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Abstract

The aim of this thesis was to gain a more comprehensive picture of men’s perceptions of sexual consent. Specifically, Study 1 aimed to examine whether men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on a variety of factors. It was investigated whether men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on the outcome of a scenario depicting a sexual interaction between two people, in this case a rape versus a non-rape scenario. It was examined whether men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on whether they have personality characteristics associated with sexually aggressive behaviour. This study included different categories of women (a woman in a committed long-term relationship but not married, which will be referred to as a de-facto; acquaintance; ex-stripper; ex-prostitute) within the scenarios. The aim was to include categories of women that may be perceived differently in terms of their sexual history, “promiscuity” and relationship status, to examine whether men’s perception of consent differ for different categories of women. Participants were asked whether they have ever visited a sex worker to examine whether clients of sex workers differ in their perceptions of consent from men in the general population. A total of 186 participants were recruited over the internet, via Facebook and online forums. The questionnaire had three parts, including a section collecting demographic information, a section depicting a rape and a non-rape scenario, and a section that included the personality measure. In the second part, participants were required to answer a set of questions measuring sexual consent after reading a rape and a non-rape scenario. The scenarios were randomised to ensure that a different category of woman was depicted in the rape versus the non-rape scenario. The results showed that men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on a variety of
factors. Specifically, some men were less clear than others that consent has not been given in the non-rape scenario, despite the woman’s verbal refusal of sexual intercourse. Further, men viewed the de-facto woman as less coerced into the sexual interaction, as more consenting to the sexual interaction and as having less right to stop the sexual interaction than the other three categories of women. Some personality traits related to attitudes and beliefs about sexually aggressive behaviour did differentiate between men’s perceptions of sexual consent, as those men who rated higher on personality traits reflecting sexually aggressive behaviour were more likely to perceive consent has been given, less coercion occurred in the rape scenario, and the woman depicted in the scenario had less right to stop the sexual interaction. Further, it was found that perceptions of sexual intent are related to perceptions of sexual consent. The more sexual intent attributed to the women in the scenario the more likely men were to perceive the women had consented to the sexual interaction and therefore had less right to stop the sexual interaction. However, perceptions of sexual intent did not differ depending on the category of women they were presented with. Lastly, the results showed that clients of sex workers’ perceptions on the three measures of consent and sexual intent did not differ from non-clients’ perceptions. The implications of these findings are that, for men, verbal signals of consent are not clear indicators of refusal of sexual interactions, which indicates that men use a variety of cues, such as a woman agreeing to come to a man’s apartment, to interpret whether consent has been given or not. This has raised questions in terms of a woman’s role when interacting with men. On the one hand it should be suggested that to avoid miscommunication of sexual consent, women should be wary of their behaviour that could be misinterpreted. However, this would suggest that women
should restrict their behaviour whereas men are the ones that misinterpret non-sexual behaviour as sexual. Further, this suggests that women are sexualised within interactions, which raises the question as to why this is the case. Another implication of the findings is that women in a de-facto relationship (a committed longer-term relationship, without being married) are still seen as the sexual property of men. This indicates that it might be difficult for women who get raped in relationships to establish that rape has occurred and they are a ‘real’ victim of rape. Further, it might be the case that men in relationships are more likely to engage in verbal and physical coercion to access sexual interactions with their partners, as there appears to be the notion that men have an inherent right to access sex in relationships. Lastly, it appeared that men can be differentiated by their personality characteristics in terms of where they fall on the continuum of consent. Men that rated higher on personality characteristics that reflect sexually aggressive attitudes and behaviours might be more likely to engage in sexual coercion. In addition, they might be more likely to misperceive sexual consent.

Study 2 aimed to further examine men’s perception of consent within a specific subpopulation of men: clients of sex workers. Specifically the aim was to gain insight into the sex worker and client interaction in terms of what constitutes sexual consent, as research indicates sex workers are frequently victims of sexual assault and rape. In addition, the aim was to examine whether clients of sex workers do differentiate sexual interactions with sex workers from sexual interactions with women in the general population and, specifically, whether they perceive sexual consent differently between these interactions. A total of 28 participants were recruited over the internet, with the help of RhED (Resourcing Health & Sexual Education). A questionnaire was created, which included a
mixed designed of qualitative and quantitative questions. The first part of the questionnaire gathered demographic information about the participants. The second part of the questionnaire included questions regarding the sexual interactions with sex workers, such as what the meaning of purchase is for the clients and what constitutes consent within this interaction, as well as questions regarding whether consent differs within an interaction with a sex worker from an interaction with a woman in the general population. Lastly, the questionnaire included the same personality measures as in Study1 to see whether sex worker clients’ perceptions of consent can be distinguished through personality traits that reflect attitudes/beliefs, which excuse sexually aggressive behaviour. The results showed that clients of sex workers are a heterogeneous group, which differs in terms of their perceptions of sexual consent within the client sex worker interaction. Some clients viewed the sexual interaction with a sex worker as a business transaction and indicated that payment clearly signified consent. Others viewed sexual consent as more complex and indicated that payment was only one part of sexual consent in addition to verbal communication of consent and non-verbal cues. Some clients clearly indicated that, regardless whether the sexual interaction was paid for, the sex worker does have the right at any point to stop the sexual interaction. Further the results showed that clients also differed in their perceptions of whether or not consent alters between an interaction with a sex worker or a woman in the general population. The implications of these findings are that it appears that, generally, clients of sex workers have a good understanding what entails sexual consent. It appeared that some clients of sex workers use more verbal forms of gaining sexual consent and are still alert to other cues when interpreting sexual consent in sexual interactions. It might be the
case that the structured procedures to establish consent at the outset of the client and sex worker interaction has helped the man’s understanding of what sexual consent entails, which, in turn, appears to have increased their sensitivity to signals of consent. A large proportion of clients stated that, for them, consent does not differ between a woman in the general population and a sex worker, which indicates that these men might also apply their understanding of what constitutes consent when interacting with women in the general population.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Thesis

