actual desire for sex; communication was not unclear in these situations

- Discussion:
  - Previous research has found that men often overestimate women's interest in sex, but these findings suggest there is ample time for that misguided perception to be resolved before any unwanted or nonconsensual activity occurs
  - Men and women easily identified partner's refusals or acceptance to engage in casual sex contrary to the belief that it is difficult to discern consent
  - Men and women both described being able to identify verbal and non-verbal forms of refusals or disinterest
  - SAPE programs that focus purely on consent communication assume that people aren't able to discern whether their partners' want to engage in sexual activity and focus primarily identifying whether their partner is resisting sex, not enjoying it

Burkett, M., & Hamilton, K. (2012). Postfeminist sexual agency: Young women's negotiations of sexual consent. *Sexualities, 15*(7), 815-833.

- Purpose: examine how young adult women consent to sex within relationships and during casual sexual encounters – applied a postfeminist critique
- Methods:
  - 1-on-1 interviews conducted with 8 women from Australia; 4 women were in committed relationships and the other 4 were single

- o Women were asked to define consent and reflect on how they consented to sex in the past

- Results:
  - o Women subscribed to the "just say no" risk-avoidance mantra, but some responses suggest their consent was implied and they would have to say "no" or "stop" in order for it to be the man's fault
  - o Women hold the responsibility in verbalizing consent, and men are not responsible for "decoding" their messages
  - o Most women reported using non-verbal consent cues in their actual consent experiences even though they mentioned the importance of verbalizing consent previously
  - o Women felt that they implicitly consented to sex through a variety of behaviors and they weren't able to "go back on their word" and refuse
  - o Intercourse was payment for flirting; must "follow through" on their actions
  - o In relationships, consent was shaped by the norms of sexual compliance to their male partners – similar to single women and their casual partners
  - o Women used sex as a way to improve their relationships; they would also tend to their partner's sexual needs even if they did not desire to engage in sexual activity

- Discussion:
  - o Women were advocating for the "just say no" approach, but they also described situations in which they felt like they couldn't say "no" or change their minds

- o Women's responses were mixed with feminist ideals that they have sexual freedom and postfeminist ideals that servicing their partner is a type of sexual empowerment
- o Two gaps: (1) women claiming sexual agency to do as they please, but recounting situations in which they felt pressured or thought they couldn't say no and (2) their inability to see those statements as contradictions
- o Most women in the study faced difficulty in properly negotiating their consent

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

- Purpose: examine whether sexual consent predicts overall quality of sexual interaction while holding relationship status, alcohol consumption, and age constant
- Methods:
  - o 640 college students completed a survey that measured: perception of quality of last sexual intercourse; number of alcoholic drinks consumed prior to engaging in intercourse; internal consent; and external consent
  - o Hierarchical linear regression was used to understand the association between consent and quality of sexual intercourse
- Results:
  - o Women: relationship status (being in a relationship), alcohol (higher number of drinks), physical response, safety/comfort, and agreement/wantedness were significant predictors of intercourse quality

- o Men: age, safety/comfort, agreement/wantedness, and direct non-verbal consent were significant predictors of intercourse quality
- Discussion:
  - o Internal consent feelings, such as being comfortable and safe with your partner and wanting to engage in the sexual activity, are linked with the quality of sexual intercourse
  - o Men are assumed to always be up for sex so in the case that men feel more comfortable and truly want to engage in sexual activity, then the quality of sexual intercourse is higher
  - o Physical response was a significant predictor for women, but not men; may be due to vaginal lubrication being linked with better quality intercourse
  - o Men indicated direct non-verbal consent as linked with better quality intercourse

Beres, M. A. (2014). Rethinking the concept of consent for anti-sexual violence activism and education. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*(3), 373-389.

- Purpose: explore how young adults define consent and how they communicate their willingness to engage in sexual activity
- Methods:
  - o Two data sets: (1) semi-structured interviews with 21 young adults, 11 women and 10 men, relevant to casual sexual encounters; and (2) semi-structured interviews with 34 young adults, 19 women and 15 men, relevant to their relationships (10 interviews were conducted with couples, 5 couples were

interviewed separately, 4 women were interviewed without having an involved partner)

- o Thematic analysis focused on how participants answered about consent, looking at both semantic and latent construction of the term consent

- Results:

  - o Three main themes: (1) consent as a minimum requirement for acceptable sex; (2) consent as a discrete event; and (3) consent unnecessary in relationships

  - o Consent as minimum requirement: concept that consent must be present to fall within the legal confines of the definition of consent; consent can be given without the desire to have sex; lack of resistance makes it okay to continue

  - o Consent as a discrete event: concept that consent was an event of granting permission to engage in sexual activity; participants explained consent as a discrete even, however, described their willingness to engage in sexual activity as a process

  - o Consent unnecessary in relationships: concept that consent isn't a factor in on-going relationships; couples said consent didn't happen in their relationship, but described situations in which they negotiated sex, thus, they didn't see their negotiations as consent

- Discussion:

  - o Findings suggest that people's conceptualization of consent differs from how they describe how they negotiate sexual activity

- Couples did not mean consent is unnecessary in their relationships, but rather communicating willingness to engage in sexual activity is different from consenting to sexual activity
- People's responses to a question about consent may differ from how that person communicates about willingness to engage in sexual activity
- "It is possible for someone to think that consent is an event that takes place once during an interaction and think that determining someone's willingness is an ongoing process."
- SAPE programs should focus on how young adults already negotiate sex and encourage them to engage in more explicit and verbal forms of communication so they can see that the negotiation process as part of giving and receiving consent

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

- Purpose: explore how miscommunication factored into students' narrative completions for a story in which a male made a sexual advance, the woman refused, sex occurred later
- Methods:
  - Online survey taken by 252 students, 185 women and 80 men, in Canada and New Zealand
  - A scenario from The Sexual Discrepancy Resolution Measure was used as the narrative students completed (man made a sexual advance, woman refused, sex occurred later)
  - Inductive thematic analysis was used to analyze and code participant responses

- Results:
  - Three themes: (1) ambivalence; (2) coercion; and (3) "woman desired sex"
  - Ambivalence: theme embodied the fact that the woman was unsure about wanting to have sex, but eventually her ambivalence was resolved because sex occurred later; ambivalence was resolved by: increased non-sexual conversation, slow increase in intimacy, self-reflection, conservation about sex and relationship, increased sexual arousal, and alcohol consumption; none of these narratives included miscommunication
  - Coercion: theme embodied sexual intercourse initiated by the man and there was no indication that the woman reconsidered her willingness to engage in sex
  - "Woman desired sex": theme embodied a woman wanting sex at the beginning, but she said no for various reasons; the woman wanted to savor the moment; woman engaged in token resistance (saying "no" when she really wants to say "yes"); only 4 participants' narratives included token resistance which is one of the concepts of miscommunication theory
- Discussion:
  - Findings suggest that women can and do clearly state their refusals and that men do hear those refusals – consistent with previous research
  - Support against miscommunication theory

Hust, S. J. T., Marett, E. G., Ren, C., Adams, P. M., Willoughby, J. F., Lei, M., . . . Norman, C. (2014). Establishing and adhering to sexual consent: The association between reading

magazines and college students' sexual consent negotiation. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(3), 280-290.

- Purpose: determine whether magazine consumption was associated with college students' intentions to seek and negotiate consent to sexual activity

- Methods:
  - 313 students, 190 women and 123 men, completed an online survey
  - Measures: sexual consent-related behavior intentions (10 items rated on a 7-point scale measuring seeking sexual consent, refusing unwanted sexual activity, and adhering to partner's sexual consent); exposure to magazines (women's, men's, teen girl, lad, news); RMA using IRMA-SF

- Results:
  - Gender was not predictive of intentions to seek sexual consent; RMA was associated with lower intentions to seek sexual consent
  - Men's magazine consumption was associated with lower intentions to seek sexual consent; women's magazine consumption was not associated with seeking sexual consent
  - Being male was associated with lower intentions to refuse unwanted sex; RMA was associated with lower intentions to refuse unwanted sex
  - Women's magazine consumption was associated with higher intentions to refuse unwanted sex
  - Being male was associated with lower intentions to adhere to partner's consent; RMA was associated with lower intentions to adhere to partner's consent

- Men's magazine consumption was associated with lower intentions to adhere to partner's consent; women's magazine consumption was not associated with adherence to partner's consent

- Discussion:
  - Exposure to men's magazines is negatively associated with consent negotiation intentions; exposure to women's magazines was associated with positive intentions
  - "Given that teens rely heavily on the media's portrayal of issues related to sex as a source of information for these issues, concerns about the extent, the nature, and the effect of sexually oriented content on behaviors are well placed." – no references

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.

- Purpose: examine how college students define consent, communicate consent to a partner, and interpret consent from a partner
- Methods:
  - 185 students, 100 women and 85 men, completed a survey that contained 16 open-ended questions: definition of sexual consent; how you indicate consent and non-consent to a partner; how you interpret consent and non-consent from a partner; and consent for different behaviors

- o Responses were analyzed by looking for themes; coded by primary author and two other coders

- o Cohen's kappa for interrater reliability was strong; chi-square analyses were used to identify gender differences in themes

- Results:

  - o Men and women provided similar responses for definitions of sexual consent

  - o Participants indicated using more verbal cues to indicate both consent and non-consent

  - o Men were more likely to use non-verbal cues as compared to women to indicate consent and non-consent; women were more likely to use verbal cues to communicate consent

  - o Women reported no response more than men

  - o Participants indicated using non-verbal cues to interpret consent from a partner; a combination of non-verbal and verbal cues were used to interpret non-consent

  - o Men were more likely to assess non-verbal cues as consent; women reported using more verbal cues to interpret their partner's consent

  - o Men assessed non-verbal cues for non-consent; women used a combination of non-verbal and verbal cues to assess non-consent

  - o Non-verbal cues were reported more frequently for less intimate behaviors, with verbal cues being used for more intimate behaviors

- Discussion:

  - o Students define consent as being explicit, but they indicate using less explicit ways of communicating and interpreting consent

- o Verbal cues, non-verbal cues, a combination, and no response were the order in which consent and non-consent were indicate

- o Student may use non-verbal cues because culture endorses more non-verbal communication, verbalizing consent is uncomfortable (awkward or ruin the mood), and consent is assumed to implied unless a partner says "no"

- o Gender differences in consent communication may be present due to traditional gender scripts; men are initiators and women are gatekeepers

- o Possibility for miscommunication between men and women

- o Men may interpret silence or the absence of a "no" as consent

- o Students perceive more explicit consent is needed for more intimate behaviors

Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent? *International Journal of Sexual Health, 27*, 156–174.

- • Purpose: examine alcohol consumption's influence on college students' consent communication (ECS and ICS)

- • Methods:

  - o Survey administered to heterosexual 794 college student, 630 women and 164 men, measuring: RMA, alcohol expectancy, alcohol consumption prior to sexual intercourse, ECS, and ICS

  - o Multivariate HLM using ECS and ICS as outcomes

- • Results:

- o Men reported using direct non-verbal cues, initiator behaviors, and borderline pressure more as compared to women; no differences between men and women on the ICS

- o Participants in committed relationships reported higher ICS scores and use of non-verbal and passive consent cues

- o RMA was negatively associated with readiness and initiator behaviors

- o Participants with higher alcohol expectancy scores had higher ECS scores

- o Single participants who consumed alcohol prior to sexual intercourse reported lower scores for safety/comfort, readiness, direct non-verbal cues, and initiator behaviors

- Discussion:
  - o Participants who consumed alcohol prior to sexual intercourse scored differently on the ICS and ECS as compared to individuals who did not consume alcohol; relationships status and gender influenced these associations

  - o Single participants did not have stronger internal feelings associated with consent as compared to individuals in committed relationships

  - o Men reported using more ECS as compared to women; may be because of traditional sexual scripts with men being initiators and women being gatekeepers

  - o People in relationships may have stronger ICS feelings because they are more familiar with their partner

  - o Non-verbal consent cues were prominent among participants who had higher alcohol expectancies but did not consume alcohol; may be because they were more confident in their ability to communicate non-verbally while sober

- Consent-based programs that promote "just get consent" or "yes means yes" are neglecting alcohol's role in college culture and consent negotiation

Satinsky, S., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Female sexual subjectivity and verbal consent to receiving oral sex. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 41*(4), 413-426.

- Purpose: examining extent to which sexual desire and sexual pleasure predicts explicit verbal communication among women who received oral sex during their last sexual interaction
- Methods:
  - Online survey was administered to 237 heterosexual women
  - Measures: demographics; external consent scale (Jozkowksi, Sanders, et al., 2014); female sexual subjectivity inventory: entitlement to pleasure from self (EPS), entitlement to pleasure from partner (EPP), and self-efficacy in achieving sexual pleasure (SESP) (Horne & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2006)
  - Analyses: frequency counts; t-tests; ANOVA; regression
- Results:
  - ANOVAs: no significant difference in EPP and SESP based on rage, sexual orientation or relationship status
  - Regression: SESP partially mediated relationship between EPP and external consent communication; EPP fully mediated relationship between SESP and external consent communication
- Discussion:

72

- Increased sexual subjectivity is associated with likelihood of using explicit verbal communication when consenting to oral sex
- EPP predicted verbal consent as a function of increase SESP
- EPP worked through SESP to predict verbal consent
- Women's ability to explicitly consent to sexual behavior could translate into her ability to express her sexual desire more clearly; this could lead to better quality sexual encounters

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016B). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

- Purpose: examine if college students are interpreting consent cues in social settings; what cues are being perceived as consent; and when does consent cue perception occur
- Methods:
  - 1-on-1 interviews with 30 college students; 17 women and 13 men
  - Thematic analysis using "truth claims" done by both authors separately then discussed together
- Results:
  - All participants responded that they used 'outside the bedroom' cues to perceive sexual consent in social settings; foregrounded themes and backgrounded themes
  - Foregrounded themes: (1) "it's hard to say, but I know it when I see it" – conceptualization that these cues are vague and ambiguous, yet they are also obvious at the same time; (2) cues occur in the context of the social gathering – consent communication begins in a social environment via implicit, non-verbal

73

behaviors (eye contact, body language, touching, flirting, tone of voice, demeanor, text messaging); (3) cues are 'codes' or 'hidden messages' – cues aren't explicit, but rather encoded in implicit verbal and non-verbal behaviors

- o Backgrounded themes: (1) alcohol consumption as consent – extent of a person's alcohol consumption as a means to determine sexual consent – men said definitely implicit consent, women said could be consent or could be having fun; (2) going home with someone as consent – leaving a social setting to go to a private location implies sexual consent – men said definitely implies consent, women said it could be consent but that consent could be communicated in the future as well; (3) context of social gathering as consent – 'outside the bedroom' consent cues – men said these are definitely consent, women said it could or could not be consent

- Discussion:
  - o College students do perceive contextual cues as indicators of sexual consent ('outside the bedroom' cues)
  - o 'Outside the bedroom' cues are not consent, but college students are conceptualizing them as such
  - o Affirmative consent policies do not align with these ideals, and, thus, are inconsistent with cultural concepts and norms of consent among college students
  - o Affirmative consent policies that endorse enthusiastic consent promote sexual violence prevention, but could also improve quality of sexual activity

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:"*

Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles. Manuscript in preparation.

- Purpose: explore how college students conceptualize sexual consent communication

- Methods:

  o Study 1: 1-on-1 interviews with 30 college students, 17 women and 13 men; thematic analyses across participant responses

  o Study 2: open-ended survey elicitation created based on participant responses during interviews was administered to 218 college students, 73% women and 27% men; salient belief elicitation methodological approach; thematic analyses across participant responses

- Results:

  o Study 1: participants indicated using social media as part of consent negotiation: (1) contact someone to initiate a dialogue resulting in sexual activity and (2) draw assumptions about a person's willingness to engage in sexual activity

  o Participant responses reflected: women's profiles were assessed, not men's; pictures that were conceptualized as "sexy" or displayed "excessive amounts of cleavage, breasts, women's crotches, or women making pouty lips" means the woman is more likely to consent to sexual activity; women who drink alcohol and attend parties are more likely to consent to sexual activity; women in sororities are more likely to consent to sexual activity; mentions of religion on social media means the woman is less likely to consent to sexual activity; a woman's self-worth was link their social media profiles

  o Study 2: 68% of participants think you can determine someone's willingness to engage in sexual activity by looking at their social media profile; 48% think you can determine whether someone would consent to sexual activity by looking at

their social media profile; participants reported that sexy pictures and status updates, the person's physical appearance, the person's clothing, and the people the person spends their time with are characteristics used to determine whether a person would consent to sexual activity; participants reported that mentions of religion, conservative/modest pictures, and conservative/modest clothing were characteristics used to determine whether a person would not consent to sexual activity

- o Chi-square analyses revealed no difference in responses between men and women; and Greek and non-Greek members
- o Emerging themes: endorsement of sexual double standard – women's profiles were judged more often than men's; endorsement of rape myths – participants responses mirrored common rape myths pertaining a person's clothing, a person being sexual (pictures and posts), and drinking alcohol

- Discussion:
  - o Participants weren't directly asked about social media during interviews, but rather the responses occurred spontaneously
  - o Hypothesized that the process of sexual consent communication and interpretation is occurring even further removed (outside the bedroom) from the actual sexual activity
  - o Social media is another arena in which the sexual double standard and victim blaming can occur

- o SAPEs should be updated to include information relevant to social media as college students are indicating this medium as part of the consent negotiation process

Sexual Consent Measures

- Articles in this topic area discuss the development of scales to measure global consent communication, event level communication, external consent communication, internal consent feelings, intentions surrounding sexual consent, and alcohol's influence on sexual consent

- Articles primarily focus on consent among heterosexual individuals with few examining consent in same-sex relationships

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

- Purpose: analyze sexual consent behaviors among college students in same-sex relationships; scale development

- Methods:
  - o 257 college students, 130 WSW and 127 MSM, completed an online survey measuring: same-sex sexual consent; number of partners; relationship status
  - o Same-Sex Sexual Consent Scale: 26 items adapted from Hickman & Muehlenhard (1999); two variations: initiating sexual behavior with partner and responding to partner's initiation of sexual behavior; 5-point scale measuring frequency (never = 1 to always = 5)

- Results:
  - Participants reported using non-verbal cues more frequently than verbal cues when both initiating and responding
  - Initiating scale included 4 factors: (1) non-verbal behaviors including touch; (2) no resistance behaviors; (3) verbal behaviors; and (4) non-verbal behaviors not including touch; reliability coefficient 0.89
  - Responding scaled include 4 factors: (1) no resistance; (2) verbal behaviors; (3) non-verbal behaviors not including clothing; and (4) undressing; reliability coefficient 0.89
  - No gender differences found with the initiating scale
  - MSM reported using more non-verbal behaviors excluding undressing as compared to WSW
- Discussion:
  - MSM and WSW reported using non-verbal cues more often than verbal cues in initiating and responding; MSM are more likely to use non-verbal cues in responding; consistent with findings among heterosexuals
  - Sexual script theory does not account for males being initiators and women being gatekeepers in same-sex relationships; MSM and WSW may exhibit more similar behaviors in contrast to heterosexual individuals who subscribe to the traditional sexual scripts
  - MSM and WSW consent to sex by not doing anything to stop advance of partner (no response)

Humphreys, T., & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale—Revised:

Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47,* 420–428.

- Purpose: revise a previously created scale to reflect a theoretical framework and validate within a heterosexual college student population

- Methods:
  - Items from the Sexual Consent Scale were re-categorized according to the TPB; additional items were added to make sure each construct was adequately represented; 59 items in pool; 7-point scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 7)
  - 372 heterosexual college students in Canada, 269 women 103 men, answered the SCS-R items in addition to Hurlbert Index of Sexual Assertiveness and Sexual Sensation Seeking Scale for the purposes of construct validity
  - Test-retest reliability was conducted in a subset of the sample (n = 40) within a 5 week timeframe; internal consistency reliability was conducted on the scale as a whole and the subscales

- Results:
  - 59 items were reduced to 39 items loading in 5 factors: (1) lack of perceived behavioral control; (2) positive attitudes toward consent; (3) indirect consent behaviors; (4) sexual consent norms; (5) and awareness of consent
  - Internal consistency reliability was 0.87; test-retest indicated moderate to low reliability over time

- Discussion:

- SCS-R is an attitudinal scale measuring: (1) how much behavioral control individuals perceive they had over sexual consent negotiation; (2) favorable beliefs about establishing consent before sexual activity begins: and (3) beliefs about norms surrounding consent negotiation
- SCS-R would be used to facilitate learning discussions around consent, miscommunication, and sexual assault
- SCS-R would be used to examine normative scripts surrounding sexual consent

Ward, R. M., Matthews, M. R., Weiner, J., Hogan, K. M., & Popson, H. C. (2012). Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale: Development and validation. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 36*, 746–756.

- Purpose: create a measure of sexual consent that includes attitudes when alcohol is involved in sexual situations among college students
- Methods:
  - Alcohol and sexual consent scale was created by the authors; 12 items; 7-point scale (not at all agree = 1 to very much agree = 7)
  - Survey measures: alcohol and sexual consent scale, alcohol use, drinking and sexual intercourse behaviors, IRMAS, Sexual Assault Questionnaire, SES, sex role stereotyping; administered to 462 incoming freshmen, 60% women
- Results:
  - PCA using varimax rotation resulted in 2 factors: campus beliefs and myths and sexual assault programming messages; reliability coefficient for entire scale was 0.76 with factor reliability coefficients over 0.72

- Discussion:

  o Many casual sex experiences in college coincide with alcohol consumption; alcohol and sexual consent scale could be utilized in conjunction with SAPE programs to discuss the implications around alcohol and consent

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

- Purpose: develop a scale that measures how college students consent to sexual intercourse

- Methods:

  o Phase 1: open-ended item elicitation administered to college students (n = 185)

  o Phase 2: item writing and development based on the 17 themes that emerged from the elicitation; 111 items reduced down to 68 items; 4-point scale (no neutral)

  o Phase 3: quantitative items included on survey with IRMA-SF and TRSS; 685 students completed; EFA; Cronbach's alpha

- Results:

  o EFA resulted in a 5-factor solution: (1) initiator behaviors; (2) non-verbal signals; (3) passive behaviors; (4) verbal signals; and (5) removal behaviors; reliability coefficient for whole scale was 0.97 with subscales above 0.80

  o Women scored higher on non-verbal signals and passive behaviors; men scored higher on initiator behaviors and removal behaviors

  o Individuals in relationships had higher scores on non-verbal signals, passive behaviors, and initiator behaviors as compared to single individuals

81

- Discussion:
    - For the CSS, only two subscales included verbal consent signals which align with current SAPE programs; may be beneficial to teach students skills to increase verbal consent cues with negotiating sexual activity

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

- Purpose: create two scales that measure college student's internal feelings of consent (ICS) and their external consent (ECS) both at the event-level
- Methods:
    - Phase 1: open-ended item elicitation administered to college students (n = 185)
    - Phase 2: item writing and development; ICS based on the 11 themes that emerged from the elicitation, 78 items reduced down to 39 items; 4-point scale (no neutral); ECS based on 9 themes, 67 items reduced down to 20; dichotomous scale (yes/no)
    - Phase 3: quantitative items (ICS and ECS) included on survey with IRMA-SF and TRSS; 660 students completed, 448 women and 211 men; EFA; Cronbach's alpha
- Results:
    - EFA using varimax rotation: ICS retained 25 items on 5 factors; ECS retained 18 items on 5 factors
    - ICS: (1) physical, (2) safety/comfort, (3) arousal, (4) consent/want, and (5) readiness; reliability coefficient for entire scale was 0.95 with factor reliability

82

coefficients above 0.90; students in a relationship had higher ICS scores

compared to single students; single men had higher ICS scores compared to single

women; physical response did not produce significant differences

- o ECS: (1) nonverbal behaviors, (2) passive behavior, (3) communication/initiator

  behavior, (4) borderline pressure, and (5) no response signals; reliability

  coefficient for entire scale was 0.84 with factor reliability coefficients above 0.67;

  men had higher ECS scores as compared with women; students in relationships

  had higher ECS scores compared to single students; men had higher borderline

  pressure scores as compared to women; women had higher ECS scores on passive

  behaviors and d signals as compared to men; single men had higher ECS scores as

  compared to men in a relationship; women in a relationship had higher ECS

  scores as compared to single women

- Discussion:

  - o SAPE programs do not include the contextual, situational, and relational factors

    when discussing consent

  - o ICS and ECS can be used to understand some of the under-explored components

    of sexual consent

References

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problem, 53*(4), 483-499.

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A. (2014). Rethinking the concept of consent for anti-sexual violence activism and education. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*(3), 373-389.

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York: New York University Press.

Burkett, M., & Hamilton, K. (2012). Postfeminist sexual agency: Young women's negotiations of sexual consent. *Sexualities, 15*(7), 815-833.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.

DeSantis, A. (2007). *Inside Greek U: Fraternities, sororities, and the pursuit of pleasure, power, and prestige*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 161-176.

Graham, K., Bernards, S., Osgood, D. W., Abbey, A., Parks, M., Flynn, A., . . . Wells, S. (2014). "Blurred lines?" Sexual aggression and barroom culture. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 38*(5), 1416-1424.

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/consent1.htm

Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society, 23*(5), 589-616.

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

Humphreys, T., & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale—Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47,* 420–428.

Hust, S. J. T., Marett, E. G., Ren, C., Adams, P. M., Willoughby, J. F., Lei, M., . . . Norman, C. (2014). Establishing and adhering to sexual consent: The association between reading magazines and college students' sexual consent negotiation. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(3), 280-290.

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523.

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Beyond the dyad: An assessment of sexual assault prevention education focused on social determinants of sexual assault among college students. *Violence Against Women, 21*(7), 848-874.

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). "Yes means yes?" Sexual consent policy and college students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 47*(2), 16-23.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Humphreys, T. P. (2014). Sexual consent on college campuses: Implication for sexual assault prevention education. *Health Education Monograph, 31*(2), 30-36.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016A). *'Who wants a quitter? . . . so you just keep trying': Gendered perspectives of college students' perceptions of sexual consent*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016B). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

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.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent? *International Journal of Sexual Health, 27*, 156–174.

Macur, J., & Schweber, N. (2012, December 16). Rape case unfolds on web and splits city. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/17/sports/high-school-football-rape-case-unfolds-online-and-divides-steubenville-ohio.html

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 872-879.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Quackenbush, D. M. (1996). *The social meaning of women's condom use: The sexual double standard and women's beliefs about the meaning ascribed to condom use*. Unpublished manuscript.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Rodgers, C. S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspectives on an old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 443-463.

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11/12), 359-375.

O'Byrne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). "If a girl doesn't say 'no' ...": Young men, rape and claims of "insufficient knowledge." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 168–193.

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.

Osman, S. L. (1995, April). *Predispositional and situations factors influencing men's perceptions of date rape*. Paper presented at the Eastern Regional Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Atlantic City, NJ.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

Sanday, P. R. (1996). Rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures. *Violence Against Women, 2*(2), 191-208.

Satinsky, S., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Female sexual subjectivity and verbal consent to receiving oral sex. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 41*(4), 413-426.

Senn, C. Y. (2011). An imperfect feminist journey: Reflections on the process to develop an effective sexual assault resistance programme for university women. *Feminism & Psychology, 21*(1), 121-137.

Ward, R. M., Matthews, M. R., Weiner, J., Hogan, K. M., & Popson, H. C. (2012). Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale: Development and validation. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 36*, 746–756.

Wiederman, M. W. (2005). The gendered nature of sexual scripts. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 13*(4), 496-502.

III. Methods

Participants

Eligibility criteria for the study included being currently enrolled in college courses, being at least 18 years of age, having access to the Internet, and being a current or former user of at least one social media platform (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or Snapchat). College students were recruited via email listserv, campus announcements, classrooms, social media, and word-of-mouth. When recruiting students via classrooms, introductory courses (e.g. health, sociology, human development, psychology) were selected because those courses typically have more diverse sets of students in terms of age, class standing, and gender. Monetary gift cards and extra credit points awarded in respective college courses were offered as compensation for participation in the study. Course instructors who offered extra credit to students for participation in the study were advised to offer an alternative extra credit assignment as participation in the study was completely voluntary.

Scale Development

A multi-phase approach was utilized to develop and validate both the Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) and the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR). Phase 1 consisted of item writing and mixed-methods pilot-testing for both measures. Phase 2 constituted additional pilot-testing resulting in scale refinement and quantitative assessments of the measures. In Phase 3, the measures were administered to a larger sample of college students in order to psychometrically assess the reliability and validity of the newly developed scales. The procedures for each phase are described in more detail below.

Phase 1: Item Writing and Pilot-testing

The purpose of Phase 1 was to develop comprehensive item pools for both measures based on the results of previous formative qualitative research (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016) and previously validated consent scales (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014). These items were then pilot-tested using a mixed-methods approach that included administration of an online survey and focus groups.

Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) item writing. The SMCMS was intended to measure endorsement of the belief that sexual consent can be determined by looking at a person's social media profile. The initial item pool for the SMCMS was created based on qualitative themes that emerged from two consent studies conducted with college students (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Items were derived from the categorical codes in the coding manuals of both studies (see Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016 and Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016 for detailed codebooks). Findings from Jozkowski and Hunt (2016) and Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) suggested college students may have differing beliefs about content found on a woman's social media profile compared to a man's profile. This is because participants in both studies almost exclusively provided responses describing content found on *women's* social media profiles, not men's profiles, even though researchers did not prompt participants to provide gender-specific responses. In other words, both college men and women were not explicitly questioned about their beliefs regarding women's or men's social media profiles specifically, although some participants, nevertheless, provided responses that directly described women's profiles.

Based on these previous findings, it was hypothesized that participant beliefs would differ based on the gender of the social media profile owner (woman's profile vs. man's profile). Thus, gender-matched pairs of items describing content found on women's and men's social media profiles were created resulting in two sets of items. The first set of items exclusively describes women's social media profiles and the second set exclusively describes men's social media profiles. For example, the item *"Things a <u>woman</u> posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity"* belongs to the women's set of items and the matching item *"Things a <u>man</u> posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity"* belongs within the men's set. To create less confusion as participants were completing the measure, the following instructions were provided:

> "*The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participant in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat). Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements*."

The directions for the men's set of items were identical with the exception of stating "thinking about men in general" rather than "women."

The initial SMCMS item pool consisted of 136 items total, with 68 items each belonging to the women's and men's sets of items separately. These items constituted three hypothesized factors within each set of items. Responses for the SMCMS ranged along a five-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Higher scores are indicative of stronger endorsement of the belief that consent can be interpreted by looking at the contents of person's social media profile.

External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) item writing. The ECSR was intended to measure how people communicate their sexual consent to a potential sexual partner. To create

the initial item pool, 29 items from the Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale (PCSS; Jozkowski &

Peterson, 2014), 13 items from Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale, 6 from the original

External Consent Scale (ECS; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014), and 2 from the Same-Sex Sexual

Consent Scale (Beres et al., 2004) were adapted for use in the ECSR item pool. New items for

the initial pool were written based on findings from formative qualitative consent studies (Beres,

2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). The newly developed items

intended to measure consent behaviors within social settings, such as parties or bars (Beres,

2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016), texting behaviors (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016), and social media

usage (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Similarly to the PCSS, the response choices for the ECSR

ranged on a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." After combining

the adapted items with the newly developed items, the item pool for the ECSR was comprised of

122 items.

As mentioned previously, the intention of creating the ECSR was to develop a measure

that reflected how college students conceptualize sexual consent. Consent research suggests

college students conceptualize consent as a process that potentially begins in social settings

(Beres, 2010; Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; O'Bryne et al., 2008). There was a

need for the scale to differentiate between consent cues that occur in the moments right before

sexual behavior begins and consent cues that occur within a social environment (e.g. party or

bar) or lacking face-to-face interaction (e.g. texting or social media). Thus, the ECSR items in

the initial pool were categorized as either: (1) "inside the bedroom" cues or (2) "outside the

bedroom" cues. "Inside the bedroom" cues are "cues that occur in the specific moments leading

up to when sex may or may not occur" (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016, p. 4), whereas, "outside the

bedroom" cues are cues that occur in social environments (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Lead in

phrases were created to ensure participants interpreted ECSR items as intended. The set of items

belonging to the "inside the bedroom" cues had the lead in phrase "*in the moments right before*

sexual activity." For example, "inside the bedroom" items read "*In the moments right before*

sexual activity . . . I would ask my partner if it is okay to engage in sexual activity" or "*In the*

moments right before sexual activity . . . I would look at my partner in a sexy way." Similar lead

in phrases were created for the "outside the bedroom" items and social media items. "Outside the

bedroom" items used the phrase "*in a social setting like a party or bar*" and social media items

used the phrase "*on social media.*" Examples of these items are "*In a social setting like a party*

or bar . . . I would ask my partner if they want to go back to my place" and "*On social media . . .*

I would 'like' my partner's pictures."

The ECSR was further dichotomized to include Initiation and Response scales. Currently,

there is a single scale that assesses how college students would typically response to a potential

partner's initiation of sexual behavior, therefore, the Initiation and Response scales were created

similarly to Beres and colleagues (2004). This was achieved by duplicating the initial item pool

of 122 items which resulted in a new total of 244 items between the Initiation and Responses

scales that both contained "inside the bedroom" and "outside the bedroom" items. To distinguish

between the Initiation and Response scales, the following directions were provided to

participants as they completed the Initiation scale:

> "*People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a*
> *variety of ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements to*
> *answer the question: 'How would you <u>initiate</u> penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual*
> *stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent*
> *or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?'*"

The instructions for the Response scale were similar except participants responded to the items

based on the question "*How would you <u>respond to a potential partner initiating</u> penetrative sex,*

oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?" Additionally, most previously validated consent scales instruct students to respond regarding how they typically consent to vaginal-penile intercourse; however, the ECSR allows participants to respond based on other sexual behaviors so as to be inclusive of more populations (e.g., non-heterosexual individuals, adolescents).

In addition to developing and structuring the ECSR to reflect previous consent research, two questions were created to accompany the Initiation and Response scales. Previous consent research has identified that the sexual behavior being consented to (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson, et al., 2014) and the partners' relationship status (Beres et al., 2014; Foubert, Garner, & Thaxter, 2006; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014) can impact how people communicate their sexual consent. Thus, a question regarding the sexual behaviors participants engaged in during their most recent consensual sexual experience and a question regarding the participant's relationship status with their most recent sexual partner were presented after both Initiation and Response scales.

Mixed-methods pilot-testing and procedures. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was received prior to collecting data for this study (Appendix A). The SMCMS and ECSR item pools, general demographics (e.g., gender, age, race/ethnicity), and sexual behavior and relationship status questions were administered to participants via Qualtrics online survey software (see Appendix B for the Phase 1 survey). Completion of the survey took anywhere between 20 and 30 minutes. For the SMCMS, the sets of women's and men's items were randomized (women's set then men's set or men's set then women's set) in order to address any bias or ordering effects as participants completed those items. At the end of the survey, students were given the opportunity to participant in a one hour focus group to provide feedback on the

93

wording, clarity, and interpretation of the newly developed SMCMS and ECSR items. Focus group participants were required to complete an informed consent form prior to their participation in the groups (Appendix C). A semi-structured focus group script was created to address general questions regarding the items; however, the script allowed for participants to guide the discussion about specific problematic or confusing items (Appendix D). Each focus group session was audio recorded for the purposes of identifying feedback that was common across all sessions. Focus group participants were compensated with a $10 gift card for their time.

Participant feedback received during the focus groups led to substantial modifications of the ECSR. Students reported having difficulty completing the ECSR because it instructed them to respond with how they typically communicated their consent to a potential partner (global measure). More specifically, participants indicated their responses to the ECSR differ according to their relationship status with their potential partner (e.g., romantic relationship partner vs. hook-up partner). For example, participants who were in long-term committed relationships reported "outside the bedroom" items, such as "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would ask my partner for their phone number*" and "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would go home with my partner at the end of the night*" were not applicable to how they typically communicate sexual consent to their current relationship partner, but were applicable to how they typically communicated their consent to a partner they had just met.

Based on this focus group feedback, the ECSR items modified to create an event-level scale that measures how students communicated sexual consent to their partner the last time they engaged in consensual sexual activity. Thus, the study ultimately became a redevelopment of the External Consent Scale. The new directions for the ECSR read:

94

"People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?"

Although the Initiation and Response scales were previously created, focus group participants reported having difficulty in recalling how their partner initiated sexual behavior and ultimately how they responded to their partner's initiation so the distinction between initiating and responding was eliminated from the ECSR. The resulting ECSR item pool contained the original 122 items comprising two scales ("Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales). All items were reworded to make each item past tense as the modified ECSR instructed participants to reflect on a specific past sexual experience. Conceptually, having a 5-point Likert scale with response choices, such as "strongly disagree" or "strongly agree," no longer made sense when the ECSR was modified into an event-level consent measure. Therefore, the response options became binary ("yes" and "no") because participants were reporting what behaviors they did ("yes") and did not ("no") use to communicate their consent the last time they engaged in consensual sexual activity. The two previous sexual experience questions regarding sexual behaviors and relationship status were retained, but were presented prior to the ECSR items. These items will be subsequently referred to as "previous sexual experience' questions.

Participant characteristics. As shown in Table 1, most participants ($N = 104$) who completed the online survey in the initial phase of item evaluation were female ($n = 66$, 64%). Most participants identified as White ($n = 79$, 76%), were between the ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 74$, 84%), and heterosexual ($n = 86$, 83%). Relationship status was evenly spread among those who were single and not dating ($n = 36$, 35%), single and casually dating ($n = 26$, 25%), and in a relationship ($n = 33$, 32%).

The subset of participants ($N = 10$) who volunteered for the focus groups to provide

qualitative feedback on the newly developed items were evenly split in terms of gender (*n* male =

5, *n* female = 5). Most focus group participants were White (*n* = 5); however, there were Black

(*n* = 4) and Hispanic (*n* = 1) participants as well. The majority of participants were between the

ages 18 and 25 (*n* = 9) and identified they were single and not dating (*n* = 7) as their relationship

status. All participants in the focus groups identified as heterosexual (*n* = 10). See Table 1 for all

focus group participant demographics.

Analyses. Separate analyses were conducted with both the SMCMS and ECSR items.

Prior to quantitative analyses, participant responses were checked for rapid submission, and any

responses that were completed in less than 10 minutes were removed from the sample.

Social Media Consent Myths Scale. Quantitative analyses were conducted using SPSS

version 23. Scree plots were utilized to identify the number of factors appropriate to fit these

data. Principle components analysis (PCA) using a direct oblimin rotation was conducted

because it was hypothesized that the factors would be correlated with each other. PCA results

were used to identify problematic items so as to subsequently remove them from the item pool.

External Consent Scale – Revised. Focus group feedback and frequency counts were

utilized to identify problematic items needing to be removed from the item pool.

Phase 2: Additional Pilot-testing

The purpose of Phase 2 was to conduct additional pilot-testing on the reduced item pools

for the SMCMS and ECSR. A new sample of college students were recruited to complete an

online survey (see Appendix E) containing the reduced SMCMS and ECSR item pools,

demographics, and "previous sexual experience" questions. Similar to Phase 1, participants were

provide the same set of instructions for the women's and men's sets of items in SMCMS, and the

sets were randomized to address any order effects or answering bias. Completion time for the survey was estimated to be between 15 and 25 minutes. Focus groups were not included during this phase of data collection, but rather, qualitative feedback on the items was elicited from a panel sexual consent experts ($N = 4$).

Participant characteristics. The majority of participants in Phase 2 ($N = 75$) were female ($n = 44$, 59%), White ($n = 59$, 79%), between the ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 73$, 97%), and heterosexual ($n = 72$, 96%). A little over half of the participants indicated they were in a relationship ($n = 40$, 53%) for their relationship status. Table 1 includes all demographic information for these participants.

Analyses. Similar to the initial phase of data collection, analyses were conducted separately with the SMCMS and ECSR.

Social Media Consent Myths Scale. Scree plots and principle components analyses (PCA) were conducted on the reduced SMCMS item pool. Scree plots identified the best factor structure to fit the items, whereas, PCA was utilized to further to reduce the item pool by eliminating problematic items.

External Consent Scale – Revised. Frequency counts were conducted using ECSR items in order to identify items that had extreme polar responses, meaning all or most participants either answered "yes" or either answered "no." When these items were identified, they were reviewed and a determination about whether the items should be retained or eliminated were made.

Phase 3: Reliability and Validity Assessments

The purpose of the final phase of data collection was to assess how the SMCMS and ECSR items functioned within a larger sample of college students and to psychometrically assess the reliability and validity of the newly developed scales.

Participant characteristics and procedures. A new, larger sample of college students ($N = 695$) participated in the final phase of data collection; however, the final analytic samples used to assess the SMCMS ($N = 397$) and ECSR ($N = 593$) differed in size. Table 1 presents the participant demographics for each of the samples separately. Table 2 includes the results of the "previous sexual experiences" questions that corresponded with the ECSR. As in both previous phases, participants completed an online survey (see Appendix F) containing demographics, SMCMS items, ECSR items, "previous sexual experience" questions, and additional scales and items detailed in the section below. The survey had an estimated completion time between 30 and 40 minutes.

Instrument. The survey instrument for Phase 3 included: (1) demographic items; (2) items regarding sexual behaviors; (3) the revised and shortened version of Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS); (4) "previous sexual experience" questions; (5) the revised version of the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR); (6) the Internal Consent Scale (ICS; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014); (7) the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Short Form (IRMA–SF; Payne et al., 1999); (8) the Sexual Double Standard Scale (SDSS; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996); (9) the Token Resistance to Sex Scale (TRSS; Osman, 1995); and (10) the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI; Worthington et al., 2012).

Sexual behaviors. Items measuring engagement and frequency of sexual behaviors were adapted from the National Survey of Sexual Health and Behavior (NSSHB; Herbenick et al.,

2010). Participants were asked to report the last time they engaged in 12 different sexual

behaviors (i.e. kissing, receiving oral sex, vaginal-penile intercourse). Response choices included

"past 30 days," "past 90 days," "in the last year," "in your lifetime," and "never."

Internal Consent Scale (ICS). Muehlenhard (1995/1996) theorized that sexual consent

includes both an internal feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity and an external

expression via words and/or behaviors of willingness to engage in sexual behavior. The ICS,

developed by Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014), examines the internal

feelings participants experienced when they consented to consensual vaginal-penile intercourse

(e.g., safe, comfortable, ready). The ICS is an event-level measure that contains 25 items with

responses ranging on a 4-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Short Form (IRMA–SF). Rape myths were

previously defined by Burt (1980) as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape

victims, and rapists" (p. 217). The IRMA-SF was developed by Payne and colleagues (1999) to

measure an individual's endorsement of rape myths. The scale includes 20 total items with 17

measuring endorsement of rape myths and three serving as "filler" items that are excluded in

data analyses. Payne and colleagues reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 demonstrating high

internal consistency reliability for the scale. Responses for the items are on a 7-point Likert-type

scale ranging from "not at all agree" to "very much agree." The IRMA-SF was included in the

survey for the purpose of providing support for the construct validity of the SMCMS.

Sexual Double Standard Scale (SDSS). The SDSS was created by Muehlenhard and

Quackenbush (1996) to measure an individual's endorsement of the sexual double standard (i.e.

the concept that men have more sexual freedom compared to women). The scale contains 26

items on a 4-point, Likert-type scale with responses ranging from "disagree strongly" to "agree

99

strongly." Six items are written to serve as direct comparisons between the behavior of men and women with the other 20 items written in parallel forms describing either men's or women's behaviors. Previous studies have found adequate internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alphas ranging between 0.57 and 0.80 for men's, women's and comparison items (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Boone & Lefkowitz, 2004; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996). Similar to the IRMA-SF, the SDSS was utilized for the purpose of providing support for the construct validity of the SMCMS.

Token Resistance to Sex Scale (TRSS). Token resistance is the belief that women say "no" to sexual activity even though they want to say "yes" and have full intentions of consenting to the activity (Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988). The TRSS (Osman, 1995) measures the extent to which an individual endorses the concept of token resistance. The scale is comprised of 8 items with response choices on a 7-point, Likert-type scale with answers ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The TRSS has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alphas ranging between 0.83 and 0.87 (Osman, 1995).

Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI). The RCI-10, created by Worthington and colleagues (2003), measures both intra- and inter-personal religious commitment. The scale includes 10 items with responses on a 5-point, Likert-type scale with choices ranging from "not at all true of me" to "totally true of me." The measure has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.93 (Worthington et al., 2003).

Analyses. Separate analyses were conducted using the corresponding analytics samples for both the SMCMS and ECSR.

Social Media Consent Myths Scale. The analyses conducted with the SMCMS included: (1) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Barlett's test of sphericity;

(2) scree plots; (3) exploratory factor analysis; (4) Cronbach's alpha; (5) paired samples *t*-test; (6) independent samples *t*-tests; and (7) correlations. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Barlett's test of sphericity were conducted to determine if the sample size for this phase was sufficiently large and if equal variances were assumed across the sample to ensure the appropriateness of conducting a factor analysis on the SMCMS data. As in previous phases, scree plots served to identify the best number of factors to fit the data. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) conducted using Principle Axis Factoring with a direct oblimin rotation was used to examine factor loadings and identify any additional items that should be removed from the SMCMS. Internal consistency reliability of the SMCMS was determined by conducting Cronbach's alphas on the SMCMS women's and men's sets of items and each SMCMS factor. Both the paired samples t-test and independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess whether differences in SMCMS scores emerged. Lastly, Pearson correlations were conducted among the SMCMS women's and men's sets of items, individual SMCMS factors, the IRMA–SF, and the SDSS to assess the construct validity of the newly developed scale.

External Consent Scale – Revised. The analyses corresponding to the ECSR included: (1) frequency counts; (2) correlations; (3) two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs); (4) Cohen's kappa; and (5) Kuder Richardson Formula 20 (KR20). Frequency counts were conducted on the ECSR by gender and relationship status. Pearson correlations were utilized to assess the relationship between the ECSR scales and factors. Two-way MANOVAs were conducted on the "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales separately to examine whether differences in consent cue use were present according to participant gender and relationship status with their partner. Cohen's kappa was conducted to establish the inter-rater

reliability for both "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales. Lastly, KR20 was utilized to examine the internal consistency reliability of the ECSR and corresponding factors.

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics for Participants across all Three Phases*

Characteristic	Phase 1 All n (%)	Phase 1 Focus Group n (%)	Phase 2 n (%)	Phase 3 SMCMS n (%)	Phase 3 ECSR n (%)
N	104	10	75	397	593
Gender					
Male	38 (36.5)	5 (50.0)	31 (41.3)	153 (38.5)	132 (22.3)
Female	66 (63.5)	5 (50.0)	44 (58.7)	244 (61.5)	461 (77.7)
Age (Mean)	22.5	22.6	21.0	21.3	21.1
Race/Ethnicity					
White	79 (76.0)	5 (50.0)	59 (78.7)	324 (81.6)	481 (81.5)
Black/African American	11 (10.6)	4 (40.0)	7 (9.3)	28 (7.1)	40 (6.8)
Hispanic/Latino	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	5 (6.7)	20 (5.1)	29 (4.9)
N. American/A. Indian	1 (1.0)	-	-	6 (1.5)	8 (1.4)
Asian/Asian American	6 (5.8)	-	2 (2.7)	12 (3.0)	18 (3.1)
Bi- or Multi-racial	5 (4.8)	-	2 (2.7)	6 (1.5)	14 (2.4)
Sexual Orientation					
Heterosexual	86 (82.7)	10 (100)	72 (96.0)	365 (92.6)	545 (92.5)
Gay/Lesbian	3 (2.9)	-	2 (2.7)	13 (3.3)	16 (2.7)
Bisexual	10 (9.6)	-	1 (1.3)	10 (2.5)	18 (3.1)
Unsure	3 (2.9)	-	-	2 (0.5)	5 (0.8)
Queer	1 (1.0)	-	-	2 (0.5)	3 (0.5)
Other	1 (1.0)	-	-	2 (0.5)	2 (0.3)
Relationship Status					
Single, not dating	36 (34.6)	7 (70.0)	35 (46.7)	133 (33.6)	161 (27.2)
Single, casually dating	26 (25.0)	-	14 (18.7)	72 (18.2)	120 (20.3)
In a relationship	33 (31.7)	2 (20.0)	40 (53.3)	170 (42.9)	277 (46.8)
Married	8 (7.7)	1 (10.0)	-	17 (4.3)	25 (4.2)
Divorced	-	-	-	1 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
Other	1 (1.0)	-	-	3 (0.8)	8 (1.4)
Sexual Relationship Status					
Exclusive/monogamous	47 (45.2)	3 (30.0)	35 (46.7)	187 (47.1)	312 (52.6)
Non-monogamous	9 (8.7)	-	2 (2.7)	11 (2.8)	19 (3.2)
Casual sexual encounter	14 (13.5)	1 (10.0)	8 (10.7)	50 (12.6)	78 (13.2)
Not having sex currently	34 (32.7)	6 (60.0)	30 (40.0)	149 (37.5)	180 (31.0)
Class Standing					
Freshmen	14 (13.5)	1 (10.0)	6 (8.0)	50 (12.6)	66 (11.1)
Sophomore	26 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	15 (20.0)	143 (36.0)	214 (36.1)
Junior	13 (12.5)	1 (10.0)	39 (52.0)	109 (27.5)	175 (29.5)
Senior	41 (39.4)	4 (40.0)	15 (20.0)	83 (20.9)	127 (21.4)
Graduate student	10 (9.6)	2 (20.0)	-	12 (3.0)	11 (1.9)

(Continued)

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics for Participants across all Three Phases (Cont.)*

Characteristic	Phase 1 All n (%)	Phase 1 Focus Group n (%)	Phase 2 n (%)	Phase 3 SMCMS n (%)	Phase 3 ECSR n (%)
Greek Membership					
Yes	26 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	32 (42.7)	153 (38.5)	271 (45.7)
No	78 (75.0)	8 (80.0)	43 (57.3)	244 (61.5)	322 (54.3)
Social Media Use					
Current user	75 (72.1)	8 (80.0)	56 (74.7)	388 (98.0)	578 (97.8)
Former user	29 (27.9)	2 (20.0)	19 (25.3)	7 (1.8)	10 (1.7)
Religious Service Attendance					
Once or more a week	21 (20.2)	2 (20.0)	33 (44.0)	94 (23.7)	146 (24.6)
2 – 3 times per month	17 (16.3)	3 (30.0)	12 (16.0)	81 (20.4)	124 (20.9)
Once a month	8 (7.7)	-	8 (10.7)	48 (12.1)	67 (11.3)
Few times per year	33 (31.7)	2 (20.0)	14 (18.7)	120 (30.2)	175 (29.5)
Never	25 (24.0)	3 (30.0)	8 (10.7)	54 (13.6)	81 (13.7)

Table 2. *Characteristics of Previous Sexual Experience*

Characteristic	n (%)
N	593
Behaviors	
Performative manual stimulation	525 (88.5)
Receptive manual stimulation	526 (88.7)
Performative oral sex	381 (64.2)
Receptive oral sex	358 (60.4)
Vaginal-penile penetration	419 (70.7)
Vaginal-dildo penetration	17 (2.9)
Anal-penile penetration	29 (4.9)
Anal-dildo penetration	3 (0.5)
Relationship Status with Partner	
Romantic relationship	369 (62.4)
Sexual relationship	89 (15.1)
Casually dating	64 (10.8)
One-time sexual experience	56 (9.5)
Other	13 (2.2)
Partner's Gender	
Male	453 (76.6)
Female	136 (23.0)
Transgender	-
Other	2 (0.3)
Initiation	
I initiated the sexual activity	65 (11.0)
My partner initiated sexual activity	212 (35.9)
My partner and I mutually initiated sexual activity	272 (46.0)
I don't know/don't remember who initiated sexual activity	42 (7.1)

References

Bay-Cheng, L. Y., & Zucker, A. (2007). Feminism between the sheets: Sexual attitudes among feminists, nonfeminists, and egalitarians. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 157-163.

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

Boone, T. L., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2004). Safer sex and the health belief model: Considering the contributions of peer norms and socialization factors. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 16*, 51-68.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.

Foubert, J. D., Garner, D. N., & Thaxter, P. J. (2006). An exploration of fraternity culture: Implications for programs to address alcohol-related sexual assault. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 361-373.

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/ consent1.htm

Herbernick, D., Reece, M., Schick, V., Sanders, S. A., Dodge, B., & Fortenberry, D. (2010). Sexual behavior in the United States: Results from a national probability sample of men and women ages 14-94. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 7*(5), 255-265.

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

106

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

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.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Muehlenhard, C. L. (1995/1996). The complexities of sexual consent. *SIECUS Report, 24*, 4-7.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 872-879.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Quackenbush, D. M. (1996). *The social meaning of women's condom use: The sexual double standard and women's beliefs about the meaning ascribed to condom use*. Unpublished manuscript.

O'Bryne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). 'If a girl doesn't say "no" . . .': Young men, rape and claims of 'insufficient knowledge.' *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 168-193.

Osman, S. L. (1995, April). *Predispositional and situations factors influencing men's perceptions of date rape*. Paper presented at the Eastern Regional Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Atlantic City, NJ.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

Worthington, E. L., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J. W., . . . Bursley, K. H. (2003). The Religious Commitment Inventory – 10: Development, refinement, and validation of a belief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(1), 84-96.

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF
ARKANSAS

October 15, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kelley Rhoads
                       Sasha Canan
                       Mary Hunt
                       Kristen Jozkowski

FROM: Ro Windwalker
                       IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #:   15-09-169

Protocol Title: *Social Media and Outside the Bedroom Sexual Consent*

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT   ☐ EXPEDITED   ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 10/14/2015 Expiration Date: 10/13/2016

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rscp/index.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 110 participants. If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

Phase 1 Online Survey

Directions: Please select the response choice that most accurately describes you. Please answer honestly and completely.

What is your gender?
○ Male
○ Female
○ Transgender
○ Another gender, please specify: _____

What is your age in years?

How would you describe your race/ethnicity?
○ White, non-Hispanic
○ Black or African American
○ Latino or Hispanic
○ Native American or American Indian
○ Asian or Asian American
○ Middle Eastern or Middle Eastern American
○ Bi- or Multi-racial

How would you describe your sexual orientation?
○ Heterosexual/straight
○ Gay/lesbian
○ Bisexual
○ Unsure/questioning
○ Queer
○ Another orientation. Please describe: _____

How would you describe your current relationship status?
○ Single and not dating
○ Single, but casually seeing someone/hanging out with someone
○ In a relationship
○ Married
○ Divorced
○ Widowed
○ Another relationship status. Please describe: _____

I am currently . . .
- ❍ In an exclusive/monogamous sexual relationship (that is, we only have sex with each other)
- ❍ In a non-exclusive/non-monogamous relationship(s) (that is, you have a primary partner and one or both of you has sex with other partners)
- ❍ Engaging in mainly casual sexual encounters (i.e. hooking up)
- ❍ Not engaging in sexual activity right now

When I want to engage in partnered sexual activity, . . .
- ❍ I typically initiate sexual behaviors with my partner
- ❍ I typically let my partner initiate sexual behaviors with me
- ❍ My partner and I equally initiate sexual behaviors each other

Are you familiar with social networking websites, such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instragram?
- ❍ Yes, I have used at least one of those social networking websites in the past.
- ❍ Yes, I am currently using at least one of those social networking websites.
- ❍ Yes, I have seen at least one of those social networking websites, but I do not use any.
- ❍ No, I have never used one of those social networking websites and never have seen one.

What is your current class standing?
- ❍ Freshmen
- ❍ Sophomore
- ❍ Junior
- ❍ Senior
- ❍ I'm not a student

Are you currently a member of a Greek organization (i.e. sorority, fraternity)?
- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No
- ❍ I'm not a student

How would you describe the area where you spent most of your childhood?
- ❍ Rural (small towns or cities isolated from larger areas or farming communities)
- ❍ Suburban (community near a bigger city, often part of a metropolitan region)
- ❍ Urban (big city – i.e., Austin, Little Rock, Memphis, Tulsa)
- ❍ Megalopolis (extra-large city with an especially diverse population – i.e., New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles)

How often do you attend religious services?
- ❍ Once a week or more
- ❍ 2-3 times per month
- ❍ Once a month
- ❍ A few times per year
- ❍ Never

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram). Please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Pictures a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the pictures she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Status updates a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the status updates she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Comments a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the comments she posts on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's physical appearance on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her physical appearance on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's attractiveness on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her physical attractiveness on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures wearing skimpy clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's interests on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her interests on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Things a woman "likes" on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things she "likes" on social media.	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Language a woman uses on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her language on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The type of friends a woman has on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the type of friends she has on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Who a woman spends her time with on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at who she spends her time with on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman's relationship status on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram). Please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her relationship status on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures that show their cleavage on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's religious affiliation on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her religious affiliation on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures of themselves making pouty lips on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her use of religious words on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's Greek sorority affiliation on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her Greek sorority affiliation on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious things on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's personality characteristics on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her personality characteristics on social media.	○	○	○	○	○

Women who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures wearing appropriate clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who have "single" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who have "it's complicated" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who have "in a relationship" as their relationship status on social media	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

are more likely to consent to sexual activity.					
Women who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures showing their Greek sorority on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post status updates about their Greek sorority on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post comments about their Greek sorority on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post status updates about "being lonely" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Who were you primarily thinking about when you completed the previous questions?
- ❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
- ❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
- ❍ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ❍ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
- ❍ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
- ❍ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ❍ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
- ❍ Someone I consider a close friend
- ❍ Someone I consider a friend
- ❍ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
- ❍ Someone I have been around only a few times
- ❍ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
- ❍ Other, please describe: _____

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram). Please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Pictures a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the pictures he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Status updates a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the status updates he posts on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Comments a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the comments he posts on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's physical appearance on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his physical appearance on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's attractiveness on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his physical attractiveness on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing no shirt on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's interests on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his interests on social media.	○	○	○	○	○

Men who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Things a man "likes" on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things he "likes" on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Language a man uses on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his language on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
The type of friends a man has on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the type of friends he has on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Who a man spends his time with on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at who he spends his time with on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

120

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
A man's relationship status on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram). Please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his relationship status on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures that show their abs on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's religious affiliation on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his religious affiliation on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves flexing their arms on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his use of religious words on social media.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's Greek fraternity affiliation on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his Greek fraternity affiliation on social media.	○	○	○	○	○

Men who post religious things on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man's personality characteristics on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his personality characteristics on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures wearing appropriate clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Men who have "single" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who have "it's complicated" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
60. Men who have "in a relationship" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures showing their Greek fraternity on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post status updates about their Greek fraternity on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post comments about their Greek fraternity on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post status updates about "being lonely" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Who were you primarily thinking about when you completed the previous questions?
❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
❍ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
❍ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
❍ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
❍ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
❍ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
❍ Someone I consider a close friend
❍ Someone I consider a friend
❍ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
❍ Someone I have been around only a few times
❍ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
❍ Other, please describe: _____

You are HALFWAY done!!! We appreciate your participation in the study. We know the survey is long, but we appreciate your patience and attentiveness while completing this questionnaire. Keep it up!