Sexual consent is an important concept as it is a factor that determines whether a sexual interaction between two people is mutually agreed upon. This thesis aims to examine men’s perceptions of sexual consent within a sexual interaction. In order to get a comprehensive picture of men’s perceptions of sexual consent two studies will be conducted. Study 1 focuses on determining factors that might help to explain differences between men’s perceptions of consent, whereas Study 2 focuses on the clients of sex workers and their perceptions of consent within the sexual interaction between the client and the sex worker. The rationale for specifically looking at men’s perception of consent is to expand on past research, which mainly focused on the differences between men’s and women’s perceptions and communication of consent. Past research showed that, compared to women, men are more likely to interpret consent as given within a sexual interaction between a man and a woman (Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2007). It is also suggested that men are more likely to be the perceivers of sexual consent as they are more likely to instigate the sexual interaction (Check & Malamuth, 1983). As the perceiver of sexual consent, it is important to interpret signals of consent correctly as misinterpretations of sexual consent can have negative outcomes such as sexual assault. Consequently, Study 1 aims to investigate whether men’s perception of consent differs depending on four factors: outcome of the scenario, personality traits, different categories of women and clients of sex workers versus non-clients.
The first factor included in Study 1 will be different dating scenarios, varying in their degree of escalation to rape versus non-rape. In both scenarios the woman verbally asks the man to stop the sexual interaction. The aim is to examine whether men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on the outcome (rape versus non-rape) of the scenario. The second aim of Study 1 is to examine whether personality traits (factor 2) linked to sexually aggressive behaviours can help to differentiate between men who are more likely to perceive that the woman has consented to the sexual interaction from those men who are less likely to think the woman has consented to the sexual interaction. The third aim of Study 1 is to investigate whether men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on the perceived sexual history, “promiscuity” and relationship status. To examine this aim, the scenarios not only vary in terms of the outcome but also in terms of the description of the women depicted in the scenario: a de-facto, an acquaintance, an ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute. The reason for including these four categories of women is that past research indicated relationship length and amount of prior sexual partners did impact perceptions of consent. Women in relationships and those with more prior sexual partners were seen as more obliged to have sexual intercourse (Humphreys, 2007; Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Further, sex workers and women perceived as promiscuous were seen as less affected by sexual assault and rape in rape cases than women who were not seen as promiscuous (Scutt, 1994). This might indicate that perceptions of the necessity to obtain consent might be impacted by stereotypes such as promiscuous women are less affected by rape or are even ‘unrapeable’. There is some research available on how different relationship statuses influence perceptions of consent, but past research has not examined how professions that might be seen as
violating conservative sexual norms, such as stripping and sex work, impact upon perceptions of consent. Consequently, the categories of women chosen for the scenario were: a de-facto, an acquaintance, an ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute. The rationale for including an ex-stripper and ex-prostitute rather than a stripper and a prostitute was, that this study did not aim to examine attitudes towards those types of work. Instead, the aim was to include two types of women that might be perceived as “promiscuous” or violating sexual norms. The fourth aim of Study 1 is to explore whether being a client of sex workers differentiates men’s perception of consent depending on the four categories of women. Clients of sex workers will not be specifically targeted, rather it is assumed that within the general population clients of sex workers will be present. Past research indicates about 15.5% of men in Australia have visited a sex worker (Rissel, Richters, Grulich, Visser, & Smith, 2003). The reason for including clients of sex workers was that these men have sexual experiences with sex workers and might hold less stereotypical beliefs about women working in professions deemed as promiscuous. Consequently, their perceptions of consent might differ from men who have never visited a sex worker.

Study 2 aims to explore how clients of sex workers perceive the sexual interaction between themselves and the sex worker and, more specifically, how they perceive, negotiate and communicate consent within this interaction. Sexual consent is important within sex work as it protects women working in the sex industry from sexual assault and rape. Past research (Miller & Schwartz, 1995) indicated that sex workers were frequent victims of sexual assault and rape and, therefore, it is important to examine the clients’ perspectives of what constitutes sexual consent within their interaction with the sex worker.
The second chapter of this thesis will provide an overview of the research concerning perceptions of consent. This chapter will also include a discussion about sexual intent. Even though consent and sexual intent are not the same concept, research on sexual intent provides insight into which factors may influence perceptions of sexual consent. Further, sexual consent will be viewed in terms of its legal context. Judgments in rape cases highly depend on the victim’s capability to prove beyond reasonable doubt that consent was not given, especially in cases where no physical evidence is present. A review of judgments indicates that the ability of a woman to prove non-consent is influenced by her demographic status. Therefore, it was seen as necessary to include the legal context as the demographic status of a woman may also influence how men in the general population perceive a woman’s ability to consent to a sexual interaction. In the third chapter, a discussion and critique of psychological theories of sexual aggression will be undertaken as they may explain individual differences in perceptions of consent.

The fourth chapter will report Study 1. It will include an introduction, which specifically targets the research on sexual consent and sexual intent needed to provide a background and rationale for the hypothesis. A method section will follow and outline demographic information about the participants, as well as provide details about the creation of the questionnaire, materials and the procedure in Study 1. A results section will then provide information about data preparation and specific analysis used to analyse the data. Lastly, the discussion will explain the findings in detail, discuss the implication of the findings and address limitations and suggestions for future research.
The fifth chapter will report Study 2. Consequently, the fifth chapter will follow the same structure as Study 1. The chapter will start with an introduction to Study 2, followed by a method section providing information about the participants, the materials and procedures. Study 2 will vary from Study 1 in terms of the design of the study. As Study 2 is more exploratory in nature it will quantitative questions and qualitative questions. Following the method section, a results and discussion section will be included detailing the analysis used in the study and explaining the findings and implications of the study. The discussion will also include a section on limitations and suggestions for future research.

Chapter six will be the general discussion of the two studies included in this thesis. The general discussion will briefly summarise the findings of each of the individual studies and then explain the wider implications of the overall findings. Limitations of both studies will be discussed in further detail and more suggestions for future research will be made.
CHAPTER TWO

Defining Consent

2.1. Conceptual Issues

Sexual consent is a crucial part of sexual interactions as it is a factor that determines if the individuals involved mutually agree upon the interaction. In order for consent to be considered a mutual agreement, both parties involved need to have a clear understanding of what it means to consent, how it is communicated and how the other person perceives consent. However, as research indicates, sexual consent is a multifaceted concept and even within the research community the definition of sexual consent has turned out to be a challenge. Definitions of sexual consent vary and there is no clear consensus within the research community of what constitutes consent (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). Muehlenhard (1995/1996) reviewed a variety of definitions in different contexts and discussed difficulties with the conceptualisation of sexual consent. Through this examination Muehlenhard suggested that there are two themes that emerge. First she suggested that consent requires knowledge about the sexual act in question and the possible social meaning of the act. Muehlenhard also points out that, in order for someone to provide informed consent, honesty from the parties involved is required. The second theme that emerged according to Muehlenhard was that consent has to be given freely, meaning that there cannot be any form of coercion involved to get the other person to consent to the sexual interaction. In addition, Muehlenhard proposed that consent has at least two components: a cognitive act and a physical act. The cognitive act is the mental decision to agree to a sexual interaction. As there is no verbal or nonverbal
communication involved the perceiver can never be sure about whether the other person consented or not. The physical act of expressing consent can either be a verbal or nonverbal expression of a willingness to engage in a sexual interaction.

Misperception and miscommunication of sexual consent does occur (Abbey, 1982, 1987; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). Research suggests even verbal expressions of consent can be interpreted as ambiguous by the people involved in a sexual interaction (Krahe, Scheinberger-Olwig, & Kolpin, 2000; Osman, 2003, 2007). This ambiguity may be resulting out of men’s belief that women engage in token resistance to sex, which means women say no to sex when they actually would like to engage in sexual activity (Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988). Token resistance is guided by traditional sexual stereotypes, which lead to the enactment of sexual scripts. These sexual scripts depict men as taking the active role to initiate the sexual interaction whereas women are the gatekeepers that are supposed to initially resist (regardless if they desire sexual activity or not) the sexual advances but eventually give in (Check & Malamuth, 1983).

Even though engaging in token resistance is rare, women have been found to engage in this behaviour to deal with a sexual double standard (Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991). This sexual double standard manifests itself in that it is seen as acceptable and even encouraged for men to have multiple sexual relationships. In contrast, women who are sexually active may suffer from social consequences and stigmatisation (Crawford & Popp, 2003). Men’s belief that women engage in token resistance may, therefore, lead to sexual harassment. They may misinterpret a ‘no’ to a sexual interaction as a
‘yes’ if he believes the woman engages in token resistance. Consequently, it is important to examine how sexual consent is communicated and understood by two people engaging in a sexual activity.