Directions: People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements to answer the question: "How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would say phrases to my partner like "I want to sleep with you"	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would use my body language or signals	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would let my partner go as far as they wanted	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would say phrases to my partner like "I want to have sex with you"	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would use non-verbal gestures imitating sexual behavior	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would let my partner do whatever they wanted to me	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would verbally tell my partner that I want to have sex with them	○	○	○	○	○
I would appear interested in sexual activity with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would not stop my partner's advances	○	○	○	○	○
I would say "yes" to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say anything to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would let the sexual activity keep progressing	○	○	○	○	○
I would verbally tell my partner that I want to fool around	○	○	○	○	○
I would flirt with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would not push my partner away	○	○	○	○	○
I would say phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	○	○	○	○	○
I would act flirtatious	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	○	○	○	○	○
I would say positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would smile at my partner	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would not tell my partner to stop	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if it is okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would look at my partner in a sexy way	○	○	○	○	○
I would not resist my partner's actions	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they have a condom/dental dam	○	○	○	○	○
I would touch my partner's lower body or genital area	○	○	○	○	○
I would go along with the sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would tell my partner I am interested in engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would touch my partner's arms	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner engage in sexual activity with me	○	○	○	○	○
I would mention sexual activity to see how my partner responds	○	○	○	○	○
I would touch my partner's chest	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say "no" to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they want me to get a condom/dental dam	○	○	○	○	○
I would caress my partner's face	○	○	○	○	○
I would not stop my partner from kissing me	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner what types of sexual behaviors I want to engage in	○	○	○	○	○
I would move my partner's hands to my lower body or genital area	○	○	○	○	○
I would not stop my partner from touching me sexually	○	○	○	○	○
I would give verbal permission to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would touch my partner's body in return	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say anything to my partner because it would be obvious I want to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would verbally communicate my interest in sexual activity to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would move closer to my partner (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say anything to my partner because my partner would just know I want to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner it is okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○

126

I would pull my partner closer to me (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner it is okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would hold my partner close (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○
I would talk dirty to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would become more physically aggressive in my actions toward my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	○	○	○	○	○
I would hold my partner down	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they are interested in engaging in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would keep moving forward in sexual activity unless my partner stops me	○	○	○	○	○
I would pull my partner on top of me	○	○	○	○	○
I would show my partner what I want them to do	○	○	○	○	○
I would look into my partner's eyes	○	○	○	○	○
I would start kissing my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would have an erection or be vaginally lubricated	○	○	○	○	○
I would take off my clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would unzip my pants	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner take off my clothes	○	○	○	○	○
I would get on top of my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner show me what to do	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner "sexy" eyes	○	○	○	○	○
I would actively kiss my partner back	○	○	○	○	○
I would take off my partner's clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would unzip my partner's pants	○	○	○	○	○
I would help my partner undress me	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would flirt with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would be very touchy with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would take my partner somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would kiss or make out with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would talk to my partner in a sexy tone of voice	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would make eye contact with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would go somewhere private with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would drink alcohol	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would give my partner sexy looks	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would tell my partner I want to go somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would get drunk	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if they want to go somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if they want to go back to my place	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would tell my partner I want to go back to their place	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would buy my partner an alcoholic drink	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would invite my partner to my place for dinner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner for their phone number	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

I would invite my partner to my place to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner to drive me home	○	○	○	○	○
I would accept an alcoholic drink from my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner my phone number	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner what they are doing later	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they want me to drive them home	○	○	○	○	○
I would invite my partner over to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would leave with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would say phrases like "I want to have sex with you" to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go home with my partner at the end of the night	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?" On social media . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would post sexy pictures of myself	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures showing off my body	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of me wearing sexy clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would post sexy status updates	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of myself drinking alcohol	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of myself at a party	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about myself drinking alcohol	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about myself being at a party	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about my relationship status	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would leave sexy comments for my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would browse my partner's social media profile	○	○	○	○	○
I would look at my partner's pictures	○	○	○	○	○
I would "like" my partner's pictures	○	○	○	○	○
I would "like" my partner's status updates	○	○	○	○	○
I would look at my partner's profile to find things we have in common	○	○	○	○	○
I would check my partner's relationship status	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you initiate penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would go to a party with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to a bar with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would take my partner on a date	○	○	○	○	○
I would go on a date with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to my partner's place for dinner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to my partner's place to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner late at night	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner sexy statements like "I want to have sex with you"	○	○	○	○	○
I would send flirtatious text messages to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner in return if they text me late at night	○	○	○	○	○

Select all of the behaviors were you thinking about as you answered the previous questions.
❑ Performing manual stimulation
❑ Receiving manual stimulation
❑ Performing oral sex
❑ Receiving oral sex
❑ Vaginal-penile penetration

- ❑ Vaginal-dildo penetration
- ❑ Anal-penile penetration
- ❑ Anal-dildo penetration

Who were you primarily thinking about when you completed the previous questions?
- ○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
- ○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
- ○ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ○ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
- ○ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
- ○ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ○ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
- ○ Someone I consider a close friend
- ○ Someone I consider a friend
- ○ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
- ○ Someone I have been around only a few times
- ○ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
- ○ Other, please describe: _____

You have made it to the FINAL SECTION of questions!!!   You have reached the final portion of questions. A few more minutes of your attention, and you will have completed the survey. Again, we greatly appreciate your participation in our study!Keep it up!

Directions: People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements to answer the question: "How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would say phrases to my partner like "I want to sleep with you"	○	○	○	○	○
I would use my body language or signals	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner go as far as they wanted	○	○	○	○	○
I would say phrases to my partner like "I want to have sex with you"	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would use non-verbal gestures imitating sexual behavior	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would let my partner do whatever they wanted to me	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would verbally tell my partner that I want to have sex with them	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would appear interested in sexual activity with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would not stop my partner's advances	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would say "yes" to my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would not say anything to my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would let the sexual activity keep progressing	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would verbally tell my partner that I want to fool around	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would flirt with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would not push my partner away	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would say phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would act flirtatious	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would say positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would smile at my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would not tell my partner to stop	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if it is okay to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would look at my partner in a sexy way	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would not resist my partner's actions	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if they have a condom/dental dam	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would touch my partner's lower body or genital area	○	○	○	○	○
I would go along with the sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner I am interested in engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would touch my partner's arms	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner engage in sexual activity with me	○	○	○	○	○
I would mention sexual activity to see how my partner responds	○	○	○	○	○
I would touch my partner's chest	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say "no" to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they want me to get a condom/dental dam	○	○	○	○	○
I would caress my partner's face	○	○	○	○	○
I would not stop my partner from kissing me	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner what types of sexual behaviors I want to engage in	○	○	○	○	○
I would move my partner's hands to my lower body or genital area	○	○	○	○	○
I would not stop my partner from touching me sexually	○	○	○	○	○
I would give verbal permission to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would touch my partner's body in return	○	○	○	○	○
I would not say anything to my partner because it would be obvious I want to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would verbally communicate my interest in sexual activity to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would move closer to my partner (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○

133

I would not say anything to my partner because my partner would just know I want to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner it is okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would pull my partner closer to me (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○
I would tell my partner it is okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would hold my partner close (in terms of physical distance)	○	○	○	○	○
I would talk dirty to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would become more physically aggressive in my actions toward my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	○	○	○	○	○
I would hold my partner down	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they are interested in engaging in sexual activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would keep moving forward in sexual activity unless my partner stops me	○	○	○	○	○
I would pull my partner on top of me	○	○	○	○	○
I would show my partner what I want them to do	○	○	○	○	○
I would look into my partner's eyes	○	○	○	○	○
I would start kissing my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would have an erection or be vaginally lubricated	○	○	○	○	○
I would take off my clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would unzip my pants	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner take off my clothes	○	○	○	○	○
I would get on top of my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would let my partner show me what to do	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner "sexy" eyes	○	○	○	○	○
I would actively kiss my partner back	○	○	○	○	○
I would take off my partner's clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would unzip my partner's pants	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would help my partner undress me	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would flirt with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would be very touchy with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would take my partner somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would kiss or make out with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would talk to my partner in a sexy tone of voice	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would make eye contact with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would go somewhere private with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would drink alcohol	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would give my partner sexy looks	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would tell my partner I want to go somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would get drunk	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if they want to go somewhere private	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner if they want to go back to my place	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would tell my partner I want to go back to their place	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would buy my partner an alcoholic drink	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would invite my partner to my place for dinner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would ask my partner for their phone number	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would invite my partner to my place to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner to drive me home	○	○	○	○	○
I would accept an alcoholic drink from my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would give my partner my phone number	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner what they are doing later	○	○	○	○	○
I would ask my partner if they want me to drive them home	○	○	○	○	○
I would invite my partner over to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would leave with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would say phrases like "I want to have sex with you" to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go home with my partner at the end of the night	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"   On social media . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would post sexy pictures of myself	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures showing off my body	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of me wearing sexy clothing	○	○	○	○	○
I would post sexy status updates	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of myself drinking alcohol	○	○	○	○	○
I would post pictures of myself at a party	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about myself drinking alcohol	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about myself being at a party	○	○	○	○	○
I would post status updates about my relationship status	○	○	○	○	○

I would leave sexy comments for my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would browse my partner's social media profile	○	○	○	○	○
I would look at my partner's pictures	○	○	○	○	○
I would "like" my partner's pictures	○	○	○	○	○
I would "like" my partner's status updates	○	○	○	○	○
I would look at my partner's profile to find things we have in common	○	○	○	○	○
I would check my partner's relationship status	○	○	○	○	○

"How would you respond to a potential partner initiating penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?"

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would go to a party with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to a bar with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would take my partner on a date	○	○	○	○	○
I would go on a date with my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to my partner's place for dinner	○	○	○	○	○
I would go to my partner's place to watch a movie	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner late at night	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner sexy statements like "I want to have sex with you"	○	○	○	○	○
I would send flirtatious text messages to my partner	○	○	○	○	○
I would text my partner in return if they text me late at night	○	○	○	○	○

Select all of the behaviors were you thinking about as you answered the previous questions.
❑ Performing manual stimulation
❑ Receiving manual stimulation
❑ Performing oral sex
❑ Receiving oral sex
❑ Vaginal-penile penetration

❑ Vaginal-dildo penetration
❑ Anal-penile penetration
❑ Anal-dildo penetration

Who were you primarily thinking about when you completed the previous questions?
⭕ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
⭕ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
⭕ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
⭕ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
⭕ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
⭕ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
⭕ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
⭕ Someone I consider a close friend
⭕ Someone I consider a friend
⭕ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
⭕ Someone I have been around only a few times
⭕ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
⭕ Other, please describe: _____

You have made it to the END!!!   Click the next button to the final page where you'll have an opportunity to volunteer as a participant in future research for monetary compensation and input your information if you are receiving extra course credit for completing this survey.

Would you be interested in participating in a future focus group about the wording and interpretation of the questions included in this survey? You will not be asked about personal sexual experiences, but rather you will be asked for feedback about the best way to word questions about sexual consent. Each focus group participant will be compensated with at $10 gift card for their participation. A focus group is a form of qualitative research in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. This means, those who participate will be talking within a group with other participants. There will be about 5 people in each focus group.
⭕ No
⭕ Yes

Are you are receiving extra credit for completing the survey?
⭕ No
⭕ Yes

Would you be interested in participating in a future focus group about the wording and

interpretation of the questions included in this survey? You will not be asked about personal sexual experiences, but rather you will be asked for feedback about the best way to word questions about sexual consent. Each focus group participant will be compensated with at $10 gift card for their participation. A focus group is a form of qualitative research in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. This means, those who participate will be talking within a group with other participants.

Your Name:
Your Email Address:

If you are receiving extra credit for completing the survey, please provide your name, the course name, and the instructor's name who is offering extra credit. This information will be kept separate from your survey responses. In other words, your responses will be kept anonymous and will not be linked to your name and you will receive the extra credit.

Your name:
Your course name (i.e. Personal Health and Safety, Psychology, etc.):
Your Instructor's name:

Informed Consent Form for Focus Group Participants

Researchers:

Kelley Rhoads, MS, CHES
219 HPER Building
Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation
University of Arkansas
Phone: 479-575-2976
Email: krhoads@uark.edu

Mary Hunt, MS
219 HPER Building
Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation
University of Arkansas
Phone: 479-575-2976
Email: maryhunt@uark.edu

Sasha Canan, MEd
219 HPER Building
Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation
University of Arkansas
Phone: 479-575-2976
Email: sncanan@uark.edu

Kristen Jozkowski, PhD
308-V HPER Building
Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation
University of Arkansas
Phone: 479-575-4111
Email: kjozkows@uark.edu

Description:
The purpose of the study is to elicit feedback on question clarity and interpretation for questions measuring sexual consent. You will **not** be asked about your personal sexual experiences, but rather you will be asked about the best way to word questions about sexual consent. The purpose of this focus group is to allow you to share your thoughts and opinions on how questions are worded and interpreted in order to make the questions better.

What is a focus group?
A **focus group** is a form of qualitative research in which a **group** of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. This means, those who participate will be talking within a group with other participants.

Risks and Benefits:
Participants will be compensated with a $10 gift card for their participation in a focus group. Additionally, participants may receive additional credit in a course for study participation, if approved by the respective professor or instructor. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study. If you feel uncomfortable at any time, you can leave the focus group. If you leave the focus group, you will not be allowed to return, and you will not receive monetary or extra course credit compensation for participation.

Voluntary Participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. By agreeing to be part of this focus group you are giving your consent.

Confidentiality:
All information will be recorded anonymously without identifying you or any other participant. Results will be reported without individual identifiers. Your name will not appear on the transcript, and all information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. Results from the research will be reported as aggregated data, when applicable. The recordings from today will be destroyed after transcribing, so that no one's voice can be linked with their response.

Right to Withdraw:
You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences—no penalty to you.

Informed Consent:
By signing this document, you are confirming that you are over the age of 18, and that you agree to be a part of this study. Your signature implies that you have read and understand the description, including the purpose of the study, the procedures to be used, the potential risks, the confidentiality, as well as the option to withdraw from the study at any time.

I agree to participate in the study. As part of my consent, I agree to be audio recorded.

_____

Signature   Date

If you have questions or concerns about this study, you may contact Kelley Rhoads by e-mail at krhoads@uark.edu. For questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Ro Windwalker, the University's IRB Coordinator, at (479) 575-2208 or by e-mail at irb@uark.edu. Thanks for your participation!

Appendix D
Focus Group Script

I. Welcome

    A. Introduction

"Thank you for coming. My name is _____ and I will be leading the session today. With me is _____, who will be taking notes and helping me with the discussion. _____ and I are graduate students at the University of Arkansas. Before we get started, I wanted to go over a few things. First, as mentioned in a recruitment letter you may have received, today's research will be using a focus group method. A **focus group** is a form of qualitative research in which a **group** of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. This means, you will be talking amongst each other. I will be a facilitator, asking questions, but everyone is free to speak."

II. Focus Group Topic

    A. Introduction

"In today's focus group we will be discussing your opinions on wording and interpretation of questions measuring sexual consent that you previously completed in an online survey. You will **not** be asked about your personal sexual experiences, but rather you will be asked about the best way to word questions about sexual consent. The focus group that we are conducting today has been approved by the UA IRB – this is the board that oversees all research activities at the University of Arkansas."

    B. Informed consent

"Please take a moment to review the informed consent form. All information today is completely confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy, and no information can be used to link you to your responses, even if the information you provide is illegal. All communication methods will be terminated and no personal identifiers will be used that could link you to your response. We will take careful measures to respect and preserve your confidentiality. If you agree to continue with participation in the focus group, please sign on the second page of your consent form. If you have changed your mind, it is okay to leave the paper on the desk and leave the room. Thank you for your time."

III. Focus Group Rules

    A. "These are the rules for our focus group:

- Please turn off your cell phones and put them away.
- Make sure that we only have one person speaking at a time.
- We ask that you keep specific information that we will share today confidential. Ensuring confidentiality will make everyone more comfortable in sharing and will help us maintain a valid data collection process, thereby strengthening our results.
- My job today is to make sure that everyone has a chance to talk. We want everyone's voice to be heard so try to make answers as succinct as possible without compromising the meaning.

- We will stick to a strict time limit. To facilitate our time together, I may occasionally have to interrupt a speaker or ask clarifying questions.
- To get us started, let's have everyone introduce themselves. (Begin with a person at random; ask that person to introduce him/herself and then point to someone else at the table to introduce him or herself).
  I am going to turn on the recorder now."

IV. Open-ended Questions – specific questions relevant to items will be determined based on the results of the statistical analyses
   A. Social Media and Perceptions of Consent scale
      a. Potential Probes:
         - What does this item mean to you? (Repeat for items that loaded highly on a non-hypothesized factor)
         - What items were unclear or confusing to you when you completed the survey?
            o How could these items be reworded to make more sense?
   B. Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale Revised
      a. Potential Probes:
         - What does this item mean to you? (Repeat for items that loaded highly on a non-hypothesized factor)
         - What items were unclear or confusing to you when you completed the survey?
            o How could these items be reworded to make more sense?
         - What is your interpretation of the phrase "in the moments right before sexual activity?"
            o What phrase would be better to convey the same concept?

V. Brief Session Summary

IV. Closing
   A. Thank you for your participation
      "Thank you to everyone for coming. We appreciate your time, honesty, and participation. Again, we ask that you keep today's discussion confidential, as we may be interviewing others with whom you may come in contact for upcoming focus groups."
   B. Compensation
      "As you exit, _____ will give you a $10 gift card for your participation."

Directions: Please select the response choice that most accurately describes you. Please answer honestly and completely.

What is your gender?
○ Male
○ Female
○ Transgender
○ Another gender, please specify: _____

What is your age in years? Type only the number of years in the text box below.

How would you describe your race/ethnicity?
○ White, non-Hispanic
○ Black or African American
○ Latino or Hispanic
○ Native American or American Indian
○ Asian or Asian American
○ Middle Eastern or Middle Eastern American
○ Bi- or Multi-racial

How would you describe your sexual orientation?
○ Heterosexual/straight
○ Gay/lesbian
○ Bisexual
○ Unsure/questioning
○ Queer
○ Another orientation. Please describe: _____

How would you describe your current relationship status?
○ Single and not dating
○ Single, but casually seeing someone/hanging out with someone
○ In a relationship
○ Married
○ Divorced
○ Widowed
○ Another relationship status. Please describe: _____

I am currently . . .
○ In an exclusive/monogamous sexual relationship (that is, we only have sex with each other)

○ In a non-exclusive/non-monogamous relationship(s) (that is, you have a primary partner and one or both of you has sex with other partners)
○ Engaging in mainly casual sexual encounters (i.e. hooking up)
○ Not engaging in sexual activity right now

When I want to engage in consensual sexual activity with a partner, . . .
○ I typically initiate sexual behaviors with my partner
○ I typically let my partner initiate sexual behaviors with me
○ My partner and I equally initiate sexual behaviors with each other

Are you familiar with social networking websites, such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram?
○ Yes, I have used at least one of those social networking websites in the past.
○ Yes, I am currently using at least one of those social networking websites.
○ Yes, I have seen at least one of those social networking websites, but I do not use any.
○ No, I have never used one of those social networking websites and never have seen one.

What is your current class standing?
○ Freshmen
○ Sophomore
○ Junior
○ Senior
○ Graduate student
○ I'm not a student

Are you currently a member of a Greek organization (i.e. sorority, fraternity)?
○ Yes
○ No
○ I used to be a member, but no longer am
○ I plan on joining a Greek organization in the future
○ I'm not a student

How would you describe the area where you spent most of your childhood?
○ Rural (small towns or cities isolated from larger areas or farming communities)
○ Suburban (community near a bigger city, often part of a metropolitan region)
○ Urban (big city – i.e., Austin, Little Rock, Memphis, Tulsa)
○ Megalopolis (extra-large city with an especially diverse population – i.e., New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles)

How often do you attend religious services?
○ Once a week or more
○ 2-3 times per month

❍ Once a month
❍ A few times per year
❍ Never

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat).   Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Pictures a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the pictures she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the status updates she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Comments a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at the comments she posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with

the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman's physical appearance on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman's attractiveness on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures wearing skimpy clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman's interests on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Language a woman uses on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The type of friends a woman has on social media are used to determine whether she	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

would consent to sexual activity.					
Women who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Who a woman spends her time with on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's relationship status on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures that show their cleavage on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's religious affiliation on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures of themselves making pouty lips on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
A woman's Greek sorority affiliation on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious things on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A woman's personality characteristics on social media are used to determine	○	○	○	○	○

148

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
whether she would consent to sexual activity.					
Women who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures wearing appropriate clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who have "it's complicated" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual	○	○	○	○	○

149

activity.					
Women who have "in a relationship" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about "being lonely" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Who were you primarily thinking about when you answered the previous statements?
❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
❍ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
❍ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
❍ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
❍ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
❍ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
❍ Someone I consider a close friend
❍ Someone I consider a friend
❍ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
❍ Someone I have been around only a few times
❍ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
❍ Women in general
❍ Other, please describe: _____

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking

(e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat). Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the things he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Pictures a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the pictures he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the status updates he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Comments a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at the comments he posts on social media.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Men who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
A man's physical appearance on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's attractiveness on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing no shirt on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's interests on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Language a man uses on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The type of friends a man has on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Who a man spends his time with on social media is used to determine whether he	○	○	○	○	○

152

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
would consent to sexual activity.					
Men who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man's relationship status on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures that show their abs on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man's religious affiliation on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post pictures of themselves flexing their arms on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
A man's Greek fraternity affiliation on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post religious things on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man's personality characteristics on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
likely to consent to sexual activity.					
Men who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing appropriate clothes on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Men who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who have "it's complicated" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who have "in a relationship" as their relationship status on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to	○	○	○	○	○

sexual activity.					
Men who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men who post status updates about "being lonely" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Who were you primarily thinking about when you answered the previous statements?
- ❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
- ❍ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
- ❍ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ❍ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
- ❍ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
- ❍ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ❍ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
- ❍ Someone I consider a close friend
- ❍ Someone I consider a friend
- ❍ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
- ❍ Someone I have been around only a few times
- ❍ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
- ❍ Men in general
- ❍ Other, please describe: _____

You are HALFWAY done!!! We appreciate your participation in the study. We know the survey is long, but we appreciate your patience and attentiveness while completing this questionnaire. Keep it up!

Directions: When answering the following questions, think about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, meaning both you and your partner consented/agreed to engage in the sexual activity. There are no right or wrong answers so please answer honestly and completely.

Select all of the behaviors you participated in the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.
- ❑ Performing manual stimulation
- ❑ Receiving manual stimulation

- ❑ Performing oral sex
- ❑ Receiving oral sex
- ❑ Vaginal-penile penetration
- ❑ Vaginal-dildo penetration
- ❑ Anal-penile penetration
- ❑ Anal-dildo penetration
- ❑ I did not participate in any of these behaviors

The last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, which best describes the relationship with your sexual partner?
- ○ Someone I'm in a romantic relationship with (e.g., girlfriend/boyfriend, fiance, wife/husband). Please indicate how long you have been in this relationship: _____
- ○ Someone I'm in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ○ Someone I'm casually dating, seeing, or talking to
- ○ Someone I had a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand, one-time hookup)
- ○ Other, please describe: _____

The last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, who initiated the sexual activity?
- ○ I initiated the sexual activity
- ○ My partner initiated the sexual activity
- ○ My partner and I mutually initiated the sexual activity
- ○ I don't know who initiated the sexual activity

Please describe how you initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how your partner initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how you and partner mutually initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how sexual activity began the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity with a partner.

Directions: People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways.   Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

156

	Yes	No
I used my body language or signals	○	○
I let my partner go as far as they wanted	○	○
I said phrases to my partner like "I want to have sex with you"	○	○
I used non-verbal gestures imitating sexual behavior	○	○
I let my partner do whatever they wanted to me	○	○
I appeared interested in sexual activity with my partner	○	○
I did not stop my partner's advances	○	○
I said "yes" to my partner	○	○
I did not say anything to my partner	○	○
I let the sexual activity keep progressing	○	○
I did not push my partner away	○	○
I said phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	○	○
I acted flirtatious	○	○
I let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	○	○
I said positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	○	○
I smiled at my partner	○	○
I did not tell my partner to stop	○	○
I asked my partner if it was okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I did not resist my partner's actions	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Yes	No
I asked my partner if they had a condom/dental dam	○	○
I touched my partner's lower body or genital area	○	○
I went along with the sexual activity	○	○
I told my partner I am interested in engage in sexual activity	○	○
I touched my partner's arms	○	○
I let my partner engage in sexual activity with me	○	○
I mentioned sexual activity to see how my partner responded	○	○
I touched my partner's chest	○	○
I did not say "no" to my partner	○	○
I asked my partner if they wanted me to get a condom/dental dam	○	○
I caressed my partner's face	○	○

	Yes	No
I did not stop my partner from kissing me	❍	❍
I told my partner what types of sexual behaviors I wanted to engage in	❍	❍
I moved my partner's hands to my lower body or genital area	❍	❍
I did not stop my partner from touching me sexually	❍	❍
I gave my partner verbal permission to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍
I did not say anything to my partner because it was obvious I wanted to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍
I verbally communicated my interest in sexual activity to my partner	❍	❍
I moved closer to my partner (in terms of physical distance)	❍	❍

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Yes	No
I did not say anything to my partner because my partner just knew I wanted to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍
I told my partner it was okay to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍
I pulled my partner closer to me (in terms of physical distance)	❍	❍
I talked dirty to my partner	❍	❍
I became more physically aggressive in my actions toward my partner	❍	❍
I gave my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	❍	❍
I held my partner down	❍	❍
I asked my partner if they were interested in engaging in sexual activity	❍	❍
I kept moving forward in sexual activity until my partner stopped me	❍	❍
I pulled my partner on top of me	❍	❍
I showed my partner what I wanted them to do	❍	❍
I looked into my partner's eyes	❍	❍
I started kissing my partner	❍	❍
I had an erection or was vaginally lubricated	❍	❍
I took off my clothing	❍	❍
I let my partner take off my clothes	❍	❍
I got on top of my partner	❍	❍
I let my partner show me what to do	❍	❍
I gave my partner "sexy" eyes	❍	❍
I took off my partner's clothing	❍	❍

You have made it to the FINAL PAGE of questions!!!   You have reached the final page of

questions. A few more minutes of your attention, and you will have completed the survey. Again, we greatly appreciate your participation in our study! Keep it up!

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Yes	No
I flirted with my partner	○	○
I was very touchy with my partner	○	○
I kissed or made-out with my partner	○	○
I talked to my partner in a sexy tone of voice	○	○
I made eye contact with my partner	○	○
I went somewhere private with my partner	○	○
I drank alcohol	○	○
I gave my partner sexy looks	○	○
I got drunk	○	○
I asked my partner if they wanted to go somewhere private	○	○
I invited my partner back to my place	○	○
I told my partner I wanted to go back to their place	○	○
I bought my partner an alcoholic drink	○	○
I asked my partner to "hang out" another time	○	○
I asked my partner for their phone number	○	○
I invited my partner to watch a movie at my place	○	○
I asked my partner for a ride home	○	○
I accepted an alcoholic drink from my partner	○	○
I gave my partner my phone number	○	○
My partner gave me a ride home	○	○
I danced closely with my partner	○	○
I said phrases like "I want to have sex with you" to my partner	○	○
I went home with my partner at the end of the night	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? On social media . . .

	Yes	No
I posted pictures showing off my body for my partner to see	○	○
I posted pictures of me wearing sexy clothing for my partner to see	○	○

159

	Yes	No
I posted sexy status updates for my partner to see	❍	❍
I posted pictures of myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	❍	❍
I posted pictures of myself at a party for my partner to see	❍	❍
I posted status updates about myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	❍	❍
I posted status updates about myself being at a party for my partner to see	❍	❍
I posted status updates about my relationship status for my partner to see	❍	❍
I left sexy comments for my partner to see	❍	❍
I browsed my partner's social media profile	❍	❍
I looked at my partner's pictures	❍	❍
I "liked" my partner's pictures	❍	❍
I "liked" my partner's status updates	❍	❍
I looked at my partner's profile to find out more about them	❍	❍
I checked my partner's relationship status	❍	❍
I sent a friend request to my partner	❍	❍
I "friended" my partner	❍	❍
I direct messaged (DM-ed) with my partner	❍	❍

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?

	Yes	No
I went to a party with my partner	❍	❍
I went to a bar with my partner	❍	❍
I went on a date with my partner	❍	❍
I went to "hang out" with my partner	❍	❍
I watched a movie with my partner	❍	❍
I texted my partner late at night	❍	❍
I sent flirtatious text messages to my partner	❍	❍
I texted my partner back when they texted me late at night	❍	❍

Are you are receiving extra credit for completing the survey?
❍ No
❍ Yes

If you are receiving extra credit for completing the survey, please provide your name, the course name, and the instructor's name who is offering extra credit. This information will be kept separate from your survey responses. In other words, your responses will be kept anonymous and will not be linked to your name and you will receive the extra credit.

Your name:

Your course name (i.e. Personal Health and Safety, Psychology, etc.):

Your Instructor's name:

Directions: Please select the response choice that most accurately describes you. Please answer honestly and completely.

What is your gender?
- ○ Male
- ○ Female
- ○ Transgender
- ○ Another gender, please specify: _____

What is your age in years? Type only the number of years in the text box below.

How would you describe your race/ethnicity?
- ○ White, non-Hispanic
- ○ Black or African American
- ○ Latino or Hispanic
- ○ Native American or American Indian
- ○ Asian or Asian American
- ○ Middle Eastern or Middle Eastern American
- ○ Bi- or Multi-racial

How would you describe your sexual orientation?
- ○ Heterosexual/straight
- ○ Gay/lesbian
- ○ Bisexual
- ○ Unsure/questioning
- ○ Queer
- ○ Another orientation. Please describe: _____

How would you describe your current relationship status?
- ○ Single and not dating
- ○ Single, but casually seeing someone/hanging out with someone
- ○ In a relationship
- ○ Married
- ○ Divorced
- ○ Widowed
- ○ Another relationship status. Please describe: _____

I am currently . . .
- ○ In an exclusive/monogamous sexual relationship (that is, we only have sex with each other)

❍ In a non-exclusive/non-monogamous relationship(s) (that is, you have a primary partner and one or both of you has sex with other partners)
❍ Engaging in mainly casual sexual encounters (i.e. hooking up)
❍ Not engaging in sexual activity right now

When I want to engage in consensual sexual activity with a partner, . . .
❍ I typically initiate sexual behaviors with my partner
❍ I typically let my partner initiate sexual behaviors with me
❍ My partner and I equally initiate sexual behaviors with each other

Are you familiar with social networking websites, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or Snapchat?
❍ Yes, I am currently using at least one of those social networking websites.
❍ Yes, I have used at least one of those social networking websites in the past.
❍ Yes, I have seen at least one of those social networking websites, but I do not use any.
❍ No, I have never used one of those social networking websites and never have seen one.