Research examining the process by which individuals communicate consent is relatively new (Beres, Herold, & Maitland, 2004; Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2004, 2007). Hall conducted a study to examine how college students expressed consent – either verbal or nonverbal – for a number of sexual interactions ranging from kissing to anal intercourse. The participants included 264 female and 158 male undergraduate social/behavioural science students. A total of 73.5% of participants (118 men and 196 women) were used for data analysis. Participants were excluded if they had never participated in a consensual sexual activity. Both men (59.3%) and women (62.5%) reported signalling consent verbally and nonverbally. Only 29.7% of males and 26.6% of females stated they only used nonverbal signals to indicate consent. Nonverbal signals of consent included kissing, getting closer, intimate touching and smiling. No gender differences were found for these variables. However, there was a large difference in the number of male and female participants. Therefore, possible gender differences may have been overseen. Further, the results indicated that individuals are more likely to give consent for the initial sexual activity, which was kissing in 59% of the cases. The most permission giving could be seen for sexual intercourse followed by oral sex. In addition, the results showed that participants do not give permission for each individual sexual behaviour within a sexual interaction.
Other research (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2007; Lim & Roloff, 1999) has focused on how consent is perceived by men and women interacting sexually. Lim and Roloff (1999) conducted a study to examine if the type of sexual consent (verbal and non-verbal) and other contextual variables such as alcohol consumption influence the way consent is perceived. One hundred undergraduate students (52 men and 48 women) participated in the study. The method used to establish the participants’ views on consent was a questionnaire with scenarios depicting a male and a female undergraduate student on a date that ended with sexual intercourse. The scenarios included 12 different contexts that reflected the woman having impaired judgment (e.g. through alcohol consumption) or being coerced through the male being aggressive and persistent to persuade the woman to have sexual intercourse with him. In addition, two types of consent were depicted: verbal and nonverbal. The nonverbal condition did not involve an explicit question for permission to sexual intercourse rather the two people started kissing and proceeded to sexual intercourse. The verbal condition included a specific request and answer for sexual intercourse.

The results showed that verbal communication was seen as a better indicator that a woman has the ability to agree, is not coerced and is truly consenting to engage in sexual intercourse. Also, the results demonstrated that contextual cues are related to how people perceive a person’s ability to consent. Regardless of the context, males were less likely than females to perceive the woman in the scenario as impaired. In addition, males perceived the scenarios as less coercive in the nonverbal condition than females. Men perceived the sexual intercourse as more appropriate in all 12 scenarios than females did. These results
suggest that there is a difference in male and female perceptions of sexual consent, as males are more likely to accept that consent has been given regardless if the woman is impaired or coerced.

Other situational variables that have been identified to influence perceptions about consent are sexual precedence and relationship history (Humphreys, 2007; Margolin, 1990; Margolin, Miller, & Moran, 1989; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000; Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Sexual precedence suggests that, if a man has a sexual history with a woman, he has a legitimate claim to future sexual intercourse with her (Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Shotland and Goodstein investigated whether people perceive it as a man’s right to have sex with a woman if he has had sex with her before. In addition, they investigated whether people think a woman has given up her right to refuse intercourse if she has repeatedly consented to sexual intercourse before. The subjects for the study were 357 (177 females, 180 males) undergraduate students. The method included a questionnaire that described a sexual scenario followed by a number of questions about the scenario. The scenario included a pair who was dating and the scenarios varied in the number of prior sexual experiences the pair had with each other (0, 1, and 10 sexual encounters). The number of prior sexual partners of the pair was also manipulated. The women had either one or four prior sexual partners and the men had either one or six sexual partners. Scales (Sexual Respectability of males/females) to measure how the number of sexual partners influenced the sexual respectability of the male and female portrayed in the scenario was included.
The results indicated that the couples’ prior sexual involvement shaped participants’ views about consent. Both men and women were perceived as more obliged to have sexual intercourse with someone again if they had sexual intercourse with that person before. If the woman had 10 prior sexual encounters with the man, both men and women perceived her as having an obligation to have sexual intercourse. However, a significant gender difference was found. Men viewed the female as more obligated to have sex than did female participants. In addition, the violence depicted in the scenario was seen as less serious and less harmful if sexual intercourse occurred before, which in turn indicates that sexual consent is viewed as less important. The results showed that participants had less respect for men and women who had more prior sexual partners. Consequently, it is important to investigate if perceptions of consent change depending on the relationship status of women such as that of an acquaintance, de-facto or married partner.

Similar results were found in a Canadian study conducted by Humphreys (2007). Humphreys investigated how couple-specific relationship experiences are linked to perceptions about sexual consent. The participant sample included 415 (64% were women and 36% were men) undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course in Canada. The method used was three versions of a vignette where a couple was portrayed on a date. After a dinner date they were portrayed as watching a movie. While watching a movie the male in the scenario starts to touch the women in a sexual manner. The woman in the scenario is depicted as uninterested, which is indicated by her removing his hand from her breast. However, he continues to touch her sexually and the couple’s date ends in sexual intercourse. No verbal expression of non-consent was given.
by the woman in the scenario. In version one, the couple was on a first date. The second version described the couple on a date celebrating three months of dating. In the final version the couple was celebrating a two-year wedding anniversary. Seventeen questions were asked to measure perceptions of consent, appropriateness of behaviour and clarity of intentions.

The results indicated that, as the duration of the relationship increased, the participants were more likely to view nonverbal consent as just as appropriate as verbal consent. Also, participants indicated that it was less necessary for the male to ask for consent verbally. In contrast, participants felt that the male should have asked for consent to kiss the woman or any other sexual activity in the first date vignette. In addition, participants felt it would have been less likely that asking for consent would wreck the mood in the first date condition than the other two conditions. Further, in the first date condition, participants agreed less that it is acceptable to assume consent, that the male’s approach was acceptable and if the female really did not want to have sexual intercourse she would have stopped the male. There were also some gender differences. Men were more likely to feel that: the female has consented to the sexual activity; consent was ok to be assumed; the woman’s non-verbal behaviour clearly indicated consent; the man’s non-verbal behaviour clearly indicated that he was asking for consent; the man’s approach was acceptable and, if the woman really did not want to have sexual relations, she would have stopped the man.

The above reviewed research on consent suggests that both genders use the same variety of verbal and nonverbal signals to convey consent. However, gender differences were found on how males and females interpret these verbal
and nonverbal signals of consent. Males are, in general, more likely to rate a female’s verbal and nonverbal signals as consent than females did themselves. This has been found regardless of the context of the sexual interaction. Factors such as sexual precedence within a relationship and relationship history have been found to influence perceptions of consent. Women who had prior sexual encounters with a man were seen as more obligated to have sex with him again regardless if she wants to have sex or not. Further, men viewed women as more obliged to have sex with a man if she had prior sexual interactions with him, than women did and violations of consent were seen as less harmful and serious if sexual precedence was present.

The view that violations of sexual consent are seen as less harmful and serious if sexual precedence was present is an important point as it may have implications in legal cases of sexual assault and rape. The law is designed to be a reflection of community attitudes and, therefore, it is important to examine if these attitudes are reflected within the legal system. In addition, the law may also provide more insight into why violations of sexual consent occur. Therefore, the next section will outline a variety of rape cases where violations of consent have occurred. The purpose of this is to show how various victim characteristics, such as relationship status or sexual history, influence perceptions about a woman’s ability to convey or deny sexual consent as well as prove non-consent in rape cases.
2.2. Legal Context of Sexual Consent

This section outlines the legal context of sexual consent. Laws are supposed to reflect community attitudes and, therefore, it was seen as important to examine how sexual consent is perceived within a legal context as it may inform attitudes within the general population. The examination of rape laws in Australia showed that the relationship status of a woman, such as being married, influenced a woman’s ability to withdraw consent within marriage until 1991. As can be seen from the above reviewed research, this is in line with community attitudes that showed the relationship status of a woman influenced perceptions of consent. An examination of how sexual consent is viewed within rape cases showed that the perceived promiscuity of a woman is another important factor within perceptions of consent.