What is your current class standing?
❍ Freshmen
❍ Sophomore
❍ Junior
❍ Senior
❍ Graduate student
❍ I'm not a student

Are you currently a member of a Greek organization (i.e. sorority, fraternity)?
❍ Yes
❍ No
❍ I used to be a member, but no longer am
❍ I plan on joining a Greek organization in the future
❍ I'm not a student

How would you describe the area where you spent most of your childhood?
❍ Rural (small towns or cities isolated from larger areas or farming communities)
❍ Suburban (community near a bigger city, often part of a metropolitan region)
❍ Urban (big city – i.e., Austin, Little Rock, Memphis, Tulsa)
❍ Megalopolis (extra-large city with an especially diverse population – i.e., New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles)

How often do you attend religious services?
❍ Once a week or more
❍ 2-3 times per month

163

❍ Once a month
❍ A few times per year
❍ Never

Directions: Please select the bubble that refers to the most recent time you engage in the following sexual behaviors. If you have never engaged in this behavior, you can select "never."

	Past 30 days	Past 90 days	In the last year	In your lifetime	Never
I kissed/made out with another person	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I masturbated alone (stimulated your body for sexual pleasure whether or not you had an orgasm)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I touched my partner's genitals	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My partner touched my genitals	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I gave my partner oral sex	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My partner gave me oral sex	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I had vaginal intercourse (penis into vagina)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Someone put their penis in my anus	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I put my penis in someone else's anus	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I used sex toys such as vibrators and dildos with my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
While in a committed relationship, I had sex with someone other than my partner	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I experienced penile-vaginal intercourse that I consented or agreed to, but that I did not want	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat). Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Pictures a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
consent to sexual activity.					
Women who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Comments a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Language a woman uses on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post pictures that show their	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
cleavage on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.					
A woman's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Women who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Who were you primarily thinking about when you answered the previous statements?
○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
○ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
○ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
○ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
○ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
○ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
○ Someone I consider a close friend
○ Someone I consider a friend
○ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
○ Someone I have been around only a few times
○ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
○ Myself
○ Women in general
○ Other, please describe: _____

Directions: The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participate in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat).   Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Things a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

167

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Men who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Pictures a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Comments a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Language a man uses on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual	○	○	○	○	○

activity.					
Men who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures that show their abs on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
A man's use of religious words on social media is used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking about men in general, please answer to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Men who do not post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who do not post status updates about attending parties on social media are more	○	○	○	○	○

likely to consent to sexual activity.					
Men who do not post status updates on social media about drinking alcohol are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○
Men who post status updates about "being bored" on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity.	○	○	○	○	○

Who were you primarily thinking about when you answered the previous statements?
○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for 6 or more months
○ Someone I have been in a romantic relationship with for less than 6 months
○ Someone I have been in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
○ Someone I have been casually dating, seeing or talking to
○ Someone I want to be in romantic relationship with in the future
○ Someone I want to be in a sexual, but not romantic relationship with in the future (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
○ Someone I want to have a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand)
○ Someone I consider a close friend
○ Someone I consider a friend
○ Someone I consider an acquaintance (that is, someone you do not know very well)
○ Someone I have been around only a few times
○ Someone I have not met in person, but have seen online
○ Myself
○ Men in general
○ Other, please describe: _____

Directions: When answering the following questions, think about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, meaning both you and your partner consented/agreed to engage in the sexual activity. There are no right or wrong answers so please answer honestly and completely.

Select all of the behaviors you participated in the last time you engaged in consensual sexual

activity.

- ❑ Performed manual sex [touched or rubbed your partner's genitals with your hand(s)]
- ❑ Received manual sex [your partner touched or rubbed your genitals with their hand(s)]
- ❑ Performed oral sex [kissed or put your mouth on your partner's genitals]
- ❑ Received oral sex [your partner kissed or put their mouth on your genitals]
- ❑ Vaginal-penile penetration [penis in vagina]
- ❑ Vaginal-dildo penetration [dildo in vagina]
- ❑ Anal-penile penetration [penis in anus]
- ❑ Anal-dildo penetration [dildo in anus]
- ❑ I did not participate in any of these behaviors

The last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, which best describes the relationship with your sexual partner?

- ○ Someone I'm in a romantic relationship with (e.g., girlfriend/boyfriend, fiance, wife/husband). Please indicate how long you have been in this relationship: _____
- ○ Someone I'm in a sexual relationship with, but not a romantic relationship (e.g., hookup partner, friends with benefits)
- ○ Someone I'm casually dating, seeing, or talking to
- ○ Someone I had a one-time sexual experience with (e.g., one-night-stand, one-time hookup)
- ○ Other, please describe: _____

The last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, which best describes the gender of your sexual partner?

- ○ Male
- ○ Female
- ○ Transgender
- ○ Other, please describe: _____

The last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, who initiated the sexual activity?

- ○ I initiated the sexual activity
- ○ My partner initiated the sexual activity
- ○ My partner and I mutually initiated the sexual activity
- ○ I don't know who initiated the sexual activity

Please describe how you initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how your partner initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how you and your partner mutually initiated sexual activity the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity.

Please describe how sexual activity began the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity with a partner.

Directions: People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no." In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Yes	No
I used my body language or signals	○	○
I let my partner go as far as they wanted	○	○
I appeared interested in sexual activity with my partner	○	○
I did not stop my partner's actions	○	○
I verbally said "yes" to my partner	○	○
I did not say anything to my partner	○	○
I let the sexual activity keep progressing	○	○
I did not push my partner away	○	○
I said phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	○	○
I flirted with my partner	○	○
I let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	○	○
I said positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	○	○
I smiled at my partner	○	○
I did not tell my partner to stop	○	○
I verbally asked my partner if it was okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no." In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Yes	No
I talked to my partner about a condom/dental dam	○	○
I touched my partner's lower body, crotch, or genital area	○	○
I verbally told my partner I wanted to engage in sexual activity	○	○

172

	Yes	No
I touched my partner's upper body, arms, or chest	○	○
I let my partner engage in sexual activity with me	○	○
I did not say "no" to my partner	○	○
I took out a condom/dental dam	○	○
I caressed my partner's face	○	○
I did not stop my partner from kissing me	○	○
I moved my partner's hands to my lower body, crotch, or genital area	○	○
I did not stop or resist my partner when they touched me sexually	○	○
I verbally told my partner it was okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I did not say anything to my partner because it was obvious I wanted to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I physically moved closer to my partner (in terms of distance)	○	○
I did not resist my partner's actions	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no."   In the moments right before sexual activity . . .

	Yes	No
I did not say anything to my partner because my partner just knew I wanted to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I physically pulled my partner closer to me (in terms of distance)	○	○
I talked "dirty" to my partner	○	○
I was sexually aggressive in my actions toward my partner	○	○
I gave my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	○	○
I kept moving forward in sexual activity unless my partner stopped me	○	○
I pulled my partner on top of me	○	○
I looked into my partner's eyes	○	○
I started kissing my partner	○	○
I had an erection or was vaginally lubricated	○	○
I took off my clothes	○	○
I let my partner take off my clothes	○	○
I got on top of my partner	○	○
I gave my partner "sexy" eyes	○	○
I took off my partner's clothes	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no." In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Yes	No
I used my body language or signals	○	○
I appeared interested in sexual activity with my partner	○	○
I did not stop my partner's actions	○	○
I verbally said "yes" to my partner	○	○
I did not push my partner away	○	○
I said phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	○	○
I flirted with my partner	○	○
I let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	○	○
I said positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	○	○
I smiled at my partner	○	○
I verbally asked my partner if it was okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I did not resist my partner's actions	○	○
I did not say anything to my partner because my partner just knew I wanted to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I physically pulled my partner closer to me (in terms of distance)	○	○
I talked "dirty" to my partner	○	○

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no." In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Yes	No
I touched my partner's lower body, crotch, or genital area	○	○
I verbally told my partner I wanted to engage in sexual activity	○	○
I touched my partner's upper body, arms, or chest	○	○
I did not say "no" to my partner	○	○
I caressed my partner's face	○	○
I did not stop my partner from kissing me	○	○
I moved my partner's hands to my lower body, crotch, or genital area	○	○
I verbally told my partner it was okay to engage in sexual activity	○	○

174

	Yes	No
I did not say anything to my partner because it was obvious I wanted to engage in sexual activity	❍	❍
I physically moved closer to my partner (in terms of distance)	❍	❍
I was sexually aggressive in my actions toward my partner	❍	❍
I gave my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	❍	❍
I looked into my partner's eyes	❍	❍
I gave my partner "sexy" eyes	❍	❍
I was very touchy with my partner	❍	❍

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no."
In a social setting like a party or bar . . .

	Yes	No
I kissed or made-out with my partner	❍	❍
I talked to my partner in a sexy tone of voice	❍	❍
I went to a private space with my partner	❍	❍
I drank alcohol	❍	❍
I got drunk	❍	❍
I invited my partner back to my place	❍	❍
I accepted an invitation to go back to my partner's place	❍	❍
I bought my partner an alcoholic drink	❍	❍
I asked my partner to "hang out" another time	❍	❍
I asked my partner for their phone number	❍	❍
I accepted an alcoholic drink from my partner	❍	❍
I gave my partner my phone number	❍	❍
I danced closely with my partner	❍	❍
I said phrases like "I really want you" to my partner	❍	❍
I left with my partner at the end of the night	❍	❍

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no."
On social media . . .

	Yes	No
I posted pictures showing off my body for my partner to see	❍	❍

	Yes	No
I posted pictures of me wearing sexy clothing for my partner to see	◯	◯
I posted sexy status updates for my partner to see	◯	◯
I posted pictures of myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	◯	◯
I posted pictures of myself at a party for my partner to see	◯	◯
I posted status updates about myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	◯	◯
I posted status updates about myself being at a party for my partner to see	◯	◯
I updated my relationship status for my partner to see	◯	◯
I browsed my partner's social media profile	◯	◯
I looked at my partner's pictures	◯	◯
I "liked" my partner's pictures	◯	◯
I "liked" my partner's status updates	◯	◯
I checked my partner's relationship status	◯	◯
I sent a friend request to my partner	◯	◯
I accepted a friend request from my partner	◯	◯
I direct messaged (DM-ed) with my partner	◯	◯

Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity? Note: Only select "yes" if you did a behavior below with the purpose of communicating your consent. If you did not do a behavior below to communicate your consent, please select "no."

	Yes	No
I went to a party with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I went to a bar with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I went on a date with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I went to "hang out" with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I watched a movie with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I texted my partner late at night to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I sent flirtatious text messages to my partner to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯
I texted my partner back when they texted me late at night to indicate my sexual consent	◯	◯

Directions: People may have different feelings associated with their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity. Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that you felt the following during the last time you engaged in sexual activity. I felt . . .

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

A rapid heart beat	❍	❍	❍	❍
Flushed	❍	❍	❍	❍
Eager	❍	❍	❍	❍
Heated	❍	❍	❍	❍
Lustful	❍	❍	❍	❍
Erect/vaginally lubricated	❍	❍	❍	❍
Secure	❍	❍	❍	❍
Protected	❍	❍	❍	❍
Safe	❍	❍	❍	❍
Respected	❍	❍	❍	❍
Certain	❍	❍	❍	❍
Comfortable	❍	❍	❍	❍
In control	❍	❍	❍	❍
Aroused	❍	❍	❍	❍
Turned on	❍	❍	❍	❍
Interested	❍	❍	❍	❍
Consented to	❍	❍	❍	❍
Agreed to	❍	❍	❍	❍
Wanted	❍	❍	❍	❍
Consensual	❍	❍	❍	❍
Desired	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ready	❍	❍	❍	❍
Sure	❍	❍	❍	❍
Willing	❍	❍	❍	❍
Aware of my surroundings	❍	❍	❍	❍

You are HALFWAY done!!! We appreciate your participation in the study. We know the survey is long, but we appreciate your patience and attentiveness while completing this questionnaire. Keep going!

Directions: Please select the response that most closely indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Your responses will be confidential, which means there will be no way to link your identity to your responses. Please answer honestly and completely.

	Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.							
Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Many women secretly desire to be raped.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Most rapists are not caught by the police.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
All women should have access to self-defense classes.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman who ''teases'' men deserves anything that might happen.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
When women are raped, it's often because the way they said ''no'' was ambiguous.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If a woman posts suggestive pictures on social media, she is somewhat responsible if she is raped.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women who post sexual content on social media should not be surprised if men try to force them to	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

have sex.							
A woman who sends sexual text messages to a man deserves anything that might happen.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If a woman agrees to sex over text messages, she cannot claim "rape" afterwards.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Directions: Please select the response that most closely indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Your responses will be confidential, which means there will be no way to link your identity to your responses. Please answer honestly and completely.

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly
It's worse for a woman to sleep around than it is for a man.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's best for a guy to lose his virginity before he's out of his teens.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's okay for a woman to have more than one sexual relationship at the same time.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It is just as important for a man to be a virgin when he marries as it is for a woman.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I approve of a 16-year-old girl's having sex just as much as a 16-year-old boy's having sex.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I kind of admire a girl who has had sex with a lot of guys.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I kind of feel sorry for a 21-year-old woman who is still a virgin.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman's having casual sex is just as acceptable to me as a man's having casual sex.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's okay for a man to have sex with a woman he is not in love with.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I kind of admire a guy who has had sex with a lot of girls.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman who initiates sex is too aggressive.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's okay for a man to have more than one sexual relationship at the same time.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I question the character of a women who has had a lot of sexual partners.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I admire a man who is a virgin when he gets married.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man should be more sexually experience than his wife.	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree
A girl who has sex on the first date is "easy."	❍	❍	❍	❍
I kind of feel sorry for a 21-year-old man who is still a virgin.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I question the character of a man who has had a lot of sexual partners.	❍	❍	❍	❍
Women are naturally more monogamous (inclined to stick with one partner) than are men.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man should be sexually experienced when he gets married.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A guy who has sex on the first date is "easy."	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's okay for a woman to have sex with a man she is not in love with.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A woman should be sexually experienced when she gets married.	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's best for a girl to lose her virginity before she's out of her teens.	❍	❍	❍	❍
I admire a woman who is a virgin when she gets married.	❍	❍	❍	❍
A man who initiates sex is too aggressive.	❍	❍	❍	❍

Directions: Please select the response that most closely indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Your responses will be confidential, which means there will be no way to link your identity to your responses. Please answer honestly and completely.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Undecided, Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Women usually say "no" to sex when they really mean "yes."	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
When a man only has to use minimal amount of force on a woman to get her to have sex, it probably means she wanted him to force her.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

180

When a woman waits until the very last minute to object to sex in a sexual interaction, she probably really wants to have sex.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A woman who initiates a date with a man probably wants to have sex.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Many times a woman will pretend she doesn't want to have intercourse because she doesn't want to seem too "loose," but she's really hoping the man will force her.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A woman who allows a man to pick her up for a date probably hopes to have sex that night.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When a woman allows a man to treat her to an expensive dinner on a date, it usually indicates that she is willing to have sex with him.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Going home with a man at the end of a date is a woman's	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

181

	way of communicating to him that she wants to have sex.						

You have made it to the FINAL SET of questions!!!   You have reached the final set of questions! Click the next button to complete the final 10 questions of the survey. Again, we greatly appreciate your participation in our study! Almost done!

Directions: Please read each of the following statements. Using the scale below, select the response that best describes how true each statement is for you. Please answer honestly and completely.

	Not at all true of me	Somewhat true of me	Moderately true of me	Mostly true of me	Totally true of me
I often read books and magazines about my faith.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make financial contributions to my religious organization.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Religious beliefs influence all of my dealings in life.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Congratulations! You have made it to the END!!!

Sometimes people fill out questionnaires, but do not take them seriously and just fill in answers that may not be accurate. We do not want to use these in the study. Please choose one of the statements below:

❍ I took the survey seriously – use my information in the study

❍ I did not answer seriously – throw out my information

IV. Manuscript #1

The Development and Psychometric Assessment of the Social Media Consent Myths Scale

Kelley E. Rhoads, PhD[1], Kristen N. Jozkowski, PhD[1], Wen-Juo Lo, PhD[2], Heather D. Blunt-Vinti, PhD[1], Jacquelyn D. Wiersma, PhD[3]

[1]: University of Arkansas, Department of Health, Human Performance and Recreation
[2]: University of Arkansas, Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources, and Communication Disorders
[3]: University of Arkansas, School of Human Environmental Sciences

Corresponding Author: Kelley E. Rhoads, PhD, Community Health Promotion, Department of Health, Human Performance & Recreation, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA

Abstract

Preliminary research suggests some college students believe they can determine a person's sexual consent by viewing that person's social media profile. This belief is problematic and warrants further exploration. Research on social media and sexual consent is novel and validated instruments measuring consent beliefs are lacking. Thus, the purpose of this study was to develop and psychometrically assess the Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) that measures endorsement of the belief that consent can be interpreted from a person's social media content. A multi-phase research design consisting of a mixed-methods approach and three data collection phases was utilized to rigorously assess and refine the SMCMS. In Phase 1, college students ($N=104$) pilot-tested the SMCMS, with a subset of students ($n=10$) recruited to provide qualitative feedback during focus groups. Phase 2 ($N=75$) comprised additional quantitative assessments. Phase 3 ($N=397$) constituted rigorous psychometric assessment via exploratory factor analysis and reliability and validity assessments. Results support the construct validity and internal consistency reliability of the SMCMS and corresponding factors. This validated scale can be used to assess consent beliefs to create more culturally relevant sexual assault prevention education programs aimed at eliminating false beliefs about sexual consent among college students.

Introduction

Sexual assault, a salient public health issue among college students, received national attention in 2014 when President Barack Obama created the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. The formation of this Task Force has resulted in public and political discourse specific to sexual assault prevention mechanisms including policies surrounding sexual consent (e.g. California and New York's affirmative consent policies). Although sexual assault is primarily defined as *nonconsensual* sexual activity that is obtained through threats, force, power, and intoxication (Koss et al., 2007), research on sexual consent remains somewhat limited (Beres, 2007). However, consent constitutes a growing area of study as researchers have acknowledged the need for more investigation of this topic (e.g., Muehlenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, & Peterson, 2016).

Sexual Consent

Sexual consent was previously defined as "the freely given verbal or nonverbal communication of a feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity" (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999, p. 259). Research examining how college students communicate sexual consent to potential partners has identified multiple contextual factors that impact consent negotiation. These factors include the behavior being consented to (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson, Sanders, Dennis, & Reece, 2014), the relationship status of the partners involved in the sexual activity (Beres, Senn, & McCaw, 2014; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), and the gender of those consenting to sexual activity (Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). Interestingly, college students indicated that explicit consent cues are necessary when asked how they define "sexual consent" (Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), yet when indicating how they actually communicate consent,

186

use of nonverbal cues (e.g., making eye contact, touching, flirting) are more commonly used among college students (e.g., Burkett & Hamilton, 2012; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004).

College students often define consent as an agreement between partners or a willingness to engage in sexual activity; these definitions seem to depict consent as a discrete event (Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). However, in detailing how they have previously communicated their consent to sexual partners and how they simultaneously interpret consent cues from their respective partners, students often describe sexual consent as an ongoing process (Beres, 2010; 2014; Humphreys, 2004; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Some findings suggest college students perceive they can assess consent cues from potential partners in social environments, such as parties or bars, removed from when (time) and where (location) sexual activity actually occurs (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Furthermore, some students report being able to perceive sexual consent in contexts that are devoid of face-to-face interactions, such as text messages and social media (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). The belief that sexual consent can be interpreted from text messages or social media is problematic; such beliefs directly contrast students' definitions of "sexual consent" mentioned above and contradicts recommendations of both sexual health researchers and educators.

Social Media and Sexual Consent

In a study conducted by Jozkowski and Hunt (2016), college students ($N = 30$) participated in one-on-one interviews in which they described how they communicated their consent to a partner and how they interpreted the same partner's consent to vaginal-penile intercourse. During these interviews, participants described beginning to assess their potential partner's cues within social settings (e.g. parties, bars). Unexpectedly, participants discussed

utilizing social media as a part of the consent process (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Participants reported using social media dually: (1) to communicate with potential partners about sexual activity and (2) as a means to draw an assumption about a person's willingness to engage in sexual activity. Because these themes were unanticipated and not specifically cued for in the initial interview protocol, Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) conducted a second study that included an open-ended elicitation survey that served as a structured follow-up to further explore this belief about consent interpretation.

Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) surveyed college students ($N = 218$) with the purposes of: (1) identifying whether students perceive they can assess a person's consent to sexual activity by looking at their social media profile and (2), if so, what content on the social media profile are they using to interpret consent. Almost half (48%) of the 218 participants in their sample perceived they could derive whether a person would consent to sexual activity by looking at the content of that person's social media profile. Students reported using the following content on social media to interpret consent: sexualized pictures and posts; pictures of the profile owner wearing limited clothing; and posted content that included drinking alcohol and attending parties. Conversely, students identified religious pictures and posts, sexually conservative pictures and posts, and a lack of content suggesting engagement in partying and drinking alcohol as the most prominent social media content indicative that a person would *not* consent to sexual activity.

These preliminary findings suggest at least some college students endorse the belief that consent can be interpreted via social media and that posting certain content to social media can be indicative of a person's sexual consent. This belief is conceptually similar to rape myths, which are "false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (Burt, 1980, p. 217), as it is a false belief about how sexual consent can be or should be interpreted. It is imperative to note that

Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) and the current study do *not* denote content posted on social

media as sexual consent cues, but rather, these studies report the *beliefs* some students have

regarding sexual consent interpretation derived from social media content.

Social Media and Sexual Assault

In recent years, social media has played a dual role in sexual assault judicial cases.

Pictures and videos posted to social media have been used to provide evidence of events that

occurred during alleged assaults. In the cases of Audrie Pott (Johnson, 2016) and Steubenville,

Ohio (Macur & Schweber, 2012), both victims were not aware of the alleged assaults until

videos and pictures depicting the assaults were uploaded to social media. In both cases, the

pictures and videos were utilized as evidence that resulted in confessions by the three boys

accused of assaulting Audrie Pott and guilty convictions for the two boys accused of raping a

female teenager in Steubenville. Although social media content assisted in building cases against

the accused in these instances, social media also serves as an avenue through which sexual

assault victims are shamed and blamed for being assaulted.

Audrie Pott and Rehtaeh Parsons, a Canadian teen, both were allegedly raped by

classmates while they were incapacitated (Ross, 2013). Photos from both of their assaults were

circulated on social media. As a result of their assaults being depicted on social media, Audrie

and Rehtaeh's reputations were attacked and they faced constant harassment on social media.

Both Audrie and Rehtaeh, devastated by the trauma of being assaulted and cyber-bullied by their

peers, committed suicide (Grim, 2013). Similarly, social media was flooded with "slut-shaming"

messages directed at both Daisy Coleman, an alleged sexual assault victim in Maryville,

Missouri (Diaz & Effron, 2014), and the Steubenville victim shortly after they came forward to

report their respective assaults. A few of the many online posts about the Steubenville victim

189

read, *"Lol @ this Ohio high school 'rape.' This bitch was clearly drunk and a slut. Own up to your mistakes, bitch"*, *"So you got drunk at a party and two people take advantage of you, that's not rape you're just a loose drunk slut"*, and *"Steubenville: Guilty. I feel bad for the two young guys, Mays and Richmond, they did what most people in their situation would have done"* (Moore, 2013).

These messages are deeply rooted in both rape myths ("she wanted it" and "it wasn't rape") and the sexual double standard (belief that allows sexual freedom and promiscuity for men, but not for women; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996). Though the Steubenville teen was a victim of a crime, she was still labeled by some as a "slut" or "whore" while the accused, who were both charged and convicted of rape, were portrayed as "innocent" or "good" boys. These messages embody the classic sexual double standard concepts that "the girl was being a slut" and should be blamed because "boys will be boys."

During the Steubenville trail, the victim's past social media content was used as evidence against her sexual assault allegations. Defense attorneys in the Steubenville case utilized the content of the victim's social media accounts to blame her for her assault and, ultimately, tried to justify the actions of the accused perpetrators. One of the defense attorneys said:

> *Online photographs and posts could ultimately be 'a gift' for his client's case because the girl, before that night in August, had posted provocative comments and photographs on her Twitter page over time. He added that those online posts demonstrated that she was sexually active and showed that she was 'clearly engaged in at-risk behavior'* (Macur & Schweber, 2012; Players and Families Wait, para. 14).

The Steubenville alleged rape case was not the first time a plaintiff's social media content was used as support for the defense. In 2011, the defense produced provocative photos from Jessica Gonzalez's social media accounts to make the argument that Jessica did not suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in the year following allegedly being gang-raped by eight

190

college baseball players in 2007 (Kaplan, 2011), thus, implying her provocative photos and behaviors in those photos were proof she was not actually a victim of gang-rape. The belief that sexual assault did not occur or is somehow justified based on the content of a victim's social media profile aligns closely with common rape myths. Although there is currently no empirical research suggesting endorsement of rape myths extends to social media content, these alleged sexual assault cases provide anecdotal support that traditional rape myths have been repackaged and applied to the domain of social media.

The Current Study

An estimated 90% of young adults are users of at least one social media platform (Perrin, 2015), such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat. College students, who partially comprise the young adult population, spend approximately 16 hours per week on social media platforms (Huang & Capps, 2013). Preliminary findings suggest some college students believe they can interpret a person's consent based on the content of their social media profile (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Furthermore, college women represent a priority population in terms of studying sexual consent and sexual violence prevention due to their high risk for experiencing sexual assault (e.g., Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs, Linquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). As such, college students are an ideal population for studying beliefs about social media and sexual consent. Research exploring the link between social media and consent interpretation is novel and requires further elucidation because sexual consent, in fact, *cannot* and *should not* be determined based on social media content. Because sexual consent research still remains limited, there is a lack of validated scales measuring beliefs regarding sexual consent. Given the gaps in literature between exploring social media consent beliefs and validated consent measures, the purpose of the current study was to develop and validate a scale, guided by formative qualitative

191

research, that measures endorsement of the belief that a person's sexual consent can be determined based on the content they post to social media.

In both studies conducted by Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016), when asked about perceptions of consent interpretation via social media, some college men and women provided responses describing content found on *women's* social media profiles even though participants were not prompted to provide gender-specific responses. In other words, participants were not directly questioned about their perceptions of women's or men's social media profiles specifically, but some participants, nevertheless, provided responses that explicitly described women's profiles. For example, one male participant specifically described content found on a woman's social media profile when he stated:

> *You know the shirts that have the big V in them? You see just enough that, you know, you might look two or three times and then the shorts with the writing on the back that say, you know, juicy and pink. Those are certainly girls that I look at first….You would think it would be easier for a bad girl to just get there* [referring to having sex] *because she's already comfortable with the small clothes on and exposing themselves. It would seem logical that she would be more comfortable to do it or more willing to do it.* (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016, p. 10-11)

For the open-ended survey elicitation, Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) found that 83% of participants who provided gender-specific responses described content found on women's social media profiles. These findings suggest that the gender of the social media profile owner (a woman's profile vs. a man's profile) may impact participants' beliefs about sexual consent interpretation. Due to this discrepancy in previous findings based on the profile owner's gender, we determined that our scale should be structured to measure any possible differences in consent interpretation between a woman's social media profile and a man's profile.

As mentioned above, men and women across both studies primarily provided responses describing women's social media profile content with only a few women who discussed men's

profile content (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Interestingly, not a single male participant across either study discussed the content of a man's social media profile that would be indicative of his sexual consent because they only discussed women's profiles. It is possible these findings are the result of sexual orientation as heterosexual men may only perceive sexual consent from women because that is who they are primarily sexually attracted to.However, female participants described content found on women's social media profiles in greater frequency than men's profiles, thus, these findings cannot solely be based on the potential sexual attractions of the participant. Additionally, it is possible more participants did not describe content found on men's social media profiles because traditional gender roles posit men are always willing to engage in sexual activity (e.g., Edgar & Fitzpatrick, 1993; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Therefore, participants may perceive it unnecessary to assess a man's profile for potential consent cues as it is assumed that men would always consent to sexual activity.

Altogether, these previous findings generate two speculations warranting further examination: (1) the possibility that the sexual double standard extends into social media content and (2) that differences in beliefs about consent interpretation via social media content could vary based on participant gender. The sexual double standard posits that men are allowed more sexual freedoms, such as number of sexual partners and engaging in sexual activity outside of a committed relationship, as compared to women (Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996). In the context of social media, women's profiles may be subject to more scrutiny if they contain sexualized content compared to men's profiles. This was illustrated in both the Steubenville case and Jessica Gonzalez's alleged gang-rape case when the victims' pictures from social media were used to characterize them negatively as promiscuous teen girls. Furthermore, because women in Rhoads and Jozkowski's (2016) studies discussed content found on both women's and

men's social media profiles, but men only discussed the content of women's profiles, men and women could have different beliefs surrounding consent interpretation based on social media content. Though the findings from these studies are preliminary in nature, we thoughtfully considered them during the construction and psychometric assessment of our new scale.