2.2.1 Legal definitions of rape, rape cases and the importance of sexual consent. Rape in Victoria is legally defined as the intentional sexual penetration of another without that person’s consent (Section 38, Crimes (Rape) Act (Vic), 1991). This includes penetrating another while being aware that the person is not consenting or might not be consenting. In addition, rape is defined as penetrating another while not giving any thought to whether the person is not consenting or might not be consenting, or after sexual penetration he or she does not withdraw from the person on becoming aware that the person is not consenting or might not be consenting (Section, 38).

As mentioned above, Section 36 of the Victorian Crimes Act, 1991 describes the meaning of consent for the purposes of Subdivisions (8A)\textsuperscript{1} to (8D)\textsuperscript{1}...
as “free agreement”. The Act states that “circumstances in which a person does not freely agree to an act include:

- the person submits because of force or the fear of force to that person or someone else; the person submits because of the fear of harm of any type to that person or someone else; the person submits because he or she is unlawfully detained; the person is asleep, unconscious, or so affected by alcohol or another drug; the person is incapable of understanding the nature of the act; the person is mistaken about the sexual nature of the act or the identity of the person; the person mistakenly believes that the act is for medical or hygienic purposes” (p.45).

Even though this seems to be a clear and comprehensive definition, it remains difficult to establish if consent was given for a sexual act. In most rape cases there is no physical evidence present and, therefore, the most important evidence comes from the testimony of the complainant (Australian Law Reform Commission, 2003). In terms of the testimony of the complainant the most important aspect is whether or not he/she consented to sexual penetration. To get a better understanding of what impacts a woman’s ability to prove consent has not been given to a sexual interaction, it is important to review how rape laws first evolved and how this influenced judgments of rape cases.

2.2.2 Sexual consent and legal cases of women who are perceived as promiscuous. In 1736 Sir Matthew Hale defined rape as ‘the carnal knowledge of a women against her will’ p. 627 (Sir Hale, Stokes, Ingersoll, & Emlyn, 1763). However, this law did not apply to married women. In 1736, the rationale for this
law was that married women have consented to the marriage and therefore have given up the right to withdraw consent in sexual acts with their husbands. This indicates that women were seen as men’s sexual property. Therefore, a man could not be charged for raping his wife and this law was only changed recently (1991) in Australia. This is in line with the reviewed literature above, which suggested that the relationship status influences a woman’s ability to withdraw consent.

In the 18th century, British law made progress. Even though rape laws did not change for married women, British law recognised that a prostitute could be raped. In spite of this, perpetrators raping a prostitute or a ‘promiscuous woman’ were unlikely to be prosecuted in Australia until the 1980s (Sullivan, 2007). This was partly due to the fact that, until 1980, the judge was required to warn the jury about the validity of the victim’s evidence. The judge had to require the jury to look for independent evidence to that of the complainant. This evidence included that sexual intercourse took place, that it was without the victim’s consent, that the accused is the person who committed the assault and that he had the mental capacity to commit the crime (Australian Law Reform Commission, 1988).

Further, evidence regarding a woman’s sexual reputation was admissible in court from at least 1829. The reason for this was that promiscuous women were seen as untrustworthy (Sullivan, 2007). Those factors compromised a woman’s ability to establish non-consent to sexual acts. Since the 1970s and 1980s, all Australian jurisdictions have enacted reforms, which limited both the admissibility of evidence regarding the victim’s sexual reputation, and the warning of the jury regarding the victim’s evidence (Henning & Bronitt, 1998; Waller & Williams, 2009). However, if the evidence regarding the victim’s
sexual history is of “substantial relevance to facts of issue” (Evidence Act (Vic) 1958), the evidence is still permissible. Therefore, it depends on the court’s judgment if evidence regarding the sexual reputation of a complainant is essential for a fair trial of the accused.

Past research that looked at consent from a legal perspective has indicated that perceptions of consent are influenced by socio-cultural stereotypes, myths and norms about women and their sexual behaviour (Bumiller, 1990; Sullivan, 2007). For example, a predominant myth about women is the pedestal myth, which holds women on a higher moral ground than men (Stewart, Dobbin, & Gatowski, 1996). Pedestal myths include views such as women should not be sexually active and women are virtuous (Bumiller, 1990).

In addition to pedestal myths research suggests that rape myth acceptance beliefs influence how rape, rapists and victims of rape are perceived. Rape myths are incorrect and stereotypical beliefs such as: “women ask for it; only bad girls get raped; or sexually active women are more likely to lie about being attacked by a man than those that are chaste” (Burt, 1980). Rape myths acceptance beliefs may be used to displace responsibility and guilt from the perpetrator on to the victim (Page, 2008).

Taylor (2007) reported that juror judgments in rape cases are influenced by attitudes, beliefs and biases about rape as well as stereotypical beliefs about the victim rather than the objective facts. As jurors are members of the community it can be assumed that these beliefs are present within the wider community. Variables that influenced the credibility of the victims included: the complainant flirted and danced with the defendant, which was seen as
encouragement; or there was no evidence of any injury and the victim did not scream or shout. These studies highlight the implication of allowing evidence of a woman’s sexual reputation in terms of her ability to prove non-consent.

The debate about the admissibility of evidence of a woman’s sexual reputation and history has remained in recent decades. There are multiple rape cases in Australian, English and Canadian jurisdictions that demonstrate how perpetrators were either acquitted or received reduced sentences because of a woman’s prior sexual experiences and reputation.

The Victorian case of *R v Harries* in 1981 is an instance where the question of allowing evidence regarding the victim’s sexual reputation was debated, and may have influenced the judge’s perception of consent. Even though the accused was charged with rape, the sentencing was more lenient than in other rape cases where women were not prostitutes or classified as unchaste by the judge (Scutt, 1994). In the case of *R v Harries*, the Crown appealed against the low sentence Mr. Harris received. However, the appeal was dismissed and the Supreme Court (Court of Criminal Appeal) argued the original sentence was appropriate (Scutt). Justice Starke said:

‘It would be unthinkable that this Court … would apply one law for prostitutes and another law for chaste women…. That, however, does not mean that the factor that one of the girls [sic] was a prostitute and the other had been is an irrelevant consideration. … [T]he fact that the women are or have been engaging in prostitution is relevant… It follows, in my opinion, that the
forcible sexual act itself would not cause a reaction of revulsion, which it might cause in a chaste woman…

[I]t seems to me that the crime when committed against prostitutes, at all events in the circumstances of this case, is not as heinous as when committed, say, on a happily married woman…’


These statements indicate that even though the judge has acknowledged that consent has not been given to the sexual act, the fact that the women were seen as promiscuous led to the assumption that the violation of consent does not have the same effects on these women.

A similar argument could be seen in the sentencing of Mr. Hakopian. Referring to the R v Harris case Judge Jones concluded that the fact the rape victim is a prostitute is a relevant consideration when determining the sentencing (R v. Harris 1991a: 7). Judge Jones said:

‘As a prostitute, [Miss X] would have been involved in sexual activities on many occasions with men she had not met before, in a wide range of situations. She had, for money, agreed to have oral and vaginal intercourse with [Mr. Hakopian] and had very shortly before these offences occurred, had oral intercourse with [Mr. Hakopian] on a consensual basis.