In addition to creating and validating our new consent measure, we also sought to examine hypotheses we developed based on the previously mentioned qualitative findings (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). We developed these hypotheses in order to assess for both the content and known-groups validity of our newly created measure. We sought to address the following hypotheses to support the validity of our scale:

1. In general, participants would more strongly endorse the belief that consent could be interpreted from a social media if the profile owner is female compared to male.
2. Men and women would have differing beliefs about consent interpretation derived from social media content.

Methods

Scale Development

The Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) was developed and psychometrically assessed across multiple phases of data collection: Phase 1 consisted of item writing and mixed-methods pilot-testing; Phase 2 constituted additional quantitative pilot-testing; and Phase 3 was comprised of psychometric assessment that included reliability and validity analyses. The procedures for each phase are described in more detail below.

Participants

Eligibility criteria for the study included being enrolled in college courses at the time of data collection, at least 18 years old, having access to the Internet, and being a current or former

user of at least one social media platform (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or Snapchat). Study participants were recruited via email listserv, campus announcements, classrooms, social media, and word-of-mouth. When recruiting participants via classrooms, introductory courses (e.g. health, sociology, human development, psychology) were chosen as those courses tend to have more diverse sets of students in terms of age, class standing, and gender. Monetary gift cards and extra credit points awarded in respective college courses were offered as compensation for participation in the study. Course instructors that offered extra credit for completing the survey also offered an alternative extra credit assignment.

Phase 1: Item Writing and Pilot-testing

The purpose of Phase 1 was to develop a comprehensive item pool based on the results of previous formative qualitative research that consisted of interviews and an open-ended survey elicitation with college students (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016) and to pilot-test those items using a mixed-methods approach.

Item writing. The initial item pool for the SMCMS was derived from the qualitative themes that emerged from the two studies previously described. Items were written directly from the categorical codes in the coding manuals of both studies (see Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016 and Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016 for detailed codebooks). Creating items based on elicited responses from the target population enhances the relevancy of the measure for use among college students (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Because we thought participant beliefs may differ based on the gender of the social media profile owner (woman's profile vs. man's profile), we created matched pairs of items for women and men that resulted in the creation of two sets of items. The first set of items describes women's social media profiles and the second describes men's social media profiles. For example, the item *"Things a <u>woman</u> posts on social media are used to*

195

determine whether she would consent to sexual activity" belongs to the women's set of items and the matching item *"Things a <u>man</u> posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity"* belongs within the men's set.

Participants were given the following instructions while completing the items:

"The following questions are about social media. Social media includes websites and applications that enable people to create and share content or to participant in social networking (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat). Thinking about women in general, please answer to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements."

The directions for the men's set of items were identical with the exception of stating "thinking about men in general" rather than "women." Responses to the items ranged along a five-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree;" thus, higher scores indicate stronger endorsement of the perception that consent can be interpreted by looking at the contents of person's social media profile. The initial item pool consisted of 136 items total (68 in each gender-specific set) constituting three hypothesized factors within each set.

Mixed-methods pilot-testing and procedures. The SMCMS item pool and demographic questions were administered to participants via Qualtrics online survey software. Completion of the survey took anywhere between 20 and 30 minutes. The sets of women's and men's items were randomized (women's set then men's set or men's set then women's set) in order to address any bias or ordering effects as participants completed the scale. At the end of the survey, students were given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a one hour focus group to provide feedback on the wording, clarity, and interpretation of the items. A semi-structured focus group script was created to address general questions regarding the items; however, the script allowed for participants to guide the discussion about specific problematic or confusing items. Each focus

group session was audio recorded for purposes of identifying feedback that was common across all sessions. Focus group participants were compensated with a $10 gift card for their time.

Participant characteristics. As shown in Table 3, the majority of participants ($N = 104$) who completed the online survey in the initial phase of item evaluation were female ($n = 66$, 64%). Most participants identified as White ($n = 79$, 76%), were between the ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 74$, 84%), and heterosexual ($n = 86$, 83%). Relationship status was evenly spread among those who were single and not dating ($n = 36$, 35%), single and casually dating ($n = 26$, 25%), and in a relationship ($n = 33$, 32%).

The subset of participants ($N = 10$) who took part in the focus groups to provide qualitative feedback on the newly developed items were evenly split in terms of gender (n male = 5, n female = 5). The majority of participants were White ($n = 5$); however, there were Black ($n = 4$) and Hispanic ($n = 1$) participants as well. Most participants were between the ages 18 and 25 ($n = 9$) and identified they were single and not dating ($n = 7$) as their relationship status. All participants in the focus groups identified as heterosexual ($n = 10$). See Table 3 for all focus group participant demographics.

Analyses. Quantitative analyses were conducted on the SMCMS items using SPSS version 23. Participant responses were checked for rapid submission, therefore, responses that were completed in less than 10 minutes were removed from the sample. Scree plots were utilized in order to identify the number of factors appropriate to fit these data. Principle components analysis (PCA) using a direct oblimin rotation was conducted because we hypothesized that the factors would be correlated with each other. PCA results were used to identify problematic items that were subsequently removed from the item pool.

Phase 2: Additional Quantitative Pilot-testing

The purpose of the second phase of data collection was to purely assess the retained SMCMS items from Phase 1 quantitatively within a new sample of college students so as to further examine the factor structure of the items and eliminate additional items from the pool.

Quantitative pilot-testing and procedures. A new sample of college students was recruited to complete the reduced SMCMS item pool and demographics via Qualtrics. As in the previous phase, participants were given the same set of instructions for the women's and men's sets of items, and the sets were randomized to address any order effects or answering bias. Completion time for the survey was estimated to be between 15 and 25 minutes. Focus groups were not included during this phase of data collection, but rather, qualitative feedback on the items was elicited from a panel of sexual consent experts ($N = 4$).

Participant characteristics. Most participants for Phase 2 ($N = 75$) were female ($n = 44$, 59%), White ($n = 59$, 79%), between the ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 73$, 97%), and heterosexual ($n = 72$, 96%). A little over half of the participants indicated they were in a relationship ($n = 40$, 53%) for their relationship status. Table 3 includes all demographic information for these participants.

Analyses. Similar to the initial phase of data collection, scree plots and principle components analyses (PCA) were conducted with the SMCMS item pool. Scree plots identified the best factor structure to fit the items, whereas, PCA was utilized to further to reduce the item pool by eliminating problematic items.

Phase 3: Reliability and Validity Assessments

The purpose of the final phase of data collection was to assess how the SMCMS items functioned within a larger sample of college students and to examine the reliability and validity of the newly developed scale.

Participant characteristics and procedures. A new, larger sample of college students
($N = 397$) participated in the final phase of data collection. More than half of the participants
identified as female ($n = 244$, 62%). Most participants were White ($n = 324$, 82%), between the
ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 363$, 92%), and heterosexual ($n = 365$, 93%). The majority indicated
either being in a relationship ($n = 170$, 43%) or being single and not dating ($n = 133$, 34%) as
their relationship status. Refer to Table 3 for complete participant demographics. As in both
previous phases, participants completed the online survey via Qualtrics, with an estimated
completion time between 30 and 40 minutes.

Measures. The survey instrument for the final phase of data collection included: (1)
demographic items; (2) the revised and shortened version of Social Media Consent Myths Scale
items; (3) the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Short Form (IRMA–SF; Payne et al., 1999);
and the Sexual Double Standard Scale (SDSS; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996).

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Short Form. Burt (1980) previously defined rape
myths as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (p. 217).
The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) scale was developed by Payne and colleagues
(1999) to measure people's endorsement of such attitudes regarding rape. The short form of this
scale contains 20 items measuring the following common rape myths: *she asked for it* (4 items);
it wasn't really rape (2 items); *he didn't mean to* (2 items); *she wanted it* (2 items); *she lied* (2
items); *rape is a trivial event* (2 items); and *rape is a deviant event* (3 items). The short form also
includes three negatively worded filler items that are not scored when analyzing the scale. The
IRMA–SF responses range on a seven-point Likert scale from "not at all agree" to "very much
agree." Higher scores on the IRMA–SF indicate stronger endorsement of rape myths. Previously,

Payne and colleagues (1999) reported high internal consistency reliability for the IRMA–SF (α = 0.87).

The purpose for including the IRMA–SF during the final phase of data collection was to utilize it as a means to assess construct validity of the newly developed SMCMS. Previous research relevant to rape myths suggest those who endorse rape myths more strongly endorse sex role stereotyping, specifically meaning they hold more traditional attitudes toward women (e.g. women should not be sexually promiscuous, women should wear conservative clothing, women should not consume alcohol to get drunk; Burt, 1980). Previous consent researchers have utilized the IRMA–SF to demonstrate construct validity when validating scales measuring sexual consent beliefs and behaviors (e.g., Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders, Peterson, Dennis, & Reece, 2014; Ward, Matthews, Weiner, Hogan, & Popson, 2012). Rape myths are theoretically similar to the items on the SMCMS as they measure endorsement of consent beliefs interpreted from social media content that could be coined as "consent myths;" thus, it is likely there would be an association between endorsing rape myths and endorsing consent myths specific to social media.

Sexual Double Standard Scale. The sexual double standard is the concept that men are afforded more sexual freedom compared to women (Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996). The Sexual Double Standard Scale (SDSS) created by Muehlenhard and Quackenbush (1996) measures people's endorsement of attitudes regarding men's and women's sexual behaviors. The SDSS contains 26 items with 6 items that directly compare the behaviors of women and men and the remaining 20 are matched pairs of items that either describe men's or women's behaviors. Responses for the scale range on a four-point Likert scale from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly." Higher scores on the SDSS indicate stronger endorsement of the sexual double

standard. Previous research with the SDSS has found the measure to have adequate internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alphas ranging between 0.57 and 0.80 for the men's set of items, women's set, and behavioral comparison items (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Boone & Lefkowitz, 2004; Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996).

Similar to the IRMA–SF, the SDSS was included on the survey instrument to provide construct validity for the SMCMS items. Previous research investigating the sexual double standard has identified that women who are perceived to be sexually promiscuous and engage in hook-up sexual encounters are often stigmatized or called names (e.g., "slut") that negatively affect their reputations or status (e.g., Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002), whereas, men do not experience similar negative outcomes relevant to their sexual behaviors. Research has yet to link endorsement of the sexual double standard with consent beliefs; however, we hypothesize there is an association between endorsement of the sexual double standard and the SMCMS items because preliminary findings suggest college students perceive content found on a women's social media profile as more indicative of sexual consent compared to content found on men's profiles (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016).

Analyses. The analyses for this phase of data collection included: (1) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Barlett's test of sphericity; (2) scree plots; (3) exploratory factor analysis; (4) Cronbach's alpha; (5) paired samples *t*-test; (6) independent samples *t*-tests; and (7) correlations. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Barlett's test of sphericity were conducted to determine whether the sample size was sufficiently large and equal variances were assumed across the sample to ensure the appropriateness of conducting a factor analysis on the SMCMS data collected during this phase. As in previous phases, scree plots served to identify the best number of factors to fit the data. Exploratory factor analysis

(EFA) conducted using Principle Axis Factoring with a direct oblimin rotation was used to examine factor loadings and identify any additional items that should be removed from the SMCMS. Internal consistency reliability of the SMCMS was determined by conducting Cronbach's alphas on the SMCMS women's and men's sets of items and each SMCMS factor. Both the paired samples t-test and independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess preliminary findings from previous research as additional validity analyses. Lastly, Pearson correlations were conducted among the SMCMS women's and men's sets of items, individual SMCMS factors, the IRMA–SF, and the SDSS to assess the construct validity of the newly developed scale.

Results

Phase 1

Factor analysis. The set of items that describe women's social media profiles (n items = 68) and the set of the items describing men's social media profiles (n items = 68) were analyzed separately in order to examine how items functioned within the gender-specific sets. Scree plot results identified a 3-factor solution as the best fit for both sets of items (i.e., items describing women's and men's social medial profiles). The factor structures for the women's set and men's set were then compared to eliminate items that did not load similarly across both factor structures in order to maintain the congruency of the matched items between both sets. For example, the items *"I can tell whether a woman would consent to sexual activity by looking at her physical attractiveness on social media"* and *"I can tell whether a man would consent to sexual activity by looking at his physical attractiveness on social media"* loaded with different groups of items in their respective gender-specific sets, thus, were eliminated from the scale. Items were also eliminated based on principle components analyses (PCA) results using a direct oblimin rotation

202

if items cross-loaded on multiple factors or had poor factor loadings (< 0.400) within their

respective gender-specific set. As an example, the item *"Women who post status updates about*

their Greek sorority on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity" loaded at

0.300 or higher on two factors within the women's set while the matching item from the men's

set (*"Men who post status updates about their Greek fraternity on social media are more likely*

to consent to sexual activity") also loaded at 0.300 or higher on two factors within the set,

resulting in both items being removed from the scale. Furthermore, feedback from the focus

group participants was utilized to either edit or eliminate items with confusing language to

reduce the possibility of participants misinterpreting the items. A total of 36 items were

eliminated from the scale during this phase, meaning 18 matched items were removed from both

the women's and men's sets in order to retain congruency between the sets. The final 3-factor

solution with the 50 items retained in each gender-specific set (100 total items) accounted for

66% and 68% of variability in items describing women's and men's social media profiles,

respectively.

Phase 2

   Factor analysis. Similar to Phase 1, the sets of items describing beliefs specific to

women's and men's social media profiles were examined separately and compared using the

same procedure previously described to eliminate additional items from the measure. Items were

eliminated utilizing the same statistical criteria described in Phase 1 analyses. However, in Phase

2, feedback was elicited from sexual consent experts rather than focus group participants to

provide further qualitative assessment of the items. The scree plots for each subset of items

indicated a 2-factor solution as the best fit for each gender-specific set. In this round of revisions,

20 matched items were eliminated from each set, retaining 30 items in both women's and men's

sets resulting in 60 total items being retained for the full scale. The separate PCA results conducted on each of the women's and men's sets of 30 items with a 2-factor solution accounted for 63% of the variance in the items for both gender-specific sets, respectively.

Phase 3

Factor analysis and reliability. Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) using the Principle Axis Factoring (PAF) procedure with a direct oblimin rotation were conducted on each set of items describing women's and men's profiles separately to further reduce the number of items. Using the same criteria from the previous phases, 10 matched items were eliminated from both sets resulting in 20 items describing women's profiles and 20 items describing men's profiles, making the total number of items for the scale 40; thus, we utilized an estimated 1:10 ratio of items to participants which is the general recommendation for psychometric assessment in behavioral research (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The KMO measure for sampling adequacy for the women's set was 0.942, which is sufficiently above the recommended cutoff of 0.600 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Additionally, the Barlett's test of sphericity was significant [χ^2 (190) = 7899.40, $p < 0.001$], indicating equal variances to be assumed across the sample. For the women's set (20 items), both scree plots and PAF identified a 2-factor solution that accounted for 68% of variability in the items and demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha =$ 0.96). The two resulting factors are: (1) women's sexualized and party-related content and (2) women's conservative and religious content. The KMO for the men's set of items was 0.926, which exceeds the recommended cutoff of 0.600 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Barlett's test of sphericity was significant [χ^2 (190) = 6632.52, $p < 0.001$], indicating equal variances to be assumed across the sample. PAF and scree plots also identified a 2-factor solution that accounted for 61% of variability in the items with high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha =$ 0.94) for the

men's set (20 items). The factors for the men's set of items were identical to the women's set of items; therefore, the resulting factors were: (1) men's sexualized and party-related content and (2) men's conservative and religious content. Table 4 depicts SMCMS factor structure and item means, standard deviations, and their respective factor loadings.

Differences in SMCMS scores. As previously mentioned, we conducted additional validity checks based on previous preliminary findings. These analyses were meant to establish the content and known-groups validity of the newly developed measure. We conducted these analyses to examine our hypotheses that (1) participant scores on the SMCMS would differ based upon the gender of the social media profile owner and (2) that scores on the SMCMS would differ based upon participant gender. To assess our hypotheses, we conducted paired samples *t*-test and multiple independent samples *t*-tests.

A paired samples *t*-test was conducted in order to examine whether participants answered the items in women's set significantly different from the men's set of items. Results indicated there were no significant differences [$t(34) = 0.69$, $p = 0.51$] in scores between these sets of items, meaning, in general, participants in this sample did not answer items significantly different based upon the profile owner's gender. Thus, our first hypothesis was not supported. As a follow-up, we conducted independent samples *t*-tests to identify if there were differences in scores on the women's full set of items, men's full set of items, and both women's and men's factors. Because we conducted six independent samples *t*-tests, we utilized a Holm-Bonferroni correction to control for type I error (Holm, 1979).

We found that males ($M = 2.96$) had significantly higher scores on the women's full set of items [$t(343.64) = 3.24$, $p < 0.001$] compared to females in the sample ($M = 2.72$). These results suggest men in the sample were more likely than women to endorse the belief that a

205

woman's sexual consent could be determined by looking at the content of her social media profile. The scores for males ($M = 2.88$) and females ($M = 2.80$) on the men's set of items did not significantly differ, meaning both men and women in this sample endorse similar beliefs about being able to perceive a man's sexual consent by looking at the content of his social media profile. Males also had significantly higher scores on the women's sexualized and party-related content factor ($M = 3.16$) and women's conservative and religious content factor ($M = 2.37$) as compared to females ($M = 2.92$ and $M = 2.10$, respectively). These results further support that men were more likely to endorse the belief that content women post to social media can be used to interpret their sexual consent. There were no significant differences between males and females scores on men's sexualized and party-related content and men's conservative and religious content factors. These results partially support our second hypothesis. Table 5 contains the results for all of the independent samples t-tests.

      Construct validity. To assess the construct validity of this newly developed scale, Pearson correlations among the SMCMS women's set of items, SMCMS men's set of items, individual SMCMS factors, the IRMA–SF, and the SDSS were conducted. The SMCMS women's set, men's set, and individual factors were all significantly positively correlated ($p < 0.01$) with the IRMA. These results suggest participants who endorse the belief that sexual consent can be perceived via a person's social media profile also endorse common rape myths. Because we hypothesized there would be differences in participant responses based on the gender of the social media profile owner (a woman's social media profile vs. a man's social media profile) and the participant's gender, we conducted correlations between the SMCMS women's set of items, SMCMS men's set of items, all individual SMCMS factors, and the SDSS. Both SMCMS gender-specific sets of items and the individual SMCMS factors were

significantly positively correlated ($p < 0.01$) with the SDSS (Table 6 for correlation coefficients). These findings suggest those participants who endorse the belief that sexual consent can be perceived via social media profile content also endorse the sexual double standard. Although the correlations between the men's subset of items was statistically significant with IRMA–SF and SDSS scores, the correlations between the women's items and both the IRMA–SF and SDSS were much higher, 0.319 and 0.259, compared to men's items correlations, 0.185 and 0.173 respectively.

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to develop a quantitative scale measuring endorsement of the belief that sexual consent can be interpreted based on social media content and, subsequently, provide evidence for the reliability and validity of this measure. Results suggested that this newly developed scale produces scores that are valid and reliable as a measurement tool that can be used to assess the belief that a person's sexual consent can be determined by looking at the content posted on their social media profile.

Reliability and Validity

The final Social Media Consent Myths Scale is comprised of two sets of gender-matched items that measure social media and consent beliefs specific to (1) sexualized and party-related content and (2) conservative and religious content found on women's and men's social media profiles. Initially, the items written for the SMCMS were developed based on qualitative findings from interviews and an open-ended survey elicitation (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Utilizing elicited responses from the target population during the item-writing process of a new scale can assist in establishing the content validity and cultural relevancy of the measure. The final items retained for the SMCMS align with the preliminary results from Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) in

which students identified sexualized pictures and posts, lack of clothing worn in pictures, and engagement in drinking alcohol and partying as social media content indicative that a person would consent to sexual activity. The women's and men's "conservative and religious content" factors of the SMCMS are composed of items that reflect student responses indicating religious and sexually conservative content on social media is indicative that a person would *not* consent to sexual activity.

Comparisons of SMCMS scores were conducted to identify if differences in scores existed based on the gender of the social media profile owner and participant's gender in an attempt to assess the newly developed scale for known-groups validity. Results indicated that the sample, as a whole, did not respond to the women's and men's subset of items differently. In other words, participants' responses for items about women's social media profiles were answered in a similar fashion as those items addressing men's social media profiles. However, subsequent analyses revealed that male participants had significantly higher scores on the full set of women's items, women's sexualized and party-related content factor, and women's conservative and religious content factor compared to female participants' scores. When comparing our results to the previous qualitative findings the SMCMS was developed from, male participants provided responses describing women's social media content only; men from that formative research did not indicate that men's social media content could be used for consent interpretation (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Thus, the fact that men had significantly higher scores on items addressing women's social media profiles compared to items assessing men's social media profiles aligns with previous findings and provides support to establish known-groups validity for the SMCMS. Furthermore, such findings suggest at least some men believe that information regarding a woman's likelihood of consenting to sex can be derived from her

social media profile; both male and female participants did not apply this same belief structure to men's social media profiles as women and men in our sample did not have differing scores on the men's set of items. This lack of difference in scores may be because participants in our sample endorse traditional gender scripts that posit men always want to engage in sexual activity, making the type of content men post to social media irrelevant in assessing whether men would consent to sexual activity because of the underlying assumption men always consent.

All correlations between the SMCMS women's and men's sets of items and the subsequent four factors were significant and ranged in strength from moderate to strong (0.449 to 0.974, $p < .01$). Additionally, the SMCMS gender-specific sets of items and each SMCMS factor illustrated high internal consistency reliability and maintained high factor loadings. These results suggest the SMCMS items work together to measure a single underlying construct regarding people's beliefs about consent interpretation based on social media content.

Rape myth acceptance. We sought to assess whether there was an association between the newly developed SMCMS and rape myth acceptance as another mechanism to assess for validity. The SMCMS women's and men's sets of items and SMCMS factors had significant positive associations with the IRMA–SF, meaning those who endorsed the belief that a person's consent could be determined by looking at their social media profile likely also endorsed common rape myths. We hypothesized such an association would exist because SMCMS items measure beliefs about interpreting sexual consent via social media content ("consent myths") which are theoretically similar to IRMA–SF items measuring rape myths. It makes sense that people who endorse SMCMS items like "*Women who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity*" and "*Women who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity*" would

also endorse IRMA–SF items like "*A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tried to force her to have sex*" and "*If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control*" (Payne et al., 1999, pp. 49-50). The SMCMS women's subset of items had the strongest association with the IRMA–SF compared to men's SMCMS items. This is most likely because the majority of items in the IRMA–SF focus on women's behaviors as victims of rape, and the SMCMS women's items also focus on women's behaviors on social media. The significant associations we found between the SMCMS and the IRMA–SF provide support for the construct validity of the new scale.

Sexual double standard. The SMCMS was assessed to determine whether there was an association between endorsement of the belief that sexual consent could be derived from social media content and the sexual double standard. As stated earlier, participant responses from previous qualitative research suggested the possibility that the sexual double standard extends to content posted on social media (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). As such, the items for the SMCMS were developed in gender-matched pairs so there would be identical items measuring beliefs about both women's and men's social media profiles (e.g., "*Women who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity*" and "*Men who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity*"). Although there were no statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the women's and men's sets of items when assessing the sample as a whole, we found differences in scores on the items assessing women's social media profile based on participant's gender. As mentioned previously, male participants reported significantly higher scores on the women's full set of items, women's sexualized and party-related content factor, and women's conservative and religious content factor to female participants in the sample. Additionally, male and female participants' scores

did not differ on the items describing men's social media profiles. These results provide partial support for the presence of a sexual double standard regarding the interpretation of consent from women's social media content among the male participants in our sample.

Correlation results indicated significant positive associations among the SMCMS women's items, men's items, and four factors and the SDSS, meaning individuals who endorsed the belief that consent can be interpreted from social media content likely endorsed the sexual double standard. All SMCMS factors were significantly correlated with the SDSS; however, the women's set of items were most highly correlated with the SDSS indicating those who endorsed the belief that content on a women's social media profile is indicative of her consent likely endorse greater acceptance of sexual freedom for men compared to women. For example, individuals who endorse the SMCS item "*Women who post pictures that show their cleavage on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity*" likely endorse the SDSS item "*A woman who initiates sex is too aggressive*" (Muehlenhard & Quackenbush, 1996, p. 200). The significant relationships found between the SMCMS and the SDSS assisted in establishing the construct validity of the new scale.

Limitations

Although the current study provided evidence for the reliability and validity of scores produced from a scale developed utilizing a multi-phase process, it was not without limitations. We conducted internal consistency reliability analyses via Cronbach's alphas for the SMCMS individual factors and gender-specific sets, but we did not examine the temporal stability of the scale by conducting test-retest reliability analyses. Assessing the scale's ability to measure endorsement of the belief that consent can be interpreted based on social media content consistently over time would provide further evidence of its reliability (DeVellis, 2003).

Students who participated in the study were recruited from a large Southern university using convenience sampling. Participants primarily identified as female, White, and heterosexual, therefore, these findings may not be representative of the college student population as a whole. Additionally, in the directions for the newly developed scale, we requested that participants think about either "women in general" or "men in general" as they completed the respective gender-specific subsets, but it could be possible that participants completed the scale based on the beliefs they hold about people they are friends with or follow on social media.

Future Research

The Social Media Consent Myths Scale measures beliefs about sexual consent, but does not address whether students report actually utilizing social media to communicate their sexual consent. Perhaps the reason why some college students endorse the belief that sexual consent can be interpreted from social media content is because they perceive the content they post on social media to be indicative of their own consent. Previous consent research has identified that college students often utilize implicit, non-verbal cues to communicate their consent to partners (e.g., Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014); therefore, future research investigating whether students perceive they can/have communicated their consent to a partner via social media is warranted.

Previous research examining sexual assault perpetration has identified contextual and situational attributes that lead perpetrators to believe their actions are justified. Attributes such as women leading men on, women agreeing to kissing/touching, and women wearing revealing clothes are common justifications for sexual assault (e.g., Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001; Wegner, Abbey, Pierce, Pegram, & Woerner, 2015). Findings from the current

212

study suggest some college students believe that social media content can be communicative of a woman's sexual consent more so than a man's. These results suggest that some students believe posting certain social media content (e.g., sexualized posts, pictures showing off cleavage, pictures wearing limited clothing) comprises contextual or situational consent. Research examining the link between sexual assault justification and consent beliefs has yet to be conducted; however, the belief that sexual assault is justified based on the type of content a person posts to social media is problematic and worth exploration.

Implications

The Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) is the first measure developed and validated that links sexual consent interpretation with social media content. The majority of current sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) programs on college campuses focus on consent promotion by encouraging students to obtain consent prior to engaging in sexual activity (Daigle, Fisher, & Stewart, 2009; Donat & White, 2000; Schewe, 2006). Affirmative consent policies ("yes means yes") also endorse consent promotion by requiring students to, mutually and voluntarily, provide consent via words and behaviors prior to sexual activity taking place. However, these programs and policies do not account for the contextual and situational factors that influence consent negotiation, such as interpreting a woman posting a sexy "selfie" to social media as her consent to sexual activity. The SMCMS could be a useful tool for measuring students' endorsement of consent myths surrounding social media content, not only to inform the creation of effective SAPE programs, but also as an evaluative mechanism to gauge whether SAPE programs are successful in educating students about sexual consent and changing beliefs regarding consent myths.

The findings of the current study not only provided evidence for the reliability and validity of the SMCMS, but also suggest some people believe they can perceive sexual consent from social media content. As mentioned previously, we are *not* suggesting that consent can be interpreted by looking at a person's social media content, but rather reporting that at least some college students endorse such a belief. Students who endorse the belief that social media content can be indicative of a person's sexual consent are more likely to endorse rape myths (e.g., victim blaming, rape can be justified) and the sexual double standard (acceptance of greater sexual freedom for men compared to women). These findings are troubling because endorsement of rape myths has been linked to engaging in sexual assault behaviors (Burt, 1980; Payne et al., 1999; Schewe, 2006), meaning those who endorse the belief that consent can be derived from social media content are more likely to perpetrate sexual assault. Additionally, college women are already at increased risk for experiencing sexual assault (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2009), and the strongest relationships found between rape myth acceptance and the sexual double standard were with the SMCMS items describing women's social media profiles. Taken together, these findings indicate that some college students believe women's social media profiles, more so than men's, are open for interpretation when it comes to sexual consent; therefore, it is not surprising the victims of the four alleged sexual assault cases mentioned earlier were subjected to online messages of "slut-shaming" and victim-blaming because people believed their social media content and other actions were indicative of their consent. Efforts to change the culture surrounding sexual consent is needed in order to eliminate endorsement of consent myths and reduce sexual assault.

Table 3. *Demographic Characteristics for Participants across all Three Phases*

Characteristic	Phase 1 All n (%)	Phase 1 Focus Group n (%)	Phase 2 n (%)	Phase 3 n (%)
N	104	10	75	397
Gender				
Male	38 (36.5)	5 (50.0)	31 (41.3)	153 (38.5)
Female	66 (63.5)	5 (50.0)	44 (58.7)	244 (61.5)
Age (Mean)	22.5	22.6	21.0	21.3
Race/Ethnicity				
White	79 (76.0)	5 (50.0)	59 (78.7)	324 (81.6)
Black/African American	11 (10.6)	4 (40.0)	7 (9.3)	28 (7.1)
Hispanic/Latino	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	5 (6.7)	20 (5.1)
Native American/American Indian	1 (1.0)	-	-	6 (1.5)
Asian/Asian American	6 (5.8)	-	2 (2.7)	12 (3.0)
Bi- or Multi-racial	5 (4.8)	-	2 (2.7)	6 (1.5)
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual	86 (82.7)	10 (100)	72 (96.0)	365 (92.6)
Gay/Lesbian	3 (2.9)	-	2 (2.7)	13 (3.3)
Bisexual	10 (9.6)	-	1 (1.3)	10 (2.5)
Unsure	3 (2.9)	-	-	2 (0.5)
Queer	1 (1.0)	-	-	2 (0.5)
Other	1 (1.0)	-	-	2 (0.5)
Relationship Status				
Single, not dating	36 (34.6)	7 (70.0)	35 (46.7)	133 (33.6)
Single, casually dating	26 (25.0)	-	14 (18.7)	72 (18.2)
In a relationship	33 (31.7)	2 (20.0)	40 (53.3)	170 (42.9)
Married	8 (7.7)	1 (10.0)	-	17 (4.3)
Divorced	-	-	-	1 (0.3)
Other	1 (1.0)	-	-	3 (0.8)
Sexual Relationship Status				
Exclusive/monogamous	47 (45.2)	3 (30.0)	35 (46.7)	187 (47.1)
Non-exclusive/ non-monogamous	9 (8.7)	-	2 (2.7)	11 (2.8)
Casual sexual encounter	14 (13.5)	1 (10.0)	8 (10.7)	50 (12.6)
Not engaging in sexual activity currently	34 (32.7)	6 (60.0)	30 (40.0)	149 (37.5)
Class Standing				
Freshmen	14 (13.5)	1 (10.0)	6 (8.0)	50 (12.6)
Sophomore	26 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	15 (20.0)	143 (36.0)
Junior	13 (12.5)	1 (10.0)	39 (52.0)	109 (27.5)
Senior	41 (39.4)	4 (40.0)	15 (20.0)	83 (20.9)
Graduate student	10 (9.6)	2 (20.0)	-	12 (3.0)

(Continued)

Table 3. *Demographic Characteristics for Participants across all Three Phases (Cont.)*

	Phase 1		Phase 2	Phase 3
	All	**Focus Group**		
Characteristic	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**
Greek Membership				
Yes	26 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	32 (42.7)	153 (38.5)
No	78 (75.0)	8 (80.0)	43 (57.3)	244 (61.5)
Social Media Use				
Current user	75 (72.1)	8 (80.0)	56 (74.7)	388 (98.0)
Former user	29 (27.9)	2 (20.0)	19 (25.3)	7 (1.8)
Religious Service Attendance				
Once or more a week	21 (20.2)	2 (20.0)	33 (44.0)	94 (23.7)
2 – 3 times per month	17 (16.3)	3 (30.0)	12 (16.0)	81 (20.4)
Once a month	8 (7.7)	-	8 (10.7)	48 (12.1)
Few times per year	33 (31.7)	2 (20.0)	14 (18.7)	120 (30.2)
Never	25 (24.0)	3 (30.0)	8 (10.7)	54 (13.6)

Table 4. *Factor Loadings for the Social Media and Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS)*

Factor Women's Set α = 0.96	M	SD	Factor Loadings
Factor 1: Sexualized and Party-related Content			
Women who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.32	1.06	.847
Women who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.30	1.05	.834
Women who post pictures that show their cleavage on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.08	1.11	.826
Women who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.16	1.07	.825
Women who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.22	1.07	.814
Women who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.16	1.08	.805
Women who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.22	1.11	.803
Women who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.82	1.08	.736
Pictures a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity	2.99	1.09	.714
Women who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.80	1.05	.706
Women who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.76	1.07	.691
Women who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.69	1.03	.676
Comments a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity	2.89	1.05	.654
Things a woman posts on social media are used to determine whether she would consent to sexual activity	2.91	1.10	.617
Women who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.64	1.00	.614
Factor 2: Conservative and Religious Content			
Women who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.16	.804	.860
Women who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.16	.804	.855
Women who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.14	.818	.847

(Continued)

Table 4. *Factor Loadings for the Social Media and Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) (Cont.)*

Factor	M	SD	Factor Loadings
Women who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.20	.780	.750
Women who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.28	.858	.697
Men's Set α = 0.94			
Factor 1: Sexualized and Party-related Content			
Men who post pictures wearing minimal clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.24	1.04	.779
Men who post provocative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.45	1.01	.753
Men who post pictures that show their abs on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.12	1.06	.748
Men who post sexy comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.37	1.02	.735
Men who post pictures that emphasize their body parts on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.32	1.02	.730
Men who post sexy status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.41	1.03	.714
Men who post pictures of themselves at parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.82	1.08	.692
Men who post pictures of themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.82	1.09	.680
Men who post sexy pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	3.33	1.03	.672
Men who post status updates about themselves drinking alcohol on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.80	1.07	.666
Men who post status updates about themselves attending parties on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.78	1.03	.649
Comments a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity	2.98	1.02	.585
Pictures a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity	2.67	.99	.580
Men who have a certain type of friends on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.68	1.01	.560
Things a man posts on social media are used to determine whether he would consent to sexual activity	2.52	1.02	.477

(Continued)

Table 4. *Factor Loadings for the Social Media and Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) (Cont.)*

Factor	M	SD	Factor Loadings
Factor 2: Conservative and Religious Content			
Men who post religious comments on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.12	.792	.836
Men who post pictures of themselves at religious events on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.20	.821	.833
Men who post religious status updates on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.16	.786	.816
Men who post pictures wearing conservative clothing on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.24	.763	.746
Men who post conservative pictures of themselves on social media are more likely to consent to sexual activity	2.32	.871	.681

Table 5. *Gender Comparisons of SMCMS Scores using Independent Samples T-tests*

	Men		Women		
	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Women's Full Set	2.96	0.70	2.72	0.76	3.24[*]
Men's Full Set	2.88	0.62	2.80	0.72	1.10
Women's Sexualized and Party-related Content	3.16	0.81	2.92	0.90	2.70[**]
Women's Conservative and Religious Content	2.37	0.77	2.10	0.68	3.43[***]
Men's Sexualized and Party-related Content	3.06	0.72	3.01	0.83	0.71
Men's Conservative and Religious Content	2.31	0.71	2.18	0.72	1.80

Note. [*]Significance level $p < 0.0083$; [**]Significance level $p < 0.01$; [***]Significance level $p < 0.0125$

Table 6. *Correlation among SMCMS Gender-specific sets and factors, IRMA–SF, and SDSS*

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. SMCMS Women's Set	-						
2. SMCMS Men's Set	.707[**]	-					
3. Women's Sexualized and Party-related Content	.974[**]	.686[**]	-				
4. Women's Conservative and Religious Content	.583[**]	.424[**]	.384[**]	-			
5. Men's Sexualized and Party-related Content	.681[**]	.970[**]	.701[**]	.261[**]	-		
6. Men's Conservative and Religious Content	.449[**]	.613[**]	.302[**]	.747[**]	.403[**]	-	
7. IRMA–SF	.319[**]	.185[**]	.270[**]	.336[**]	.152[**]	.203[**]	-
8. SDSS	.259[**]	.173[**]	.245[**]	.173[**]	.158[**]	.140[**]	.319[**]

Note. [**]Significant at 0.01 level.

References

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A. M., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(8), 784-807.

Bay-Cheng, L. Y., & Zucker, A. (2007). Feminism between the sheets: Sexual attitudes among feminists, nonfeminists, and egalitarians. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 157-163.

Beres, M. (2007). "Spontaneous" sexual consent: An analysis of sexual consent literature. *Feminism and Psychology, 17*(1), 93-108.

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

Boone, T. L., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2004). Safer sex and the health belief model: Considering the contributions of peer norms and socialization factors. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 16*, 51-68.

Burkett, M., & Hamilton, K. (2012). Postfeminist sexual agency: Young women's negotiations of sexual consent. *Sexualities, 15*(7), 815-833.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Lee, H. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct.* Retrieved from http://titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/sites/titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/files/ccs-report.pdf

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation, 10*(7). Retrieved from http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n7.pdf

Daigle, L. E., Fisher, B. S., & Stewart, M. (2009). The effectiveness of sexual victimization prevention among college students: A summary of "what works." *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 398-404.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Applied social research methods series: Vol. 26. Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Diaz, J., & Effron, L. (2014). Newly released documents, tapes from Maryville teen alleged rape case reveal new details. *ABC News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/US/newly-released-documents-tapes-maryville-teen-alleged-rape/story?id=23164717

Donat, P. L. N., & White, J. W. (2000). Re-examining the issue of non-consent in acquaintance rape. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, & feminism* (pp. 355-376). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Edgar, T., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1993). Expectations for sexual interaction: A cognitive test of the sequencing of sexual communication behaviors. *Health Communication, 5*, 239-261.

Grim, K. (2013). *Suicides should compel us to end victim-blaming*. Retrieved from http://www.aauw.org/2013/04/25/suicides-and-victim-blaming/

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/consent1.htm

Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society, 23*(5), 589-616.

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6*(2), 65-70.

Huang, S., & Capps, M. (2013). Impact of online social network on American college students' reading practices. *The College Quarterly, 16* (1). Retrieved from http://collegequarterly.ca/2013-vol16-num01-winter/huang-capps.html

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

Johnson, C. (2016). Sundance film shows realities behind social media use and sexual assault. The Oklahoman. Retrieved from http://newsok.com/article/5475276

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

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.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent? *International Journal of Sexual Health, 27*, 156–174.

Kaplan, T. (2011). Risque photos of plaintiff revealed in De Anza gang-rape civil trial. *The Mercury News*. Retrieved from http://www.mercurynews.com/ci_17622279

Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., . . . White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 357-370.

Krebs, C. P., Linquist, 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*(6), 639-647.

Macur, J., & Schweber, N. (2012). Rape case unfolds on the web and splits city. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/17/sports/high-school-football-rape-case-unfolds-online-and-divides-steubenville-ohio.html?_r=0

Moore, J. (2013). 23 people who think the Steubenville rape victim is to blame. *Buzzfeed*. Retrieved from https://www.buzzfeed.com/jpmoore/23-people-who-think-the-steubenville-rape-victim-is-to-blame?utm_term=.uvPOY0pyNy#.phAlwOaGRG

Muehlenhard, C. L., Humphreys, T., Jozkowski, J. N., & Peterson, Z. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *Journal of Sex Research, 53*(4-5), 457-487.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Quackenbush, D. M. (1996). *The social meaning of women's condom use: The sexual double standard and women's beliefs about the meaning ascribed to condom use*. Unpublished manuscript.

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11/12), 359-375.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.

Perrin, A. (2015). Social networking usage: 2005 – 2015. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/10/PI_2015-10-08_Social-Networking-Usage-2005-2015_FINAL.pdf

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

Ross, S. (2013). Who failed Rehtaeh Parsons? *The Chronicle Herald*. Retrieved from http://thechronicleherald.ca/metro/1122345-who-failed-rehtaeh-parsons#.UWPfLERNjaM.facebook

Schewe, P. A. (2006). Interventions to prevent sexual violence. In Paul A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the life span* (pp. 223-239). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, F. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Ward, R. M., Matthews, M. R., Weiner, J., Hogan, K. M., & Popson, H. C. (2012). Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale: Development and validation. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 36*, 746–756.

Wegner, R., Abbey, A., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., Woerner, J. (2015). Sexual assault perpetrators' justifications for their actions: Relationships to rape supportive attitudes, incident characteristics, and future perpetration. *Violence Against Women, 21*(8), 1018-1037.

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 806-838.

V. Manuscript #2

The Redevelopment of an Event-level Measure of Sexual Consent

Kelley E. Rhoads, PhD[1], Kristen N. Jozkowski, PhD[1], Wen-Juo Lo, PhD[2], Jacquelyn D. Wiersma, PhD[3], Heather D. Blunt-Vinti, PhD[1]

[1]: University of Arkansas, Department of Health, Human Performance and Recreation
[2]: University of Arkansas, Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources, and Communication Disorders
[3]: University of Arkansas, School of Human Environmental Sciences

Corresponding Author: Kelley E. Rhoads, PhD, Community Health Promotion, Department of Health, Human Performance & Recreation, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA

Abstract

Preliminary research suggests some college students believe sexual consent can be communicated in social settings (e.g., parties, bars) and contexts lacking face-to-face interaction (e.g., text messages, social media). Researchers have labeled such perceptions of consent as "outside the bedroom" consent. Current validated consent scales measure consent that occurs in the moments right before sexual behavior happens ("inside the bedroom" consent), and do not include "outside the bedroom" consent. The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR), a comprehensive measure that assesses how college students communicated consent during their last consensual sexual experience. Development of the ECSR was guided by previous measures and formative qualitative research. A multi-phase research design consisting of a mixed-methods approach and three data collection phases was utilized to develop and refine the ECSR. In Phase 1, college students (N=104) pilot-tested the items, with a subset of students (n=10) recruited to provide qualitative feedback during focus groups. Phase 2 (N=75) constituted additional item refinement. Phase 3 (N=593) included psychometric assessments via reliability and validity analyses. The final ECSR contains two scales and is comprised of 104 items. Results supported the validity and reliability of the ECSR scales and corresponding factors. The ECSR contributes to consent literature as the first scale measuring "outside the bedroom" consent. Additionally, the ECSR can be used to inform the creation of more culturally relevant sexual assault prevention education programs that address misconceptions around the perception that "outside the bedroom" cues are indicative of consent.

Introduction

Approximately one in five college women experience an attempted or completed sexual assault during college (e.g., Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs, Linquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). In 2014, President Obama created the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault in response to this prominent public health issue (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). The purpose of the Task Force is to collaborate with universities in an effort to eliminate sexual violence on college campuses (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). Additionally, state legislators have created and implemented affirmative consent policies ("yes means yes") in four states (California, New York, Connecticut, and Illinois), as of June 2016 (The Affirmative Consent Project, 2016), which attempt to reduce sexual assault by requiring students to provide mutual and voluntary consent to sexual activity by using words and behaviors indicative of their consent to each sexual behavior engaged in during the interaction. Both the Task Force and implementation of affirmative consent policies have created a forum in which sexual consent has become the topic of public discourse. Although there is an undeniable link between sexual consent and sexual assault, consent research still remains limited in comparison to sexual assault research (Beres, 2007) which is why researchers have called for additional study of sexual consent to be conducted (e.g., Muehlenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, & Peterson, 2016).

Sexual Consent

Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) previously defined sexual consent as "the freely given verbal or nonverbal communication of a feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity" (p. 259). When defining sexual consent, college students often provide a definition synonymous with Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) that conceptualizes consent as an agreement between

partners or a willingness to engage in sexual activity (Beres, Senn, & McCaw, 2014; Humphreys, 2004; Jozkowski, Peterson, Sanders, Dennis, & Reece, 2014). Previous consent research examining how college students communicate their sexual consent to potential partners found that students report utilizing nonverbal forms of communication most often (e.g., making eye contact, touching, flirting) (e.g., Burkett & Hamilton, 2012; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004). Additionally, researchers have identified contextual factors that influence how students communicate consent, such as the sexual behavior (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), partners' relationship status (Beres, 2014; Foubert, Garner, & Thaxter, 2006; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014), and the person's gender (Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). Although students provide definitions that characterize consent occurring as a discrete event, when expressing how they previously communicated consent to a partner and interpreted consent cues from that respective partner, students often described sexual consent as an ongoing process (Beres, 2010; Beres et al., 2014; Humphreys, 2004; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a). In other words, students described communicating consent cues (words or behaviors) to their partner and continually checked their partner's response for what students perceived to be their partner's consent cues. Beres (2010) identified this process of communicating and receiving feedback as "active participation" (p. 8).

Early consent research primarily focused on identifying cues students use in the moments right before sexual behavior began (e.g., Beres, 2007; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004); however, more recent research suggests college students perceive they can assess consent cues from potential partners in social settings, such as parties or bars, far removed from the place ("proverbial bedroom") and time (when) in which sexual activity

actually occurs (Beres, 2010; Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; O'Bryne, Hansen, &

Rapley, 2008). For example, one female college student interviewed by Jozkowski and Hunt

(2016a) said, "*I knew he wanted to* [have vaginal-penile intercourse] *because he hadn't left my*

side all night . . . dancing on me, getting drinks, kissing on my neck, being touchy . . ." (p. 13).

Additionally, some students perceive being able to interpret sexual consent in contexts that lack

face-to-face interactions, such as text messages and social media (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a;

Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). For instances, one male participant described communicating

consent via text message when he said, "*If I text her 'what's up' and it's two in the morning, she*

knows what it means . . . it means – 'want to have sex?'" (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a, p. 17).

Furthermore, Rhoads and Jozkowski (2016) reported another male participant describing how

sexual content on social media can be used to make assumptions about a person's willingness to

engage in sexual activity:

> *Your* [online] *profile pictures, like, that's the representation of you, so if it's sexually*
> *explicit, you could probably figure that that person is kind of, you know, out there.*
> *Sexually out there. More willing to do sexual things than most people, so you all*
> [referring to men] *might think that you got a chance.* (p. 10)

Jozkowski and Hunt (2016a) conceptualized the distinction between consent cues that occur in

the moments right before sexual behavior happens and consent cues that occur in a social setting

as "inside the bedroom" consent and "outside the bedroom" consent, respectively. It is key to

note that Jozkowski and Hunt (2016a) did *not* constitute "outside the bedroom" cues as consent,

but, rather, were examining what college students *perceived* to be consent.

These findings suggest college students perceive sexual consent as a process beginning

with "outside the bedroom" consent is in stark contrast with some student definitions of consent

that emphasize the need for explicitness during consent communication (Humphreys, 2007;

Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). The belief that "outside the bedroom" consent can be

interpreted from a partner is at odds with both affirmative consent policies and sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) programs that mainly emphasize consent promotion. Furthermore, the perception that "outside the bedroom" cues are indicative of a person's sexual consent becomes extremely problematic if their partner perceives an "inside the bedroom" refusal as irrelevant because they interpreted consent previously while in a social setting. Thus, research exploring students' perceptions regarding consent communication and interpretation is imperative as holding false beliefs about consent can lead to sexual assault.

Sexual Consent Scales

In an effort to provide an in depth understanding about college students' consent beliefs and perceptions, some researchers developed and validated quantitative measures. The majority of validated consent scales assess: (1) attitudes or beliefs associated with consent (Humphreys & Brousseau, 2010; Humphreys & Herold, 2007; Rhoads, Jozkowski, Lo, Blunt, & Mosely, 2016); (2) global use of consent cues (Beres, Herold, & Maitland, 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014); and (3) event-level use of consent cues (Jozkowski, Sanders, Peterson, Dennis, & Reece, 2014).

Humphreys and colleagues (Humphreys & Brousseau, 2010; Humphreys & Herold, 2007) developed the Sexual Consent Scale (SCS) to examine student attitudes and beliefs regarding consent. Initially, the scale measured attitudes regarding the importance of explicit consent, commitment reducing the need to ask for consent, consent as a discrete event or a process, and discussion of consent with friends and partners. After revising the scale utilizing the Theory of Planned Behavior as a theoretical framework, the Sexual Consent Scale – Revised (SCS–R) measures both attitudes and consent behaviors. The three attitudinal constructs measure perceived behavioral control over consent negotiation, positive attitudes about establishing

232

consent, and sexual consent norms; whereas, the behavioral constructs measure use of indirect, nonverbal consent cues and discussing consent with peers and partners. Although this scale does not measure specifically how consent was communicated during a sexual interaction, it is a useful tool for understanding college students' beliefs regarding sexual consent. Another scale intended to measure consent beliefs is the Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS; Rhoads et al., 2016). The SMCMS measures endorsement of the belief that a person's sexual consent can be determined by viewing the content of their social media profile. The scale is comprised of gender-matched items that either describe the content of women's social media profiles or describe content found on men's social media profiles. The SMCMS measures consent beliefs about women's and men's social media profiles that contain (1) sexualized and party-related content and (2) conservative and religious content. Similarly to the SCS–R, the SMCMS does not measure consent communication, but, rather, assesses endorsement of consent myths surrounding sexual consent interpretation derived from social media content.

Other researchers created scales to assess, in general, how college students typically communicate their consent to a potential partner. Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) developed a scale that measured students' frequency of using direct verbal signals, direct nonverbal signals, indirect verbal signals, indirect nonverbal signals, intoxication signals, no response signals, and direct refusal signals to communicate their consent to vaginal-penile intercourse. Because Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale was created for use among heterosexual individuals, Beres and colleagues (2004) adapted the scales to create the Same-Sex Sexual Consent Scale that includes an Initiating Subscale and a Responding Subscale for use among non-heterosexual individuals. The Initiating Subscale measures frequency of consent cue use when students are initiating sexual behavior with a potential partner, whereas, the Responding Subscale measures

frequency of consent cue use when a potential partner is initiating sexual behavior. Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) developed the Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale (PCSS) that assesses the specific strategies students use when they typically communicate their consent to vaginal-penile intercourse. The factor structure of the PCSS was conceptually similar to Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale measuring students' use of cues while initiating sexual activity as the PCSS measures nonverbal signals of interest, passive behaviors, initiator behaviors, verbal cues, and removal behaviors. In contrast to Beres and colleagues (2004) scale, the PCSS does not include items measuring how students would respond to a potential partner's initiation of sexual behavior. The three scales mentioned above instructed students to reflect about their use of particular consent cues generally when communicating their consent. Thus, these measures could be conceptualized as "global" consent scales that measure how students generally consent to sexual activity rather than how students consented to sexual activity during a previous sexual interaction.

Currently, there are only two scales developed to measure students' consent at the event-level (e.g., during the most recent sexual encounter). Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) created event-level consent measures that assess consent feelings and consent cue use in a previous sexual interaction. More specifically, these dual measures assess how students internally felt leading to the decision to consent to sex and how they externally communicated their consent during the most recent time they engaged in vaginal-penile intercourse. Both the Internal Consent Scale (ICS) and External Consent Scale (ECS) were conceptualized to further explore Muehlenhard's (1995/1996) theorization that consent includes both an internal feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity and an external expression via words and/or behaviors of willingness to engage in sexual behavior. The ICS examines internal

234

feelings associated with consenting to vaginal-penile intercourse (e.g., safe, comfortable, ready), whereas, the ECS measures how students outwardly communicated their consent to their partner (e.g., direct nonverbal behaviors, passive behaviors, no response signals). The ICS and ECS contain 25 and 18 items, respectively. In addition to being the only measures to assess event-level sexual consent, the ICS is the only measure that assesses internal feelings of consent.

The Current Study

Of the six consent scales mentioned previously, only four (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) measure perceptions of consenting to sexual activity in general or sexual consent behaviors used during the most recent experience of vaginal-penile intercourse. Although these scales were rigorously developed and informed by previous literature and/or qualitative elicitation responses, they do not reflect the recent findings suggesting students conceptualize sexual consent as a process that begins with "outside the bedroom" consent (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). In order to create effective and culturally relevant SAPE programs for college campuses, it is necessary for scales assessing sexual consent perceptions and behaviors to reflect students' conceptualization of consent communication and interpretation. Such scales would be useful in identifying what college students perceive to be sexual consent in order to address false beliefs regarding sexual consent (e.g., leaving a bar with someone is not indicative of their sexual consent). Given that current validated instruments measuring sexual consent do not incorporate "outside the bedroom" consent, the purpose of the current study was to develop and validate a comprehensive event-level consent measure reflective of student perceptions' that consent can be communicated using "outside the bedroom" cues.

In addition to developing and validating the sexual consent measure, we sought to examine hypotheses we developed based on previous consent research. We developed these hypotheses in order to assess the known-groups validity of our consent measure. We hypothesized that differences in consent communication would emerge based on the participant's gender and relationship status with their partner as previous research has identified such factors as being influential in how people communicate their sexual consent (e.g., Beres, 2014; Foubert et al., 2006; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014).

Methods

Scale Development

The External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) was rigorously developed and structured utilizing a multi-phase research design. Phase 1 consisted of item writing and mixed-methods pilot-testing. Phase 2 constituted additional quantitative pilot-testing of the new items. Lastly, Phase 3 included administering the ECSR within a larger sample to psychometrically assess the reliability and validity of the redeveloped scale. The procedures for each phase are described in more detail below.

Participants

Eligibility criteria for the study across all three phases included current enrollment in college courses, being at least 18 years old, and having access to the Internet. Study participants were recruited via email listserv, campus announcements, classrooms, social media, and word-of-mouth. When recruiting participants via classrooms, introductory courses (e.g., health, sociology, human development, psychology) were chosen as those courses tend to have more diverse sets of students in terms of age, class standing, and gender. Gift cards and extra credit

points awarded in respective college courses were offered as incentives to participants. Participation in the study was voluntary so course instructors who offered extra credit for participating in the study were instructed to provide students with an alternative extra credit assignment.

Phase 1: Scale Redevelopment and Mixed-methods Pilot-testing

The purpose of Phase 1 was to create a comprehensive item pool consisting of adapted items from consent scales (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) as well as newly developed items reflective of previous qualitative consent research (e.g., Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016) which address constructs not represented in the previous measures. The initial item pool was then pilot-tested utilizing a mixed-methods approach.

Item-writing and scale redevelopment. We began developing the initial item pool by structuring it similarly to the Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale (PCSS; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014). The PCSS contained 44 items comprising 5 factors with responses ranging along a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014). We adapted 29 items from the PCSS and utilized the same 5 response choices ("strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"). Additionally, we adapted 13 from Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale, 6 items from the External Consent Scale (ECS; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014), and 2 from the Same-Sex Sexual Consent Scale (Beres et al., 2004). Novel items were created based on findings from formative qualitative consent studies (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). The newly developed items were created to reflect common themes that emerged from previous research with college students that suggested consent communication and interpretation occurs in social settings, such as parties or bars (Beres, 2010;

237

Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a), texting messages (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a), and social media content (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). The initial item pool for the scale was comprised of 122 items on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

As mentioned previously, we began developing the ECSR with the intention of creating a measure that reflected how college students conceptualize sexual consent. Previous research indicates that college students have described sexual consent occurring as a process that begins in social settings (Beres, 2010; Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; O'Bryne et al., 2008). Thus, we wanted our scale to differentiate between consent cues that occur in the moments right before sexual behavior begins and consent cues that occur within a social environment (e.g., party or bar) or devoid of face-to-face interaction (e.g., texting or social media). Therefore, we divided the items of the initial item pool into two categories: (1) "Inside the Bedroom" cues and (2) "Outside the Bedroom" cues. "Inside the Bedroom" cues are "cues that occur in the specific moments leading up to when sex may or may not occur" (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a, p. 4), whereas, "Outside the Bedroom" cues are cues that occur in social environments (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a). In order to ensure participants interpreted the items similarly to how we intended, the set of items measuring "Inside the Bedroom" cues had the lead in phrase "*in the moments right before sexual activity*." For example, "Inside the Bedroom" items read "*In the moments right before sexual activity . . . I would ask my partner if it is okay to engage in sexual activity*" or "*In the moments right before sexual activity . . . I would look at my partner in a sexy way*." We created similar lead in phrases for items assessing "Outside the Bedroom" cues and social media cues. "Outside the Bedroom" items used the phrase "*in a social setting like a party or bar*" and social media items used the phrase "*on social media*." Examples

of these items would be "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would ask my partner if they want to go back to my place*" and "*On social media . . . I would 'like' my partner's pictures*."

After creating the initial item pool and categorizing items as assessing "Inside the Bedroom" or "Outside the Bedroom" cues, we further structured the scale to assess how students generally communicate their sexual consent when initiating sexual behavior with a potential partner and how they would generally respond to a potential partner's initiation. Currently, there is only one scale that assesses how college students would typically respond to a potential partner's initiation of sexual behavior, therefore, we created Initiation and Response scales similar to Beres and colleagues (2004). This was accomplished by duplicating our initial item pool of 122 items which resulted in having a total of 244 items between the Initiation and Responses scales that both contained items measuring "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" cues. To distinguish between the Initiation and Response scales, we provided the following directions to participants when they completed the Initiation Scale:

> "*People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements to answer the question: 'How would you <u>initiate</u> penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation with a potential partner to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?'*"

The instructions for the Response Scale were similar except we had participants answer based on the question "*How would you <u>respond to a potential partner initiating</u> penetrative sex, oral sex, or manual stimulation to let him/her know you are indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual behavior?*" Most validated consent scales instruct students to answer based on how they typically consent to vaginal-penile intercourse; however, we wanted our scale to be inclusive of other sexual behaviors so it would be relevant to non-heterosexual individuals.

In addition to developing and structuring the new measure to reflect previous consent research, we created two questions to accompany the Initiation and Response scales. As mentioned prior, consent research has identified that the sexual behavior being consented to (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson, et al., 2014) and the partners' relationship status (Beres, 2014; Foubert, Garner, & Thaxter, 2006; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014) can impact how people communicate their sexual consent. For the first question, participants were provided a list ranging in performative and receptive sexual behaviors (excluded kissing) and were instructed to select all of the behaviors they thought about as they completed each scale. The second question asked participants to report their relationship status with the person who they primarily thought about as they completed the scales. These items were presented after both Initiation and Response scales so as to allow participants to provide information on the behaviors and relationship status they primarily considered as they completed the initial item pool.

Mixed-methods pilot-testing and procedures. The initial item pool, behavior and relationship status questions, and general demographic items were administered to participants via Qualtrics online survey software. Completion of the survey ranged between 20 and 30 minutes. At the end of the survey, students ($N = 56$) were given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a one hour focus group to provide feedback on the wording, clarity, and interpretation of the scale items. A semi-structured focus group script was created to address general questions regarding the scale as a whole; however, the script allowed for participants to guide the discussion about specific problematic or confusing items. Each focus group session was audio recorded for purposes of identifying feedback that was common across all sessions. All focus group participants were compensated with a $10 gift card for their time.

The subset of students who participated in the first focus groups ($n = 5$) provided feedback that resulted in structural modification to the scale items. Participants reported having difficulty completing the scale because it was a global consent scale measuring how they typically communicated their consent to a potential partner. More specifically, participants indicated their responses to the items would differ according to their relationship status with their potential partner (e.g., romantic relationship partner vs. hook-up partner). For example, participants who were in long-term committed relationships reported "Outside the Bedroom" items, such as "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would ask my partner for their phone number*" and "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would go home with my partner at the end of the night*" were not applicable to how they would communicate consent to their current relationship partner, but were applicable to how they communicated their consent to a partner they had just met. Thus, the participant could select "strongly agree" for the item though it did not reflect how they would typically communicate consent in their current relationship. Because we did not specify the "type" of partner (e.g., romantic relationship partner, friends with benefits, one-night stand) we wanted participants to think about as they completed the items, participants did not think their responses were accurate because they responded with different types of partners in mind. Although we included a question after both Initiation and Response scales asking participants to report their relationship status with whom they primarily thought about while completing the items, we concluded the only way to provide a more accurate account of consent communication and reduce participant confusion during scale completion was to structure the scale as an event-level consent measure.