On my assessment, the likely psychological effect on the victim of the forced oral intercourse and indecent assault, is much less a factor in this case and lessens the gravity of the offences’ (R v. Hakopian 1991a: 8, emphasis added).
These cases highlight the difficulty for women, who are perceived as promiscuous, to prove non-consent, which has major implications for the outcome of sentencing. In addition, it can also be seen that the court interprets consent in two different ways. First, it is considered if consent was given or not to establish if rape occurred. Second, the court also infers value judgments about what effects violations of consent have on the victims, which in turn influences sentencing. In the cases above this was the sexual history of the women, which made these women seen as promiscuous. This is in line with the previously mentioned sexual double standard. The women in those rape cases were judged as promiscuous as they had multiple sexual partners, which led to stigmatisation. In turn, it did not matter that the accused men were actively seeking out sex workers. Most importantly, the judges’ comments above suggest that women who were seen as promiscuous were less affected by violations of consent. This is an essential finding, as it needs to be examined if these value judgments are also represented within the community. If they are, it could influence perceptions about the necessity to obtain consent. As can be seen from the review on consent above, promiscuity and its influence on perceptions of consent has not been explicitly examined.

An area of research that provides some insight into how these value judgments influence perceptions about sexual consent is that of sexual intent. It is important to acknowledge that perceptions of sexual intent are not the same as perceptions of sexual consent (Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998). However, Hickman and Muehlenhard, (1999) suggest that perceptions of sexual intent are in fact one aspect of the cognitive processes involved in evaluating consent (Hickman and Muehlenhard, 1999). Therefore, perception of intent only relates to
one part of the definition used for consent, which is the perception of someone’s interest but not their actual agreement to a sexual interaction.

2.3 Related concepts: Sexual Intent

This section examines the literature about sexual intent in order to understand how perceptions of sexual interest might impact upon perceptions of sexual consent. Studies conducted into perceptions of sexual intent found that men view people and interactions as more sexual than women do. In particular, these studies have found that men misinterpret women’s non-sexual behaviours as sexual interest. (Abbey, 1982, 1987; Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Abbey & Melby, 1986; Farris, Treat, Viken, & McFall, 2008; Jacques-Tiura, Abbey, Parkhill, & Zawacki, 2007; Koukounas & Letch, 2001; Kristen Lindgren, George, & Shoda, 2007; Kristen Lindgren, Parkhill, George, & Hendershot, 2008).

For example, Abbey (1982) conducted a study to investigate how friendliness of a member of the opposite sex is perceived. The subjects included in this study were 144 (72 males and 72 females) undergraduate students. The method included a laboratory experiment where a male and a female participant either engaged in a 5-minute conversation or observed this conversation unknown to the participants engaged in the conversation. This method may be a limitation as it was conducted in an unnatural environment. The results showed that male observers and those who engaged in the conversation rated the female who engaged in the conversation as more promiscuous and seductive than females did. Males also rated the male actor as more seductive and flirtatious than females did. In addition, males were also more sexually attracted to the opposite sex who
engaged in the conversation than females were. This study indicates that males are more likely to misperceive friendliness as seductive and promiscuous than females do.

Other studies (Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Jacques-Tiura, et al., 2007; Koukounas & Letch, 2001) looked at factors that influence perceptions of intent. Abbey and Harnish (1995) investigated the effects of participant gender, target alcohol consumption and participant rape supportive attitudes on perceptions of intent. Their sample included 297 women and 125 male undergraduate students. The methods included four different vignettes which were: two students went out for dinner, two young executives met for lunch, two students went on a date to a baseball game and two co-workers went to a cocktail party together. The vignettes were manipulated in that men and women were drinking different beverages; either alcoholic or soda pop. Alcohol consumption by the female and male target was fully crossed over. The results showed that men rated the female and male target as intending to be more sexual than females did. Males who rated higher on rape myth acceptance rated the female as being more sexual and more attracted to her male partner than males who rated low on rape myth acceptance. Further, the results showed that the female target was seen as being more sexual when the male drank alcohol than when he did not drink alcohol. The female was seen as being most sexual when both targets drank alcohol and least sexual when she drank alcohol and the male did not. As can be seen from these results, a variety of variables influence perceptions of intent.

In addition to gender, alcohol consumption and rape supporting beliefs, Koukounas and Letch (2001) found that personality traits (sex role orientation, sociosexual effectiveness, sexual preoccupation) influence perceptions of intent.
The participants included 183 men and 186 women of whom more than half attended a secondary school. The method included a video segment showing a social interaction between a male and a female. Four nonverbal variables (eye contact, touch, physical proximity, and female clothing) were manipulated to show three different levels of intensity. Each of the participants only viewed one video segment. The results showed that men perceived more sexual intent of the female actor than women did, regardless of the intensity of the nonverbal cues. Further, the results showed that men were more likely to be sociosexual ineffective and sexually preoccupied than women. Individuals who rated higher on these variables were also more likely to infer more sexual intent in the female actor.

As can be seen the majority of these studies has compared men to women but only view studies have investigated individual differences in men’s perception of intent. However, a study conducted by Jacques-Tiura, Abbey, Parkhill and Zawacki (2007) examined individual differences predicting men’s perception of intent. Specifically, they investigated how hostile masculinity, impersonal sex and drinking in dating and sexual situations predict men’s misperception of sexual intent. The participants were 365 male students. The method included a self-administered questionnaire. The results showed that hostile masculinity, impersonal sex and drinking in dating and sexual situations predicted men’s frequency of misperceptions of women’s sexual intent.

This thesis is interested in studies that examined how perceptions of intent are influenced by the perceived seductiveness, promiscuity and flirtatiousness of a woman. A factor that appears to influence perceptions of sexual intent is how
sexualised a woman’s clothing style is perceived. Past research suggests that women who dress provocatively were seen as more likely to provoke sexual harassment, sexual assault and rape. In addition, revealing female body parts, such as breasts, has been seen as immodest, and nudity is seen as related to sexuality (Johnson & Workman, 1992, 1994). This indicates that sexualised clothing is viewed as a form of conveying sexual intent and thereby may be related to perceptions of promiscuity, seductiveness and flirtatiousness. These studies are particularly relevant for this thesis as they may provide insight into why it is perceptions of consent change depending on how sexualised a woman is perceived as.

Moor (2010) conducted a study to examine men and women’s perception on women who wear “provocative” or sexualised body-revealing clothing. Sexualised clothing within this study was described as: low-cut tight jeans revealing the woman’s belly button and a short top revealing a large proportion of the woman’s breast. The participant sample included 321 (60% women, 40% male) undergraduate students in Israel, with an age range from 18-24 years. The method included a questionnaire that had three separate parts. In the first part, men and women were presented with a photograph depicting a woman wearing sexualised attire. Participants were provided with ten statements such as “she wishes to feel attractive” or “she intends to convey an interest in sex”. They then had to rate those statements indicating how much they believed this was the motivation for the woman to wear sexualised attire. The second part of the questionnaire varied for male and female participants. The male version included questions regarding the woman’s motivation to wear sexualised attire and their own responses to such attire. The female participants were asked about their own
style of clothing and what caused them to choose this particular look. Part three of the questionnaire was only for female participants and assessed their experience with sexual violence.