Based on focus group feedback, the scale items were restructured to measure how students communicated their sexual consent to their partner the last time they engaged in consensual sexual activity. The new directions for the scale read:

> "*People communicate their consent or willingness to engage in sexual activity in a variety of ways. Thinking about the last time you engaged in consensual sexual activity, how did you let your partner know you were indicating your consent or willingness to engage in that sexual activity?*"

Although we previously created Initiation and Response scales, focus group participants reported having difficulty distinguishing between how they initiated sexual behavior and how they responded to their partner initiating sexual behavior because of the fluidity of their sexual experiences. Therefore, we eliminated the distinctions between initiating and responding in our scale by reverting back to a singular set of items comprising an "Inside the Bedroom" Scale and an "Outside the Bedroom" Scale. The initial item pool containing 122 items was reworded to make each item past tense as participants are asked to report how they communicated their consent during a past sexual encounter. For example, the original "Outside the Bedroom" item "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I would ask my partner for their phone number*" became "*In a social setting like a party or bar . . . I asked my partner for their phone number.*" Instead of utilizing the original 5-point Likert scale, the response options became binary ("yes" and "no"). We included similar questions that asked students to report their relationship status with whom they last engaged in consensual sexual activity and to select all of the sexual behaviors they participated in during their last consensual sexual experience. These two questions subsequently are referred to as "previous sexual experience" items.

After reconceptualizing our scale as an event-level measure, we were cognizant that our study became a scale redevelopment of the External Consent Scale (ECS; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014). The ECS was originally created with the intention of measuring how a person

242

communicated their external consent during the last time they engaged in vaginal-penile intercourse. We had included items from the original ECS in our initial item pool and developed others that were conceptually similar to items composing the ECS. Though the ECS was created utilizing elicitation responses and established as a valid and reliable measure, the ECS lacks comprehensiveness as it only contains 18 items and does not assess perceptions of "outside the bedroom" consent. It was at this juncture that our scale was entitled the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR).

The ECSR was administered again via Qualtrics online survey software for another round of mixed-methods pilot-testing. Just as before, students ($N = 48$) who completed the online survey were recruited to participate in one hour focus groups to provide feedback on the ECSR. The same semi-structured script was utilized to loosely guide focus group discussions. The focus groups were audio recorded and each participant was compensated with a $10 gift card for their time. The subset of students ($n = 5$) who participated in this round of focus groups provided feedback resulting in the clarification and elimination of some items. Focus group participants did not report any significant issues that required additional modification to the structure of the ECSR. A total of 107 items were retained from the initial item pool to be further pilot-tested in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Additional Quantitative Pilot-testing

The purpose of the second phase of data collection was to further refine the ECSR by assessing the items retained from Phase 1 within a new sample of college students.

Quantitative pilot-testing and procedures. A new sample of college students ($N = 75$) were recruited to complete the reduced ECSR item pool, "previous sexual experience" questions, and demographics via Qualtrics. Similarly to second pilot-test in Phase 1, participants were

provided the same directions for completing the ECSR. Completion time for the survey was estimated to be between 15 and 25 minutes. Focus groups were not included during this phase of data collection, but rather, qualitative feedback on the items was elicited from sexual consent experts ($N = 4$).

Item refinement. We conducted frequency counts on the ECSR item pool in order to identify items that had extreme polar responses, meaning all or most participants either answered "yes" or either answered "no." These items were reviewed by the research team and the panel of experts to determine whether the items should be retained or eliminated. Based on feedback from the panel of experts, some additional items were added to the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale and we modified the "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" items to be congruent in terms of wording. For example, we had an "Outside the Bedroom" item that was "*In a social setting like a party or a bar . . . I said phrases like 'I want to have sex with you' to my partner*" that we modified to be identical to the "Inside the Bedroom" item that read "*In the moments right before sexual activity . . . I said phrases to my partner like 'I want to have sex with you'*" to increase the congruence of items between the two scales. As such, 114 items comprised the ECSR item pool for Phase 3.

Phase 3: Reliability and Validity Assessments

The purpose of Phase 3 was to administer the ECSR to a larger sample of college students and to examine the reliability and validity of the redeveloped scale.

Participant characteristics and procedures. A new, larger sample of college students ($N = 860$) participated in the final phase of data collection. Of the 860 participants who began the online survey, 766 completed the survey in its entirety (89% response rate). The final question of the survey read, "*Sometimes people fill out questionnaires, but do not take them seriously and*

just fill in answers that may not be accurate. We do not want to use these in the study. Please

choose one of the statements below." Twenty-five participants were removed from the sample for

selecting the response "I did not answer seriously – throw out my information" for the final

survey question. An additional 71 participants were removed due to rapid submission (i.e.,

having a survey completion time less than 10 minutes) which resulted in having a total of 695

participants.

To complement the ECSR, participants completed the "previous sexual experience"

questions. The question that requested participants to select all of the sexual behaviors they

engaged in during their last consensual sexual experience included the option "I did not

participate in any of these behaviors." The question included a comprehensive list of

performative and receptive sexual behaviors but excluded kissing because college students often

report kissing as a behavior communicative of sexual consent to other behaviors (Beres, 2010;

Beres et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a). A final 102 participants were removed from our

sample for selecting the response option "I did not participate in any of these behaviors"

resulting in our analytic sample being composed of 593 participants.

The majority of participants identified as female ($n = 461$, 78%). Most participants were

White ($n = 481$, 82%), between the ages of 18 and 24 ($n = 554$, 94%), and heterosexual ($n = 545$,

93%). The majority indicated either being in a relationship ($n = 277$, 47%) or being single and

not dating ($n = 161$, 27%) as their relationship status. Manual stimulation, both performative ($n =$

525, 89%) and receptive ($n = 526$, 89%), were the most common sexual behavior participants

reported engaging in during their last consensual sexual experience. Most participants ($n = 369$,

62%) reported having a romantic relationship with their most recent sexual partner. Refer to

Table 7 for complete participant demographics and Table 8 for complete characteristics of

participants' previous consensual sexual experience. As in both previous phases, participants completed the online survey containing demographic items, "previous sexual experience" questions, and ECSR items via Qualtrics. The survey had an estimated completion time between 30 and 40 minutes.

Analyses. The analyses for this phase of data collection included: (1) frequency counts; (2) correlations; (3) two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs); (4) Cohen's kappa; and (5) Kuder Richardson Formula 20 (KR20). Frequency counts were conducted on the ECSR items by gender and relationship status. Pearson correlations were utilized to assess the relationship between the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale, ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale, and the corresponding scale factors. Two-way MANOVAs were conducted on the "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales separately to examine whether differences in consent cue use were present according to participant gender and relationship status. Cohen's kappa was conducted to establish the inter-rater reliability for both "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales. Lastly, KR20 was utilized to examine the internal consistency reliability of the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale, ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale, and the corresponding scale factors.

Results

Factor Structure

The final External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) consists of 104 items after eliminating 10 additional items due to extreme scores (i.e., almost all participants either selected "yes" or "no" for these items). The ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale (see Table 9) consists of 41 items measuring 4 factors: (1) Verbal Cues; (2) Nonverbal Cues; (3) No Response Cues; and

(4) Tacit Knowing. The ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale (see Table 10) consists of 63 items measuring 9 factors: (1) Verbal Cues; (2) Nonverbal Cues; (3) No Response Cues; (4) Tacit Knowing; (5) Alcohol Cues; (6) Transition Cues; (7) Texting Cues; (8) Socialization Cues; and (9) Social Media Cues. It should be noted that we extended Jozkowski and Hunt's (2016a) conceptualize of "outside the bedroom" consent to encompass ECSR items regarding texting and social media as those cues occur far removed from actual sexual behavior and precede "inside the bedroom" consent.

Most of the correlations between the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale as a whole and its factors were significant ($p < 0.01$) indicating the factors comprehensively assess consent cues used in the moments right before sexual behavior occurred. The only non-significant correlation for the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors was between the Verbal Cues and No Response Cues factors. All correlations between the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale and factors were significant ($p < 0.01$) indicating the factors work together to measure consent cues utilized in social settings or contexts lacking face-to-face interaction. Tables 11 and 12 include all ECSR correlations.

Gender and Relationship Status Comparisons

Two-way MANOVAs were conducted in order to examine whether differences in consent cue use exist according to participant gender and relationship status with their sexual partner. For these analyses, relationship status with a sexual partner was artificially dichotomized into (1) romantic relationship or (2) non-romantic relationship. Participants who indicated they were in a romantic relationship (e.g., boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, wife) with the partner they last engaged in sexual activity with were grouped into the romantic relationship category, whereas, participants who indicated their relationship status with their most recent sexual partner

as a sexual relationship, casually dating, one-time sexual experience, or other were grouped into the non-romantic relationship category.

Two-way MANOVAs were conducted separately on the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scale factors. To assess the underlying MANOVA assumption regarding homogeneity of the variance-covariance matrices of the dependent variables, the Box's M statistic was utilized. For analyses that produced a significant F test for Box's M ($p < .05$), we interpreted MANOVA results utilizing the Pillai's Trace statistic, whereas, the Wilks' Λ statistic was interpreted for analyses that did not violate the homogeneity assumption. For the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors, there was no significant interaction between gender and relationship status [Pillai's Trace = .002, $F(4, 534) = .310$, $p = .871$], but both gender [Pillai's Trace = .065, $F(4, 534) = 9.351$, $p < .01$] and relationship status [Pillai's Trace = .031, $F(4, 534) = 4.288$, $p < .01$] were significant; therefore, we conducted one-way MANOVAs on gender and relationship status separately and followed-up with ANOVAs to further examine significant main effects. The Holm-Bonferroni correction was applied to all ANOVA results to control for Type I error (Holm, 1979). There was a significant main effect for gender [Pillai's Trace = .065, $F(4, 538) = 9.308$ $p < .01$] on the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors. Significant differences were found for Verbal Cues [$F(1, 541) = 13.74$, $p < .01$] and No Response [$F(1, 541) = 15.51$, $p < .01$] factors. Men reported higher use of both Verbal Cues and No Response to communicate their sexual consent compared to women. No significant differences in the Nonverbal Cues and Tacit Knowing factors of the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale were found according to participant gender. Relationship status also had a significant main effect [Wilks' Λ = .951, $F(4, 536) = 6.959$, $p < .01$] for the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors. Verbal Cues [$F(1, 539) = 16.70$, $p < .01$] and Nonverbal Cues [$F(1, 539) = 22.39$, $p < .01$] both significantly differed according to

248

relationship status. Participants who indicated they were in a romantic relationship with their most recent sexual partner reported utilizing both Verbal Cues and Nonverbal Cues more in comparison to participants who were in the non-romantic relationship category. There were no significant differences in the No Response Cues and Tacit Knowing factors of the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale according to relationship status.

Similarly to the MANOVA results for the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors, the results for the two-way MANOVA conducted on the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors did not produce a significant interaction between gender and relationship status [Pillai's Trace = .030, $F(9, 508) = 1.746$, $p = .076$], but both gender [Pillai's Trace = .102, $F(9, 508) = 6.395$, $p < .01$] and relationship status [Pillai's Trace = .046, $F(9, 508) = 2.743$, $p < .01$] exhibited significant main effects. Thus, we utilized the same procedures described above to further examine the main effects for the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors. There was a significant main effect for gender [Wilks' $\Lambda = .901$, $F(9, 511) = 6.238$, $p < .01$] on the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors. The Verbal Cues factor exhibited significant differences according to participant gender. More specifically, men reported utilizing more "Outside the Bedroom" Verbal Cues during their last consensual sexual experience compared to women. None of the remaining eight "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors had significant differences according to participant gender. Relationship status had a significant main effect [Pillai's Trace = .091, $F(9, 510) = 5.653$, $p < .01$] for the set of "Outside the Bedroom" factors. Scores for the Texting Cues and Alcohol Cues of the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale were significantly different depending on relationship status. Participants categorized into the non-romantic relationship group reported higher scores on both Texting Cues and Alcohol Cues factors of the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale compared to participants belonging to the romantic relationship category. The

seven other "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors did not produce differences based on relationship status. Table 13 provides the results for each follow-up ANOVA conducted to examine the significant main effects for both gender and relationship status.

Reliability

In order to assess the reliability of ECSR, two sexual consent experts were recruited to provide their feedback on the relationship between the ECSR items and their corresponding factors comprising the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales. The experts were provided with a list that included all ECSR items separated into their corresponding scale ("Inside the Bedroom" vs. "Outside the Bedroom"). The factors from each scale were given a numerical value and both experts were instructed to apply a numerical value to each item according to which factor they thought it reflected. For example, the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale contains a Verbal Cues factor that received the value "1" and a Nonverbal Cues factor that received the value "2." Both experts coded the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale item "*In the moments right before sexual activity . . . I said phrases to my partner like 'I really want you'*" as a "1" because they thought the content of the item was most strongly associated with the Verbal Cues factor. Additionally, both experts coded the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale item "*In the moments right before sexual activity . . . I used my body language or signals*" as a "2" because they thought this particular item aligned most closely with the Nonverbal Cues factor. After both experts provided a code for each item of the ECSR, we conducted inter-rater reliability analyses for the "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales separately using Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1960) to measure the extent to which the experts agreed on the item codes. Both the "Inside the Bedroom" ($\kappa = 0.91$) and "Outside the Bedroom" ($\kappa = 0.90$) scales demonstrated

"almost perfect" agreement according to Landis and Koch's (1977, p. 165) cut-off of 0.81 or higher.

In addition to assessing the inter-rater reliability of the ECSR, we conducted internal consistency reliability analyses for the ECSR scales and corresponding factors using Kuder Richardson Formula 20 (KR20). Because the ECSR is an event-level measure with binary responses ("yes" or "no"), KR20 was the most appropriate procedure to estimate internal consistency reliability (Kuder & Richardson, 1937). Both full "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales produced reliability coefficients (0.85 and 0.95, respectively) above 0.80 demonstrating high internal consistency reliability (DeVellis, 2003; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Reliability coefficients for the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors ranged from 0.75 and 0.82 demonstrating moderate to high internal consistency reliability. Similarly, the reliability coefficients for the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors were between 0.61 and 0.88 demonstrating moderate to high internal consistency reliability. Thus, the KR20 results provide evidence suggesting the ECSR items work congruently to measure the underlying factors composing this scale.

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to develop and validate a measure assessing sexual consent communication. The External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) was developed and structured with the intention of creating a measure that reflects recent findings suggesting college students conceptualize consent communication as a process that can begin in social settings (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a). A multi-phase, mixed methods approach was utilized to revise the original ECS and structure the revised scale based on previous consent measures

and formative qualitative research. Our research design incorporated assessments that provided evidence supporting the reliability and validity of the revised measure. Results suggest the ECSR is a measurement tool that produces reliable and valid scores that assess how college students communicated their sexual consent to their partner during their most recent consensual sexual experience.

Reliability and Validity

The final External Consent Scale - Revised (ECSR) is comprised of 104 binary items corresponding to two scales: (1) "Inside the Bedroom" Scale and (2) "Outside the Bedroom" Scale. Conceptually, the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale measures the consent cues used in the moments leading up to sexual behavior occurring, whereas, the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale is intended to measure consent cues used in social settings (e.g., parties or bars) or contexts devoid of face-to-face interactions (e.g., text messages and social media) that precede sexual behavior. The distinction between these categories of consent align with previous findings derived from interviews with college students conducted by Jozkowski and Hunt (2016a). As mentioned before, most sexual consent scales primarily focus on how people communicate their consent in the moments leading up to sexual behavior (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014); however, the ECSR extends beyond previously validated consent scales to be a more comprehensive measure of consent communication because it includes the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale. Development and psychometric assessment of the "Outside the Bedroom" Scale contributes to current consent literature as previous research has not quantitatively examined perceptions of consent that occur in social environments or contexts that lack face-to-face interaction; thus, the ECSR findings are both unique and novel.

Items for the ECSR were adapted from previously validated consent scales (Beres et al., 2004; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) or developed based on the findings of previous formative qualitative findings (Beres, 2010; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Adapting items from validated consent scales and creating additional items based on elicited responses from college students assisted in establishing the content validity and cultural relevancy of the ECSR for use within the college student population. The Verbal Cues, Nonverbal Cues, No Response Cues, and Alcohol Cues are conceptually similar to Hickman and Muehlenhard's (1999) scale factors. Tacit Knowing items were developed directly from Beres' (2010) finding that suggests college students think sexual consent communication is obvious when considering the contextual factors of the situation. Beres' (2010) and Jozkowski and Hunt (2016) found that college students think leaving a social setting, like a bar, to go to a more private location, like someone's home, can be communicative of a person's sexual consent, thus, we created the Transition Cues items. The Texting Cues and Social Media Cues were derived from previous findings suggesting students think sexual consent can be interpreted via text messages (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a) and social media content (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). In addition to using previous consent research as a framework for our scale, we conducted focus groups to assess how participants interpreted items and the measure as a whole to simultaneously create a scale that reflects the target population's feedback and provides additional support for the content validity of the scale.

The ECSR scales demonstrated "almost perfect" (Landis & Koch, 1977, p. 165) inter-rater reliability. Additionally, both ECSR scales and their corresponding factors demonstrated moderate to high internal consistency reliability. The correlations between the full "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales and their corresponding factors indicated there are

significant associations between the underlying factors and the larger consent measure. The results of these analyses provide support that the ECSR factors comprising both "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" scales individually measure distinct components of how people communicate consent but also combine to measure a singular conceptualization of sexual consent communication.

Gender Differences

As mentioned previously, a person's gender may influence how they communicate sexual consent (Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). We anticipated that differences in participants' consent cue use during their most recent consensual sexual experience would emerge based on their gender. For the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors, men reported higher use of both Verbal Cues and No Response Cues compared to women in the sample. Men also indicated using more Verbal Cues in social settings ("Outside the Bedroom" Scale) to communicate their consent to their partner. Our "Inside the Bedroom" Scale findings are partially consistent with previous research. Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) found that men reported using No Response Cues more frequently than women, but, in contrast, women from their sample reported utilizing Indirect Verbal Cues more frequently than men. Also contrary to our findings regarding gender, Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) and Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) found women were more likely to report using passive behaviors, which are conceptually similar to items composing our No Response Cues factor, to communicate their consent. One possible reason that the gender differences we found regarding the "Inside the Bedroom" Scale deviate from previous research could be because both Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) and Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) utilized scales measuring general consent to vaginal-penile

intercourse (e.g., global consent), whereas, the ECSR is an event-level consent scale that measures consent communication across multiple sexual behaviors.

The "Inside the Bedroom" Scale gender differences we found were also not consistent with the original External Consent Scale (ECS; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) though it, too, is an event-level measure. It is possible our findings were not congruent with Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) because the ECS instructs participants to reflect on how they communicated their consent to vaginal-penile intercourse and only contains 18 items measuring external consent behaviors. The revised ECSR directs participants to think about all of the behaviors they engaged in during their most recent consensual encounter instead of just limiting participants to provide responses regarding the most recent time they engaged in vaginal-penile intercourse. We specifically developed the ECSR be inclusive of other sexual behaviors so as to expand the utility of the measure for use in certain populations (e.g., non-heterosexual individuals or adolescents). As previously mentioned, the revised version of the scale is more comprehensive compared to the original ECS (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) as the revisions includes over 100 items measuring external consent communication. The additional items allow participants to respond with more details regarding how they communicated their consent. With more items, the ECSR can better account for the multiple ways people may communicate their sexual consent. Furthermore, the ECSR is the first scale created to distinguish between "Inside the Bedroom" and "Outside the Bedroom" consent; therefore, it is plausible that men may use Verbal Cues more often in social settings compared to women as previous consent research had not yet quantitatively examined gender differences in "outside the bedroom" consent.

Although some gender differences we found aligned with previous research, many deviated from what we anticipated based on previous consent research regarding gender and sexual consent. Perhaps college students perceive, in general, that they use certain consent cues more frequently when communicating consent, but the cues they perceive actually using to communicate their consent during their most recent consensual sexual experience may be different based on the contextual factors (e.g., behavior) of that sexual experience. For example, a woman consenting to vaginal-penile intercourse may take her pants off to indicate her consent to that behavior (nonverbal cue), then, the following day, may verbally tell her partner to take off their pants to indicate her consent to oral sex (verbal cue). In that scenario, the woman's gender remains constant, but how she communicated her consent could have varied strictly based upon the sexual behaviors. It is possible that the sexual behavior being consented to may be more influential in consent communication compared to the person's gender. Though we found significant differences in consent communication between men and women in our sample, the effect sizes for these differences were relatively small (Cohen, 1977), ranging between 0.025 and 0.038. Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) reported the effect sizes for their significant gender differences were also small indicating the differences they found based on gender were minimal. Previous researchers (Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007; Jozkowski, Peterson, et al., 2014) have identified that the sexual behavior being consented to does impact consent communication, but the strength of the association between sexual behavior and its corresponding consent communication has not been examined.

Relationship Status Differences

Previous research has identified that the relationship status of the partners consenting to sexual activity impacts how people communicate their consent (Beres, 2014; Foubert, Garner, &

Thaxter, 2006; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski, 2013; Jozkowski, Peterson et al., 2014). We found significant differences in consent communicated based on the partners' relationship status. On the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale factors, participants who indicated they were in a romantic relationship with their most recent sexual partner had higher scores on the Verbal Cues and Nonverbal Cues factors. Participants who were categorized into the non-romantic relationship reported higher scores on both the Alcohol Cues and Texting Cues factors of the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale. The relationship status differences we found were more consistent with previous research compared to the gender differences we found. Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) found that participants who indicated they were in a relationship reported that they would, generally, use more nonverbal cues, passive behaviors (conceptually similar to our No Response factor), and initiator behaviors to communicate their consent. Our findings regarding relationship status differences for the ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale are partially consistent with Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) with respect to the use of nonverbal cues though, again, we argue that our partial non-congruency with their results could be derived from the different basis of our scale measurements (global vs. event-level). Additionally, Jozkowski and Peterson (2014) did not explicitly ask participants to report their relationship status with the partner who they were primarily thinking about as they completed the Perceptions of Consent to Sex Scale (PCSS), but, rather, categorized their participants into "relationship" and "single" according to the participants' general relationship status.

When conducting focus groups with fraternity men, Foubert and colleagues (2006) found that men preferred to utilize verbal communication with a romantic relationship partner compared to a non-romantic partner to discuss engaging in sexual activity. Our ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale findings align with Foubert and colleagues (2006) and may be partially due to

fear of rejection that some men stated as being harsher outside of the context of a romantic relationship. Thus, men reported being more hesitant to openly communicating about sexual activity with women whom they were less familiar with. Conversely, sexual precedence theory posits that once partners engage in sexual activity, it is expected that sexual activity will continue between the partners (Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Humphreys (2007) suggests the dynamic of consent evolves in established relationships, as partners become more familiar and comfortable with each other, to include more nonverbal cues and less explicit verbal cues. Our ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" finding that people who responded regarding a romantic partner utilized Nonverbal Cues more compared to people who responded with a non-romantic partner in mind is reflective of sexual precedence theory.

Furthermore, the differences we found for the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale factors align with previous qualitative findings. Jozkowski and Hunt (2016a) interviewed college students ($N = 30$) in order to elucidate how college students perceive to communicate and interpret consent cues during a hook-up (e.g., one-time sexual experience). The relationship status differences in consent communication for the "Outside the Bedroom" factors is similar to previous qualitative findings that students perceived women accepting an alcoholic drink from their partner in a social setting (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016b) or texting their potential hook-up partner late at night as indications (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a) of sexual consent in the context of a non-romantic relationship. Our findings regarding romantic relationship partners partially supported previous findings; however, the significant differences found regarding non-romantic relationship partners was congruent with previous research. Thus, we suggest the findings regarding differences in consent communication based upon the relationship status of the partners establishes the known groups validity of the ECSR.

Limitations

Though the current study provided evidence for the reliability and validity of a scale intended to measure consent communication, it was not without limitations. Although the ECSR is appropriate for use of examining a person's consent to sexual behaviors other than just vaginal-penile intercourse, it does not identify which consent cues corresponds to each behavior. In other words, we were not able to measure how people consented to individual sexual behaviors to assess whether differences emerged in consent communication based on the behaviors participants reported engaging in (e.g., vaginal-penile v. anal-penile, v. oral genital sex). Furthermore, because the ECSR is an event-level measure that assesses how people communicated consent during their most recent consensual sexual experience, we were limited in our capacity to conduct reliability and validity assessments on the revised scale. We conducted internal consistency reliability analyses via Kuder Richardson Formula 20 (KR20) for the ECSR scales and corresponding factors, but were not able to examine the temporal stability of the scale by conducting test-retest reliability analyses as people are likely to provide different responses to the ECSR as contextual factors influence consent communication. Additionally, we could not conduct correlations between the ECSR scales and corresponding factors with attitudinal scales measuring similar constructs, such as rape myth acceptance or token resistance, because it is not conceptually meaningful to examine the association between a one-time behavioral measurement of consent communication with global attitudes and beliefs to provide support for construct validity. Lastly, students who participated in the study were recruited from a large Southern university using convenience sampling. Participants primarily identified as female, White, and heterosexual; therefore, these findings may not be representative of the college student population as a whole.

259

Future Research

Most sexual consent research with college students has examined consent within the context of heterosexual sex (Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016a; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014). Currently, Beres and colleagues (2004) are the only researchers to utilize a validated measure to explicitly examine consent communication within a non-heterosexual population. Given that non-heterosexual individuals represent a largely understudied population within consent literature, future research using the ECSR should be conducted with individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) in order to examine how they communicate consent during consensual sexual experiences. Furthermore, as we previously suggested, contextual factors, such as the sexual behavior, may be more influential in how people communicate their consent to their partner compared to gender. Therefore, additional study explicitly identifying how people communicated their consent for specific sexual behaviors is warranted.

Implications

The External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) was rigorously developed utilizing a multi-phase approach incorporating mixed methods of data collection across multiple samples of college students. The ECSR contributes to current consent literature as it is the first scale developed and validated to examine consent communication occurring as a process that potentially begins in social settings or contexts lacking face-to-face interaction. The ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale items specifically assess the types of cues people use in the moments directly preceding sexual behavior, whereas, the ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale items assess cues people utilize in social settings preceding the time (when) and location (where)

260

in which sexual behavior actually occurs. Although the findings of the current study provide support for the reliability and validity of the new consent measure, these findings have important implications for better understanding how college students communicate their consent during a previous consensual experience.

The utility of the ECSR includes measuring how college students perceived they communicated their sexual consent during the most recent time they engaged in consensual sexual activity. Most SAPE programs on college campuses primarily focus on promoting consent by encouraging students to obtain consent prior to engaging in sexual activity (Daigle, Fisher, & Stewart, 2009; Donat & White, 2000; Schewe, 2006). Affirmative consent policies ("yes means yes") also endorse consent promotion by requiring students to, mutually and voluntarily, provide their consent via words and behavior prior to engaging in sexual activity. But, both SAPE programs and affirmative consent policies do not account for contextual nuances students perceive as being indicative of consent, such as interpreting a person accepting an alcoholic drink or receiving a text message at three in the morning from someone as being indicative of a person's sexual consent. The ECSR could assist in identifying how students perceived to have communicated their sexual consent in order to create more culturally relevant SAPE programs that address the false perceptions some students may have regarding sexual consent. It is imperative for students to be educated that contextual nuances do *not* constitute sexual consent and should *not* be utilized as a means to presume a potential partner's consent. Furthermore, the ECSR could be an evaluative mechanism to gauge if SAPE programs are creating lasting changes in how students conceptualize consent and whether the programs are truly influencing students to engage in more explicit sexual consent behaviors.

The belief that behaviors exhibited in social environments or via text messages and social media content constitutes consent is problematic and can result in an uncomfortable encounter at best or potentially sexual assault particularly if one partner erroneously presumes their partner consented to sexual activity when, in fact, their partner only wanted to watch a movie together (e.g., "Netflix and chill," a coded invitation for sex). Thus, it is apparent, that cultural shifts in how students conceptualize sexual consent are needed to refine students' understanding of consent and consent communication in order to prevent sexual violence on college campuses.

Table 7. *Demographic Characteristics for the Analytic Sample*

Characteristic	n (%)
N	593
Gender	
Male	132 (22.3)
Female	461 (77.7)
Age (Mean)	21.1
Race/Ethnicity	
White	481 (81.5)
Black/African American	40 (6.8)
Hispanic/Latino	29 (4.9)
Native American/American Indian	8 (1.4)
Asian/Asian American	18 (3.1)
Bi- or Multi-racial	14 (2.4)
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	545 (92.5)
Gay/Lesbian	16 (2.7)
Bisexual	18 (3.1)
Unsure	5 (0.8)
Queer	3 (0.5)
Other	2 (0.3)
Relationship Status	
Single, not dating	161 (27.2)
Single, casually dating	120 (20.3)
In a relationship	277 (46.8)
Married	25 (4.2)
Divorced	1 (0.2)
Other	8 (1.4)
Sexual Relationship Status	
Exclusive/monogamous	312 (52.6)
Non-exclusive/ non-monogamous	19 (3.2)
Casual sexual encounter	78 (13.2)
Not engaging in sexual activity right now	180 (31.0)
Class Standing	
Freshmen	66 (11.1)
Sophomore	214 (36.1)
Junior	175 (29.5)
Senior	127 (21.4)
Graduate student	11 (1.9)
Greek Membership	
Yes	271 (45.7)
No	322 (54.3)
Religious Service Attendance	
Once or more a week	146 (24.6)
2 – 3 times per month	124 (20.9)
Once a month	67 (11.3)
Few times per year	175 (29.5)
Never	81 (13.7)

Table 8. *Characteristics of Last Consensual Sexual Experience*

Characteristic	n (%)
N	593
Behaviors	
Performative manual stimulation	525 (88.5)
Receptive manual stimulation	526 (88.7)
Performative oral sex	381 (64.2)
Receptive oral sex	358 (60.4)
Vaginal-penile penetration	419 (70.7)
Vaginal-dildo penetration	17 (2.9)
Anal-penile penetration	29 (4.9)
Anal-dildo penetration	3 (0.5)
Relationship Status with Partner	
Romantic relationship	369 (62.4)
Sexual relationship	89 (15.1)
Casually dating	64 (10.8)
One-time sexual experience	56 (9.5)
Other	13 (2.2)
Partner's Gender	
Male	453 (76.6)
Female	136 (23.0)
Transgender	-
Other	2 (0.3)
Initiation	
I initiated the sexual activity	65 (11.0)
My partner initiated sexual activity	212 (35.9)
My partner and I mutually initiated sexual activity	272 (46.0)
I don't know/don't remember who initiated sexual activity	42 (7.1)

Table 9. *External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) "Inside the Bedroom" Scale*

Factor	Analytic Sample N = 593	
	Yes	No
Full Scale α = 0.85	n (%)	n (%)
Factor 1: Verbal (α = 0.79)		
I verbally said "yes" to my partner	269 (45.6)	321 (54.4)
I said phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	298 (50.6)	291 (49.4)
I flirted with my partner	522 (88.5)	68 (11.5)
I said positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	406 (68.8)	184 (31.2)
I verbally asked my partner if it was okay to engage in sexual activity	157 (26.7)	432 (73.3)
I talked to my partner about a condom/dental dam	220 (37.3)	370 (62.7)
I verbally told my partner I wanted to engage in sexual activity	269 (45.6)	321 (54.4)
I verbally told my partner it was okay to engage in sexual activity	223 (37.8)	367 (62.2)
I talked "dirty" to my partner	208 (35.3)	381 (64.7)
I gave my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	355 (60.3)	234 (39.7)
Factor 2: Non-verbal (α = 0.80)		
I used my body language or signals	563 (95.6)	26 (4.4)
I appeared interested in sexual activity with my partner	568 (95.9)	24 (4.1)
I smiled at my partner	543 (91.6)	50 (8.4)
I touched my partner's lower body, crotch, or genital area	490 (83.1)	100 (16.9)
I touched my partner's upper body, arms, or chest	555 (94.1)	35 (5.9)
I took out a condom/dental dam	122 (20.9)	463 (79.1)
I caressed my partner's face	429 (73.5)	155 (26.5)
I physically moved closer to my partner (in terms of distance)	554 (93.7)	37 (6.3)
I physically pulled my partner closer to me (in terms of distance)	440 (74.3)	152 (25.7)
I pulled my partner on top of me	297 (50.6)	290 (49.4)
I looked into my partner's eyes	498 (84.7)	90 (15.3)
I started kissing my partner	540 (91.7)	49 (8.3)
I had an erection or was vaginally lubricated	466 (79.1)	123 (20.9)
I took off my clothes	298 (50.7)	290 (49.3)
I let my partner take off my clothes	481 (81.5)	109 (18.5)
I got on top of my partner	406 (69.2)	181 (30.8)
I gave my partner "sexy" eyes	337 (57.3)	251 (42.7)
I took off my partner's clothes	398 (67.2)	194 (32.8)
Factor 3: No Response (α = 0.82)		
I let my partner go as far as they wanted	342 (58.2)	246 (41.8)
I did not stop my partner's actions	485 (82.2)	105 (17.8)
I did not say anything to my partner	217 (36.8)	372 (63.2)
I let the sexual activity keep progressing	546 (92.5)	44 (7.5)
I did not push my partner away	499 (84.6)	91 (15.4)
I let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	522 (88.6)	67 (11.4)

(Continued)

Table 9. *ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale* (*Cont.*)

Factor	Analytic Sample N = 593	
	Yes	No
Full Scale α = 0.85	n (%)	n (%)
I did not tell my partner to stop	494 (84.0)	94 (16.0)
I did not say "no" to my partner	503 (85.3)	87 (14.7)
I did not stop my partner from kissing me	539 (91.7)	49 (8.3)
I did not resist my partner when they touched me sexually	523 (88.5)	68 (11.5)
I did not resist my partner's actions	535 (90.8)	54 (9.2)
Factor 4: Tacit Knowing (α = 0.75)		
I did not say anything to my partner because it was obvious I wanted to engage in sexual activity	423 (71.7)	167 (28.3)
I did not say anything to my partner because my partner just knew I wanted to engage in sexual activity	402 (68.3)	187 (31.7)

Table 10. *External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) "Outside the Bedroom" Scale*

Factor Full Scale α = 0.95	Analytic Sample N = 593	
	Yes n (%)	No n (%)
Factor 1: Verbal (α = 0.85)		
I verbally said "yes" to my partner	183 (31.4)	400 (68.6)
I said phrases to my partner like "I really want you"	193 (33.3)	387 (66.7)
I flirted with my partner	461 (79.2)	121 (20.8)
I said positive statements (i.e. I really enjoy being with you) to my partner	336 (57.6)	247 (42.4)
I verbally asked my partner if it was okay to engage in sexual activity	122 (21.0)	460 (79.0)
I talked "dirty" to my partner	135 (23.3)	44 (76.7)
I verbally told my partner I wanted to engage in sexual activity	154 (26.2)	433 (73.8)
I verbally told my partner it was okay to engage in sexual activity	114 (19.4)	474 (80.6)
I gave my partner compliments (i.e. you're so attractive)	329 (56.5)	253 (43.5)
I talked to my partner in a sexy tone of voice	213 (36.4)	372 (63.6)
I asked my partner to "hang out" another time	236 (40.5)	347 (59.5)
I asked my partner for their phone number	139 (23.8)	445 (76.2)
I gave my partner my phone number	215 (36.9)	368 (63.1)
Factor 2: Non-verbal (α = 0.85)		
I used my body language or signals	425 (72.6)	160 (27.4)
I appeared interested in sexual activity with my partner	380 (65.1)	204 (34.9)
I smiled at my partner	480 (82.5)	102 (17.5)
I physically pulled my partner closer to me (in terms of distance)	320 (55.0)	262 (45.0)
I touched my partner's lower body, crotch, or genital area	118 (20.1)	468 (79.9)
I touched my partner's upper body, arms, or chest	374 (64.0)	210 (36.0)
I caressed my partner's face	263 (44.9)	323 (55.1)
I physically moved closer to my partner (in terms of distance)	391 (67.0)	193 (33.0)
I looked into my partner's eyes	407 (69.5)	179 (30.5)
I gave my partner "sexy" eyes	269 (45.9)	317 (54.1)
I was very touchy with my partner	316 (53.9)	270 (46.1)
I kissed or made-out with my partner	358 (60.9)	230 (39.1)
I danced closely with my partner	307 (52.4)	279 (47.6)
Factor 3: No Response (α = 0.88)		
I did not stop my partner's actions	299 (51.3)	284 (48.7)
I did not push my partner away	360 (61.9)	222 (38.1)
I let my partner touch wherever they wanted on my body	220 (37.9)	360 (62.1)
I did not resist my partner's actions	327 (56.5)	252 (43.5)
I did not say "no" to my partner	287 (49.1)	297 (50.9)
I did not stop my partner from kissing me	356 (60.9)	229 (39.1)
Factor 4: Tacit Knowing (α = 0.81)		
I did not say anything to my partner because my partner just knew I wanted to engage in sexual activity	271 (46.6)	311 (53.4)

(Continued)

Table 10. *ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale (Cont.)*

	Analytic Sample	
Factor	Yes	No
Full Scale α = 0.95	n (%)	n (%)
I did not say anything to my partner because it was obvious I wanted to engage in sexual activity	245 (41.8)	341 (58.2)
Factor 5: Alcohol (α = 0.80)		
I drank alcohol	379 (64.8)	206 (35.2)
I got drunk	284 (48.9)	297 (51.1)
I bought my partner an alcoholic drink	131 (22.5)	452 (77.5)
I accepted an alcoholic drink from my partner	280 (47.9)	304 (52.1)
Factor 6: Transition (α = 0.61)		
I went to a private space with my partner	262 (44.7)	324 (55.3)
I invited my partner back to my place	228 (39.0)	357 (61.0)
I accepted an invitation to go back to my partner's place	299 (51.3)	284 (48.7)
I left with my partner at the end of the night	353 (60.3)	232 (39.7)
Factor 7: Texting (α = 0.86)		
I texted my partner late at night to indicate my sexual consent	178 (30.4)	407 (69.6)
I sent flirtatious text messages to my partner to indicate my sexual consent	256 (43.5)	333 (56.5)
I texted my partner back when they texted me late at night to indicate my sexual consent	213 (36.2)	376 (63.8)
Factor 8: Socialization (α = 0.78)		
I went to a party with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	84 (14.3)	502 (85.7)
I went to a bar with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	55 (9.4)	528 (90.6)
I went on a date with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	154 (26.2)	434 (73.8)
I went to "hang out" with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	242 (41.1)	347 (58.9)
I watched a movie with my partner to indicate my sexual consent	185 (31.5)	403 (68.5)
Factor 9: Social Media (α = 0.81)		
I posted pictures showing off my body for my partner to see	54 (9.2)	535 (90.8)
I posted pictures of me wearing sexy clothing for my partner to see	44 (7.5)	544 (92.5)
I posted sexy status updates for my partner to see	13 (2.2)	576 (97.8)
I posted pictures of myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	34 (5.8)	555 (94.2)
I posted pictures of myself at a party for my partner to see	83 (14.1)	505(85.9)
I posted status updates about myself drinking alcohol for my partner to see	20 (3.4)	567 (96.6)
I posted status updates about myself being at a party for my partner to see	43 (7.4)	541 (92.6)
I updated my relationship status for my partner to see	102 (17.4)	485 (82.6)
I "liked" my partner's pictures	334 (56.9)	253 (43.1)
I "liked" my partner's status updates	263 (44.9)	323 (55.1)
I sent a friend request to my partner	190 (32.4)	397 (67.6)
I accepted a friend request from my partner	273 (46.6)	313 (53.4)
I direct messaged (DM-ed) with my partner	151 (25.7)	436 (74.3)

Table 11. *Correlations among ECSR "Inside the Bedroom" Scale and Factors*

Factors	1	2	3	4
1. Full Scale	-			
2. Verbal Cues	.663*	-		
3. Nonverbal Cues	.872*	.481*	-	
4. No Response Cues	.554*	-.021	.250*	-
5. Tacit Knowing	.243*	-.278*	.187*	.377*

Note. *Significance level $p < 0.01$

Table 12. *Correlations among ECSR "Outside the Bedroom" Scale and Factors*

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Full	-								
2. Verbal Cues	.830*	-							
3. Nonverbal Cues	.871*	.713*	-						
4. No Response Cues	.752*	.573*	.722*	-					
5. Tacit Knowing	.562*	.341*	.536*	.599*	-				
6. Alcohol Cues	.619*	.445*	.484*	.319*	.231*	-			
7. Transition Cues	.736*	.564*	.612*	.483*	.372*	.591*	-		
8. Texting Cues	.499*	.287*	.241*	.206*	.187*	.231*	.296*	-	
9. Socialization Cues	.515*	.310*	.254*	.221*	.174*	.260*	.274*	.628*	-
10. Social Media Cues	.536*	.307*	.255*	.161*	.148*	.283*	.286*	.419*	.385*

Note. *Significance level $p < 0.01$

Table 13. *Follow-up ANOVAs for Significant Gender and Relationship Status Main Effects*

	Independent Variables				Group Difference	
Dependent Variables	Gender		Relationship Status			
	Male	Female	Romantic Rel.	Non-Romantic Rel.	Gender Diff. *p*	Rel. Status Diff. *p*
Scale Scores	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)		
"Inside the Bedroom" Scale						
Verbal Cues	5.76(2.88)	4.70(2.70)	5.31(2.73)	4.32(2.74)	< 0.001[a]	< 0.001[a]
Nonverbal Cues	14.05(3.11)	13.44(3.35)	14.10(3.00)	12.75(3.58)	.075	< 0.001[b]
No Response Cues	9.61(1.52)	8.67(2.49)	9.01(2.30)	8.67(2.37)	< 0.001[b]	.093
Tacit Knowing	1.52(0.75)	1.37(0.84)	1.42(0.82)	1.38(0.82)	.073	.547
"Outside the Bedroom" Scale						
Verbal Cues	6.16(4.20)	4.47(3.28)	4.98(3.69)	4.59(3.35)	< 0.001[c]	.222
Nonverbal Cues	7.54(4.50)	7.56(4.11)	7.46(4.31)	7.70(4.02)	.955	.526
No Response Cues	3.45(2.49)	3.10(2.32)	3.03(2.41)	3.39(2.28)	.151	.093
Tacit Knowing	1.00(0.89)	0.85(0.91)	0.83(0.91)	0.97(0.91)	.156	.080
Alcohol Cues	1.90(1.71)	1.81(1.44)	1.64(1.56)	2.15(1.35)	.602	< 0.001[c]
Transition Cues	1.94(1.47)	1.95(1.32)	1.87(1.39)	2.07(1.30)	.949	.096
Texting Cues	1.20(1.33)	1.95(1.32)	0.98(1.26)	1.38(1.35)	.585	< 0.001[d]
Socialization Cues	1.33(1.64)	1.23(1.49)	1.12(1.55)	1.48(1.47)	.551	.009
Social Media	2.70(3.13)	2.72(2.50)	2.77(2.70)	2.63(2.57)	.926	.558

Note. [a] Significance level $p < .0125$, [b] Significance level $p < .0167$, [c] Significance level $p < .0063$, [d] Significance level $p < .0071$

References

Beres, M. (2007). "Spontaneous" sexual consent: An analysis of sexual consent literature. *Feminism and Psychology, 17*(1), 93-108.

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

Beres, M. A. (2014). Rethinking the concept of consent for anti-sexual violence activism and education. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*(3), 373-389.

Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(7), 765-776.

Burkett, M., & Hamilton, K. (2012). Postfeminist sexual agency: Young women's negotiations of sexual consent. *Sexualities, 15*(7), 815-833.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Lee, H. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Retrieved from http://titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/sites/titleix-vawa.virginia.edu/files/ccs-report.pdf

Cohen, J. A. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 37-46.

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Daigle, L. E., Fisher, B. S., & Stewart, M. (2009). The effectiveness of sexual victimization prevention among college students: A summary of "what works." *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 398-404.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Applied social research methods series: Vol. 26. Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Donat, P. L. N., & White, J. W. (2000). Re-examining the issue of non-consent in acquaintance rape. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, & feminism* (pp. 355-376). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Foubert, J. D., Garner, D. N., & Thaxter, P. J. (2006). An exploration of fraternity culture: Implications for programs to address alcohol-related sexual assault. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 361-373.

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/consent1.htm

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6*(2), 65-70.

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

Humphreys, T. P., & Brousseau, M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale – Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 46*, 1-9.

Humphreys, T. P., & Herold, E. (2007). Sexual consent in heterosexual dating relationships: Development of a new measure. *Sex Roles, 57*, 305-315.

Jozkowski K. N. (2013). The influence of consent on college students' perceptions of the quality of sexual intercourse at last event. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 260–272.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016a). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016b). 'Who wants a quitter? . . . so you just keep trying': Gendered perspectives of college students' perceptions of sexual consent. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

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

273

consent: Implications for contemporary sexual assault prevention education. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*, 904–916.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Krebs, C. P., Linquist, 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*(6), 639-647.

Kuder, G. F., & Richardson, M. W. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika, 2*(3), 151-160.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*(1), 159-174.

Muehlenhard, C. L. (1995/1996). The complexities of sexual consent. *SIECUS Report, 24*, 4-7.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Humphreys, T., Jozkowski, J. N., & Peterson, Z. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *Journal of Sex Research, 53*(4-5), 457-487.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Bryne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). 'If a girl doesn't say "no" . . .': Young men, rape and claims of 'insufficient knowledge.' *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 168-193.

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

Rhoads, K. E., Jozkowski, K. N., Lo, W., Blunt, H. D., & Mosely, J. D. (2016). *The development and psychometric assessment of the Social Media Consent Myths Scale*. Manuscript in preparation.

Schewe, P. A. (2006). Interventions to prevent sexual violence. In Paul A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the life span* (pp. 223-239). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Shotland, R. L., & Goldstein, 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.

The Affirmative Consent Project. (2016). *50 states of consent*. Retrieved from http://affirmativeconsent.com/affirmative-consent-laws-state-by-state/?hvid=20iWpX

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014). *Not alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*. Washington, DC: The White House.

VI. Conclusion

Implications

The purpose of this study was to develop and psychometrically assess two measures of sexual consent. Although sexual assault received national attention with the creation of the White House Task Force (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014), research on the topic of sexual consent still remains limited in comparison to sexual assault literature (Beres, 2007). Even more limited are reliable and valid scales measuring beliefs and perceptions about sexual consent. Thus, this study sought to address the gaps in literature regarding the topics of sexual consent and measurement tools. Results suggest both newly developed measures are reliable and valid scales, in addition, to being unique contributions to consent literature.

Social Media Consent Myths Scale. The initial idea for developing the Social Media Consent Myths Scale (SMCMS) was conceived after college students, unexpectedly, discussed their perceptions regarding social media potentially being involved in sexual consent interpretation during one-on-one interviews (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). These unanticipated and problematic findings warranted additional investigation which resulted in a second study consisting of an open-ended survey elicitation. Themes emerging from the formative elicitation suggested the possibility that students believe the content, such as sexualized pictures and posts, limited clothing in pictures, and postings about partying and drinking alcohol, of women's social media profiles can be more indicative of consent compared to the content of men's profiles (Rhoads & Jozkowski, 2016). Unfortunately, these themes were not surprising in the wake of recent events regarding sexual assault in the national mainstream media. For example, in the Steubenville, Ohio sexual assault case, defense attorneys placed blame on the victim because she

had posted sexualized pictures on social media prior to her assault (Macur & Schweber, 2012). Results of the current study suggest college men may endorse the belief that women's social media profiles are up for interpretation regarding sexual consent more so than college women. Taken the results of these studies and mainstream media incidences altogether, it is apparent that social media poses a new challenge to sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) as it has likely become a new forum through which sexual consent myths and correlates, such as rape myth acceptance and the sexual double standard, are perpetuated.

Thus, the SMCMS was developed with the intention of identifying how strongly people endorse the *myth* that sexual consent can be interpreted by looking at the content of a person's social media profile. The SMCMS has multiple applications throughout the planning, development, and evaluation phases of SAPE programs. The SMCMS can be administered as a baseline measure during a needs assessment to determine how strongly a population endorses consent myths regarding social media. It can also be utilized to develop curriculum for SAPE programs that specifically addresses prominent consent myths in an effort to educate the target population about these false beliefs with the overarching goal of eliminating such endorsement. Furthermore, the SMCMS could serve as an evaluative mechanism to measure post-program beliefs regarding social media and sexual consent to identify whether the program successfully impacted how people conceptualize and understand sexual consent. Therefore, the SMCMS can be utilized in an applied setting in order to create more effective SAPE programs that specifically address currently held consent myths.

External Consent Scale – Revised. The External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) extends beyond other consent measures as it is the only scale that incorporates perceptions of "outside the bedroom" consent. The distinction between "inside the bedroom" consent (i.e.,

277

consent that occurs in the moments right before sexual behavior happens) and "outside the bedroom" consent was first made by Jozkowski and Hunt (2016) when they conducted interviews with college students. Their findings suggest students perceive that consent can be communicated and interpreted in social settings, such as parties or bars, and align with previous findings of Beres (2010). Furthermore, some students perceived being able to communicate and interpret consent in "coded" or "hidden messages," via verbal and nonverbal cues, because explicit consent is culturally considered taboo (Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016). Results of the current study suggest people who are in non-romantic relationships may rely on "outside the bedroom" consent cues pertaining to text messaging and bar behaviors involving alcohol (e.g., buy a drink for a partner, accepting a drink from a partner) more so than those who are in a romantic relationships. These results contrast previous findings suggesting college students believe more explicit sexual consent is required in newer relationships where partners are less familiar with each other (Humphreys, 2004; 2007). In a time when the phrase "Netflix and chill" is a euphemism for sex and accepting an alcoholic drink is perceived to be indicative of consent, there was a need to quantitatively assess perceived use of "outside the bedroom" cues as a method for communicating consent.

Thus, the ECSR was developed to be a comprehensive event-level consent measure that assesses people's perceptions about how they communicated consent during their most recent consensual sexual experience. Similarly to the SMCMS, the utility of the ECSR includes both being an assessment to understand people's perceptions about consent communication and a program evaluation tool. Most current SAPE programs on college campuses primarily focus on promoting consent by encouraging students to obtain explicit consent prior to engaging in sexual activity (Daigle, Fisher, & Stewart, 2009; Donat & White, 2000; Schewe, 2006). These programs

278

typically target "inside the bedroom" consent and do not account for the contextual factors

students are perceiving to be indicative of consent in social settings. SAPE programs would

benefit from utilizing the ECSR to identify student perceptions regarding "outside the bedroom"

consent in an effort to understand how students perceive consent, and then tailor education if

necessary in order to educate students that these perceptions, in fact, do *not* constitute sexual

consent. Additionally, the ECSR may be used as a program assessment tool to measure whether

SAPE programs actually influence how students communicate their sexual consent after program

participation. The ECSR has the potential to be a building block to insight cultural change

regarding how college students conceptualize and understand sexual consent by assisting in the

development and evaluation of successful SAPE programs.

Future Research Trajectory

Though this study has contributed to consent literature by exploring novel beliefs and

perceptions regarding sexual consent, it has identified areas that require additional examination.

Furthermore, this study provided foundational support for future research that is both divergent

yet complementary of current consent research.

Social Media and Sexual Consent. Previous research examining sexual assault

perpetration has identified contextual factors that lead perpetrators to believe their actions are

justified and do not constitute sexual assault. Factors such as women leading men on, women

agreeing to kissing/touching, and women wearing revealing clothes are common justifications

for sexual assault (e.g., Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001; Wegner, Abbey,

Pierce, Pegram, & Woerner, 2015). Findings from the current study suggest some college

students believe that social media content can be communicative of a woman's sexual consent

more so than a man's. Furthermore, findings suggest some students believe posting certain social

media content (e.g., sexualized posts, pictures showing off cleavage, pictures wearing limited clothing) comprises contextual consent. Research examining the link between sexual assault justification and consent myths has yet to be conducted; however, the belief that sexual assault is justified based on the type of content a person posts to social media is problematic and worth exploration.

The current study placed emphasis on student endorsement of consent myths regarding being able to interpret consent based on the content of a person's social media profile. Though such examination has implications for development of successful SAPE programs, further research on social media as a medium for perpetuation of consent myths is warranted. Thus, future investigation regarding social media and sexual consent should focus on identifying salient messages about sexual consent that are being circulated on social media. More specifically, exploring the types of messages people are receiving on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter, about sexual consent can be the initial step in developing public health messages that counter such false statements. Identifying common consent myths people are being exposed to via social media provides the opportunity to create social media campaigns specifically aimed at dispelling consent myths.

"Outside the Bedroom" Consent. There are multiple contextual factors that influence how people communicate and interpret consent. Research on contextual factors, such as the sexual behavior and relationship status of partners, remains limited. Thus, exploring how people communicate their consent to different sexual behaviors and in different relationship statuses is needed in order to identify how much influence such contextual factors exert on consent behaviors. Furthermore, most consent research conducted with college student has investigated perceptions of consent within the context of heterosexual sex (Hall, 1998; Hickman &

280

Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004; 2007; Jozkowski & Hunt, 2016; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2014; Jozkowski, Sanders, Peterson, Dennis, & Reece, 2014). Current there is only a singular study that specifically examined consent communication and interpretation within a non-heterosexual sample of college students (Beres, Herold, & Maitland, 2004). Given that non-heterosexual individuals represent an understudied population within consent literature, future "outside the bedroom" consent research should be conducted with individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB) to identify whether differences in consent communication exist based on sexual orientation.

Muehlenhard (1995/1996) theorized that consent includes both an internal feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity and an external expression via words and/or behaviors of willingness to engage in sexual behavior. Jozkowski and colleagues (Jozkowski, Sanders et al., 2014) developed both the Internal Consent Scale (ICS) and External Consent Scale (ECS) based upon Muehlenhard's (1995/1996) theory. The current study redeveloped the ECS into the External Consent Scale – Revised (ECSR) to be a more comprehensive measure of consent communication. In light of the additions measuring perceptions of "outside the bedroom" consent, future research should examine whether differences in internal consent feelings exist in situations where a person consented to undesired sexual activity. Perhaps, perceptions of communicating "outside the bedroom" consent play a pivotal role in a person's decision to consent to sexual activity though they do not desire such behavior (e.g., felt obligated to consent because they accepted an alcoholic drink from a potential partner). Research examining internal consent feelings is limited; however, such research, taken altogether with perceived "outside the bedroom" consent, may provide more insight into the internal feelings people felt leading up to the decision to consent to undesired sexual activity.

Final Thoughts

As a researcher, it can be difficult to look beyond research designs and statistical results to consider the "human impact" of research. Disregarding the factor loadings and reliability coefficients of this study, the "human impact" is the overall effects this research can exhibit on individual people. It would be remiss of me if I did not take a step back to examine the bigger picture and "human impact" of this research.

As a health educator, my training has taught me how to address health issues through the three main levels of prevention: (1) primary; (2) secondary; and (3) tertiary. Most health education initiatives align with primary prevention as it is more cost effective in terms of time, effort, and money to prevent people from engaging in negative health behaviors in the onset rather than treating or managing a chronic health condition after it has developed. Thus, my immediate thought when considering the "human impact" of this study was to identify its potential influence on sexual assault prevention education (SAPE) programs as its main contribution in terms of "human impact." Although this study does have implications for SAPE programs, I cannot help but consider this research's "human impact" on those for whom sexual assault prevention is no longer feasible.

As I conclude this study, my thoughts are consumed with how this research impacts victims of sexual assault. As I prepared my first manuscript of this dissertation, I was deeply touched and saddened by the lives and stories of Audrie Pott, Rehtaeh Parsons, Daisy Coleman, Jessica Gonzalez, and the Steubenville victim. A common theme in each of their stories was the ridicule and blame these women faced though they were victims of a crime perpetrated against them. These women are only a few among the nearly 300,000 people who are victims of sexual assault each year (Truman & Langton, 2015). Whether we explicitly acknowledge it or not,

society has failed each and every person who has been a victim of sexual assault. Though it is tempting to draw a line in the sand and say my research fulfills its "human impact" by informing prevention programs, I challenge myself to conduct research that creates a meaningful impact on sexual assault victims. I am, by far, not the first researcher to say we are in dire need of cultural shifts in how we, as a society, think about sexual violence; however, I am truly committed to creating a cultural environment in which blame is not placed on sexual assault victims and perpetrators are not seen as doing what "anyone else would have done" if in a similar situation. Thus, myself and my research join the fight to create a new paradigm combating sexual assault that includes both prevention efforts and justice and support for victims.

References

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A. M., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(8), 784-807.

Beres, M. (2007). "Spontaneous" sexual consent: An analysis of sexual consent literature. *Feminism and Psychology, 17*(1), 93-108.

Beres, M. (2010). Sexual miscommunication? Untangling assumptions about sexual communication between casual sex partners. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 12*(1), 1-14.

Beres, M. A., Herold, E., & Maitland, S. B. (2004). Sexual consent behaviors in same-sex relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 33*, 475–486.

Daigle, L. E., Fisher, B. S., & Stewart, M. (2009). The effectiveness of sexual victimization prevention among college students: A summary of "what works." *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 398-404.

Truman, J. L., & Langton, L. (2015). *National crime victimization survey, 2010-2014*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Donat, P. L. N., & White, J. W. (2000). Re-examining the issue of non-consent in acquaintance rape. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, & feminism* (pp. 355-376). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hall, D. S. (1998). Consent for sexual behavior in a college student population. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ejhs.org/volume1/consent1.htm

Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 258-272.

Humphreys, T. P. (2004). Understanding sexual consent: An empirical investigation of the normative script for young heterosexual adults. In M. Cowling & P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Making sense of sexual consent*. (pp. 209–225). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(4), 307-315.

284

Jozkowski, K. N., & Hunt, M. (2016). *Consent 'outside the bedroom': Exploring heterosexual college students' perceptions of consent cues in social setting*. Manuscript under review.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Assessing the validity and reliability of the perceptions of the Consent to Sex Scale. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 632-645.

Jozkowski, K. N., Sanders, S., Peterson, Z. D., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Consenting to sexual activity: The development and psychometric assessment of dual measures of consent. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 437–450.

Macur, J., & Schweber, N. (2012). Rape case unfolds on the web and splits city. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/17/sports/high-school-football-rape-case-unfolds-online-and-divides-steubenville-ohio.html?_r=0

Muehlenhard, C. L. (1995/1996). The complexities of sexual consent. *SIECUS Report, 24*, 4-7.

Rhoads, K. E., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2016). *"Shirtless selfies for guys, scantily clad girls:" Perceptions of sexual consent based on social media profiles*. Manuscript in preparation.

Schewe, P. A. (2006). Interventions to prevent sexual violence. In Paul A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the life span* (pp. 223-239). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wegner, R., Abbey, A., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., Woerner, J. (2015). Sexual assault perpetrators' justifications for their actions: Relationships to rape supportive attitudes, incident characteristics, and future perpetration. *Violence Against Women, 21*(8), 1018-1037.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014). *Not alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*. Washington, DC: The White House.