The results showed that there are gender differences in the beliefs as to why women wear revealing clothing. The majority of male respondents believed that the primary reasons for women to dress sexualised are to convey temptation and seduction. Of the men, 53.2% believed that women mostly intended to arouse men with sexualised attire and 30.6% believed that women always intended to arouse men with their sexualised attire. Further, 55.6% of men believed that women dressed sexualised to elicit sexual advances most of the time and an additional 20.2% believed this is always the case. In addition, nearly half of the men reported that they enjoyed gazing at women who are dressed sexualised (48.4% always enjoy it, 46.1% mostly enjoy it) and are sexually aroused by them (29.8% are always aroused, 58.1% are mostly aroused). These beliefs are in contrast to the reasons given by the women in the study for wearing body-revealing clothing. A large percentage 82.1% of women reported that they liked the look and 72% reported wanting to look attractive. Intent to arouse men was only given by 3.2% of women as a reason and only 5.3% stated they aimed to seduce men with their clothing. In addition, women did not believe that the woman depicted in the picture tried to convey an interest in sex or to use her clothing to gain affection.

These results indicate that men believe women wear sexualised clothing to arouse men. This suggests that they attribute sexual intent to the women’s decision to wear body-revealing clothing. However, the results clearly showed
that the majority of women have different reasons to wear sexualised clothing such as wanting to look attractive. A second important finding is men reported that gazing at women dressed in body-revealing clothing is sexually arousing them. This raises the question of whether sexualised clothing increases the risk of sexual assault. If men attribute sexual intent they may be less likely to view sexual consent as necessary. Therefore, it is important to investigate this.

The majority of the above reviewed studies have compared men to women, but only a few studies have investigated individual differences in men’s attitudes and psychological factors that may relate to men’s perceptions of intent. However, a study conducted by Jacques-Tiura, Abbey, Parkhill and Zawacki (2007) examined how two psychological factors and drinking behaviour relate to individual differences in men’s perception of intent. Specifically, they investigated how hostile masculinity (a tendency to have negative attitudes toward women and to view sex as a tool to dominate women), impersonal sex (preference for casual uncommitted sexual relationships) and drinking in dating and sexual situations predict men’s misperception of sexual intent. The participants were 365 male students from an American University. The method included a self-administered questionnaire. The results showed that hostile masculinity, impersonal sex and drinking in dating and sexual situations predicted men’s frequency of misperceptions of women’s sexual intent.

Overall, it can be said that men and women perceive verbal and nonverbal cues of sexual consent and sexual intent differently. Men are more likely to view verbal and nonverbal cues as signals of consent than females. Further, literature on the related area of sexual intent suggests that men view the world generally in
more sexual terms than women do and generally perceive female’s nonsexual behaviour as sexual. Also, there are a variety of psychological factors and attitudes such as hostile masculinity, impersonal sex, rape myths acceptance and alcohol consumption, which shape perceptions of intent. People who rated higher on hostile masculinity, impersonal sex and rape myth acceptance were more likely to misperceive cues of sexual intent. Even though a large amount of literature has looked into perceptions of consent, it can be seen from the above reviewed research that literature on consent is lacking in studies regarding the psychological factors that may predict males’ perceptions of consent. Therefore the next chapter will provide an overview of theories that possibly enhance the knowledge of differences in male perceptions of sexual consent.
CHAPTER THREE
Theories of sexual violence

This chapter aims to review a number of theories that may explain differences within male perceptions of sexual consent. Before a detailed description of relevant theories is provided, it is important to highlight again that this review is not specifically examining sexual offenders. Instead, it is looking at possible factors that may distinguish men’s perceptions of consent in different situations. It can be assumed that men are likely to fall on a continuum in terms of their perceptions of consent. As aforementioned, past research (Jacques-Tiura, et al., 2007) has already indicated that theories of sexual offending such as the confluence model (hostile masculinity, impersonal sex) help to differentiate men in terms of their views on sexual intent. Therefore, this will be the first theory detailed in this current study.

3.1. The Confluence model of sexual aggression

Malamuth (1986) suggested that sexual aggression results from a convergence of several factors: motivation, disinhibition and opportunity. Further, Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss and Tanaka (1991) suggested that motivation and disinhibition can be meaningfully organised into two major paths: the hostile masculinity pathway and the impersonal sex/sexual promiscuity pathway. According to these authors, sexual aggression can be understood as an interaction between these two pathways. It was considered as important to examine those two pathways in further detail, as beliefs and attitudes supporting sexually aggressive behaviours might explain differences in perceptions of
consent. It might be the case that men who are more likely to adhere to beliefs and attitudes reflecting sexually aggressive behaviours are more likely to perceive that consent has been given (when in fact it has not been given) or are less likely to accept that consent has not been given.

In the development of these two pathways, Malamuth et al. (1991) drew on research of early family interactions, as coerciveness can often result from early home experiences and parent-child interactions (Malamuth, Heavey, & Linz, 1996). Malamuth et al. (1991, 1996) drew on Dodge, Bates and Pettit’s (1990) and Patterson, DeBaryshe and Ramsey’s (1989) research, which found that family interactions shape enduring cognitive and behavioural responses. Malamuth et al. (1996) suggested that violent home environments may contribute to the development of adversarial or hostile “schemas” related to male-female interactions. Further, they proposed that children growing up in hostile and sexually abusive home environments possibly develop feelings of inadequacy and shame, especially about sex. This in turn will lead them to self-protecting aggrandizing anger and a strong need to control intimates (Malamuth et al., 1996).

According to Patterson et al. (1989), hostile home environments also lead individuals to associate with delinquent peer groups and to participate in antisocial behaviour. Malamuth et al. (1996) expanded this notion and proposed that this may endorse the development of certain characteristics linked to aggressive behaviour against women, such as hostile cognitions. In addition, they propose that the affiliation with delinquent groups may lead to the adoption of adult roles without having gone through the developmental stages to adopt
necessary skills such as impulse control. This in turn may cause individuals to use domineering and coercive behaviours when frustrated (Malamuth et al., 1996). Malamuth et al. (1991) used these characteristics and conceptualised them into the two pathways, which will be described in further detail.

3.1.1 The hostile masculinity path. As mentioned above, the affiliation with delinquent peer groups may promote certain attitudes, rationalisations, and personality characteristics that increase the likelihood of coercive behaviour. Further, Malamuth et al. (1991) proposed that societies that view certain qualities such as power, risk taking, toughness, dominance, aggressiveness, “honour-defending” as particularly masculine may cause men to regard feminine qualities with hostility. Men aspiring to these qualities are more likely to be aggressive and controlling towards women in sexual and non-sexual interactions (Ward et al., 1996). Malamuth et al. suggested that these factors make up the hostile masculinity path.

3.1.2 The sexual promiscuity/impersonal sex path. As previously mentioned, delinquent adolescents may adopt adult roles without having gone through the developmental steps to acquire the necessary skills needed to have success in such a role (Malamuth et al., 1996). This may lead to precocious sexual behaviour. Malamuth et al. claim that adolescent boys may place a large emphasis on sexuality and sexual intercourse to gain and maintain peer status and self-esteem. These boys may use various methods to gain sexual intercourse from females, including coercion. However, Malamuth et al. stated that not all men having a promiscuous sexual orientation use coercion as a matter of getting sex and neither have all sexually coercive men had delinquent backgrounds.
Malamuth et al. (1991) conducted a study to test the model. Their sample included 1,713 men who were students at American Universities. To test the model, a variety of scales proposed to measure the two pathways were included. Even though their model was guided by theory, Malamuth et al. (1991) found that these two paths are relatively independent from each other. Further, they found no consistent relationship between delinquency and attitudes supporting sexual violence. This suggests that attitudes supporting violence and hostile masculinity may stem from another influence than abusive home environments or delinquency. However, they found a significant relationship between sexual promiscuity and hostile masculinity when predicting sexual aggression.

A variety of other research has supported the model. For example, Wheeler, George and Dahl (2002) conducted a study to predict sexually aggressive behaviour using the Confluence Model and its hostile masculinity and impersonal sex paths. Their sample included 209 heterosexual male undergraduates over 18 years of age, who were recruited from the Psychology Department sign-up sheets at a large west coast urban university in the United States. A large proportion of their sample admitted some history of sexual aggression 61% (N=127). Forms of sexual aggression included sexual coercion (47.4%, N=99), sexual assault (13.4%, N=28), attempted rape (4%, N=8), and over 9% of the sample (N=19) reported having committed acts of sexual assault, which meet most legal definitions of rape. The results showed that hostile masculinity and impersonal sex were important predictors of participants’ self-reported history of committing sexual coercion and/or assault. Individuals who scored high on both factors were at higher risk of committing sexually violent
acts than individuals who had high levels of only one or neither of these two factors.

As has been mentioned above, Malamuth et al. (1991) found no significant relationship between delinquency and attitudes supporting sexual violence. Therefore, it is important to consider other theories that may explain attitudes supportive of violence against women. One theory that emerges as relevant to this is Ward, Hudson, Marshall and Siegert’s (1995) attachment theory of sexual offending.

### 3.2. Attachment Theory of Sexual Offending

Ward, Hudson, Marshall and Siegert (1995) proposed a comprehensive attachment model of intimacy deficits among sexual offenders. They suggested that intimacy problems combined with disinhibiting factors such as deviant sexual fantasies, alcohol abuse and cognitive distortions may lead some men to obtain intimacy in maladaptive ways. Considering that men with attachment issues might obtain intimacy in maladaptive ways, it could be the case that attachment deficits are related to perceptions of sexual consent. Consequently attachment theory will be considered as it may help to explain differences in men’s perceptions of consent.

framework, which integrated attachment theory, research on intimacy deficits, loneliness and sexual offending. Marshall used Bowlby’s (1969, 1973) theory of attachment, which suggests that problems in childhood attachment lead to intimacy problems later in life. Further, Marshall included the construct of emotional loneliness, as emotional loneliness has been found to lead to hostile attitudes and interpersonally aggressive behaviour (Check, Perlman, & Malamuth, 1985; Diamant & Windholz, 1981).

Ward et al. (1995) criticised Marshall’s theoretical framework for not acknowledging that different sex offender types may have different types of intimacy issues. These intimacy problems may have resulted from different developmental experiences, which in turn may cause dissimilar beliefs and expectations regarding relationships. Therefore, distinct interpersonal strategies may arise (Ward et al.). Second, according to Ward et al., Marshall did not specify the link between adverse early experiences and adult relationships. Therefore, a description of the mechanism that can plausibly generate maladaptive interpersonal behaviour is missing. Lastly, Marshall did not fully develop the attachment model. He stated that intimacy problems result from a lack of a secure attachment bond. However, Marshall did not distinguish the four different attachment styles, which are secure, ambivalent, avoidant. Ward et al. addressed these issues in their development of a comprehensive attachment model.

3.2.1. Overview of attachment theory. Bowlby was one of the first researchers to investigate human’s needs to establish strong emotional bonds, which are referred to as attachment. According to Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980),
the primary function of attachment systems is to provide the child with proximity
in situations of danger and fear. Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1978) built
on the work of Bowlby and proposed that the function of attachment systems is to
provide children with a sense of felt security. In addition, Ainsworth et al., (1978)
identified three distinct attachment styles, which were labelled secure, anxious-
resistant, and avoidant. Bowlby (1980) suggested that these early attachment
styles are internalised and therefore form the basis for adult relationships.

Bartholomew (1990) and Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991)
investigated different attachment styles and proposed a four-category model. This
model is the basis for Ward et al.’s (1995) theory of sexual offending.
Bartholomew (1990) extended Bowlby’s internal working models, which are
internal representations of the self and others based on the child’s attachment
style. These working models regulate the child’s emotional responses and its
general style of interaction with others.

Bartholomew (1990) suggested that working models of the self and others
can be dichotomised as either positive or negative. A person with a positive self-
model would see him/herself as worthy of love and attention, while a person with
a negative self-model would perceive him/herself as unworthy of love and
attention. A person with a positive model of others will perceive others as
trustworthy, caring and available. In turn, a person with a negative view of others
will perceive people as rejecting, uncaring and distant.

Bartholomew (1990) used these working models to define the four
attachment styles for adults. In her model, a securely attached person is
characterised by positive working models of the self and others. These
individuals are able to engage in adult relationships characterised by high levels of intimacy, warmth and acceptance (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The second attachment style is called preoccupied. People with this attachment style perceive themselves as not deserving love because of their own worthlessness, yet they have a positive view of others. Therefore, they are preoccupied with gaining other people’s approval. Bartholomew refers to the third attachment style as fearful. The individual with this attachment style is characterised by a negative view of the self and others. They desire relationships and intimacy, however they are highly sensitive to disapproval and marked by a high fear of rejection. Therefore, these people often actively avoid social interactions or relationships where they could be exposed to rejection (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The last attachment style is called dismissing. People with this attachment style view themselves in a positive way and others in a negative one. These individuals do not desire social interactions or relationships as they dismiss the importance of these. Instead, these individuals are likely to place importance on impersonal aspects of life such as work.

3.2.2. A comprehensive model of attachment style and intimacy deficits in sexual offenders. Ward et al. (1995) used Bartholomew’s adult attachment model and, in particular, the three insecure styles to explain intimacy deficits in offenders and how these may cause sexual offending. Ward et al. refer to Bartholomew’s preoccupied attachment style as anxious/ambivalent (negative self-concept/positive concept of others). People who fall in this category describe their most important love relationships as being strongly sexually attracted, jealous and having extreme contrasting emotional states (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).
The second insecure attachment style is the fearful or as Ward et al. (1995) named it, the Avoidant I attachment style (negative self-concept/negative concept of others). These individuals desire close relationships and emotional contact with others. However, their fear of rejection leads them to avoid close emotional relationships with others (Bartholomew, 1990). This avoidance of close relationships causes impaired social skills and deficits in intimacy (Ward et al.). Therefore, instead of establishing close intimate relationships, individuals with this attachment style are likely to use sexual activity to make contact with others (Shaver & Hazan, 1988). Ward et al. further propose that, because men with this attachment style seek impersonal contacts with others out of fear of rejection, their lives should be characterised by impersonal sex.

The third insecure attachment style is the dismissing, or as Ward et al. called it, Avoidant II attachment style (positive self-concept/negative concept of others). The men in this group are likely to seek impersonal relationships or social contacts involving minimal levels of emotional involvement and personal disclosure, as their main aim is to stay independent and keep a sense of autonomy (Ward et al.). Further, their impersonal relationships are assumed to be characterised by hostility, which results from their wish to maintain distance from others (Bartholomew, 1990). It is claimed that these factors, combined with other risk factors such as deviant sexual fantasies and cognitive distortions, will lead these men to sexually offend and this is likely to be in an aggressive manner.

As Ward et al. (1995) pointed out, not all men who have insecure attachment styles will become sexual offenders. Again, as mentioned above, men will fall on a continuum on each of these interacting psychological factors, and it
is these profiles that may distinguish sexual offenders from non-offenders. Further, as Ward et al suggest, outcomes will depend on other factors such as cognitive distortions. Another factor that might contribute to the development of sexually aggressive behaviour for someone with attachment deficits is loneliness (Marshall, 2010). As mentioned above, Ward et al. (1995) criticised Marshall’s (1989, 1993) theoretical framework, which integrated attachment theory, research on intimacy deficits, loneliness and sexual offending. However, as mentioned above, emotional loneliness has been found to lead to hostile attitudes and interpersonally aggressive behaviour and, therefore, loneliness will be considered as a trait within this thesis (Check, Perlman, et al., 1985; Diamant & Windholz, 1981; Marshall, 2010).

The above discussed theories are important to consider, not so much because this thesis is trying to apply these theories to men in the general population, but to examine whether some of the traits discussed within these theories are relevant when examining differences in perceptions of sexual consent. Consequently this thesis chose personality measures to establish those differences on the above discussed theories of sexual violence.
CHAPTER FOUR

Study 1: Male perceptions of sexual consent

As discussed in the previous chapters, sexual consent is a complex concept, which determines what constitutes a mutually agreed upon sexual interaction between two parties. Part of its complexity lies in its communication. Sexual consent can be communicated through direct or indirect verbal statements, however, past research suggests that more often people use more subtle non-verbal forms to communicate consent (Hall, 1998). For example, men and women communicate consent non-verbally via kissing, intimate touching, allowing physical closeness or not resisting the sexual advances of their partners. Other research (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999) showed that there are differences in how men and women communicate consent verbally and non-verbally. Men are more likely to communicate consent via non-verbal cues, or not providing a response (such as saying no) whereas women were more likely to use indirect verbal signals (e.g. asking the other person if they have a condom) (Hickman & Muehlenhard).

However, the complexity of sexual consent not only lies in its different forms of communication but also in how it is perceived. Perceptions of sexual consent are important to investigate as the parties involved in the sexual interaction might assume the other person communicates sexual consent in the same manner as they do (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). The perceiver might mistakenly assume consent has been given if the other person does not communicate consent in the same way.
In the past, research examined differences in men and women’s perceptions of consent. The findings suggest that men and women differ in their perceptions of what constitutes consent to a sexual interaction. Men are, in general, more likely than women to rate females’ verbal and nonverbal signals as indicators of consent (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Lim & Roloff, 1999). The reasons why this is the case may be found in the related concept of sexual intent, which can be defined as an expression of sexual interest (Koukounas & Letch, 2001). Sexual intent has been relatively more widely researched than sexual consent and may provide information about why this may occur (Abbey, 1982, 1987; Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Abbey & Melby, 1986; Farris, et al., 2008; Koukounas & Letch, 2001). Sexual intent research has found that men are more likely to perceive people and interactions as indications of sexual willingness and interest than women do. For example, research on sexual intent suggests that men misperceive a woman’s friendliness, such as engaging in a conversation, as the woman being flirtatious, promiscuous and seductive (Abbey, 1982). Sexual intent research also examined a variety of factors, such as target alcohol consumption, personality traits and participant rape supportive attitudes, which may impact on how sexual intent is perceived. The majority of these studies (e.g. Abbey, 1982, 1987, Abbey & Harnish, Abbey & Melby, Farris et al.) found that, regardless of which factor was included in the evaluation, men rated women’s sexual intentions consistently higher than women did.

Consequently, if men attribute more sexual intent into women’s behaviour than the woman meant to convey, they also might overestimate their willingness to engage in sexual interactions and, therefore, perceptions of consent might be impacted by sexual intent (Abbey, 1982, 1987). For example, Abbey (1987)
found that even though both men and women reported that their friendly
behaviour has been misperceived as sexual intent, women reported this to a
greater extent than men. In addition, women reported to a significantly higher rate
than men that they have been touched or kissed because their friendliness was
misperceived as sexual intent. This indicates that misinterpretations of behaviours
as indications of sexual willingness might also lead to violations of sexual
consent, as research indicated the touching and kissing was unwanted.

The impact of overestimations of behaviours as sexual intent and
willingness to engage in sexual interactions not only has implications in terms of
personal interaction between men and women but also in how consent is
perceived within a legal context. As Taylor (2007) suggested, myths and
stereotypes about rape and victims of rape are common within society and, as
jury members are randomly drawn from the public, it is likely that these myths
and stereotypes impact on their judgments in rape cases including consent. In her
study, Taylor found if the rape victim flirted and danced with the defendant the
victim was perceived as less credible, which impacted on her credibility to
establish that consent was refused. However, not only beliefs and attitudes about
rape have an influence on how the victim is perceived. For example, men were
consistently more likely to perceive the victim as not credible than women
(Taylor & Joudo, 2005). The examination of the legal context of consent in the
introduction chapters confirmed the notion that factors that relate to a woman’s
sexuality and sexual intentions may impact on perceptions of sexual consent.
Specifically, it appeared that the sexual reputation of a woman influenced how
jurors and judges viewed a woman’s right to withdraw consent as well as her
ability to prove that consent has been refused in front of the court.
In addition, legal perceptions of sexual consent suggest that the relationship status of a woman (e.g. married) influences perceptions about her being a ‘real’ victim of rape. As mentioned above, rape in marriage was not illegal until 1991 in Australia, which indicates that men have been perceived as entitled to have sexual intercourse with their wives (High Court of Australia, 1991). In addition, it suggests that consent was seen as irrelevant within a marriage. Even though the laws regarding rape within marriage have been changed it is important to consider if the legal views of consent are present within the community.

As shown in the earlier chapters, research on sexual consent has examined factors such as the relationship status of a woman (Humphreys, 2007; Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). The results of this research support the perceptions of consent in the legal context, as the relationship status of a woman (e.g. married) impacted on people’s perceptions of consent. In particular, a woman was seen as more obliged to have sex with a man if sexual precedence with this man existed (Humphreys). The same result was found if a woman had a higher number of different sexual partners (Shotland & Goodstein). This indicates that a woman who is perceived to be more sexually active or is in a sexual relationship has less right to refuse consent to a sexual interaction.

Even though there is a relatively large amount of research conducted in the area of consent it has to be considered there are areas that still require further investigation. First it must be considered that the majority of research into consent compared male to female perceptions of consent (e.g.Humphreys, 2007; Lim & Roloff, 1999; Muehlenhard, 1988). However, it cannot be assumed that
differences in perceptions of sexual consent only occur between genders, rather it is likely there are also differences of consent within genders. As previously mentioned, men are more likely to be the perceivers of sexual consent, as they are generally more likely to instigate sexual interactions. Consequently, it is important to examine men’s perceptions of consent in more detail. Specifically, Study 1 is interested in what factors explain differences within men’s perceptions of consent.

Previous studies investigated how the relationship status of a woman, such as being married or being an acquaintance, influences perceptions of consent (e.g. Humphreys, 2007). Study 1 aims to expand on this research to not only examine how a different relationship status of a woman impacts on perceptions of consent but also how certain professions that suggest promiscuous behaviour influence perceptions of sexual consent.. The inclusion of sex workers and exotic dancers has been seen as necessary as the research on sexual intent suggests that promiscuity, flirtatiousness and seductiveness increase the level of sexual intent attributed to people (e.g. Abbey, 1982, 1987). Further, the examination of the legal context of consent suggests that sexual consent is perceived differently if sex workers, or women who are perceived as promiscuous, are involved in rape cases.

Therefore, Study 1 aims to examine if men perceive consent differently depending on the category of women they are presented with in a scenario depicting a sexual interaction. The sexual interaction is either escalated (the interaction ended in rape) or non-escalated (the men stopped the sexual interaction when the woman asked him to).
rape was to establish whether a verbal form of non-consent will be perceived as non-consent in the non-rape scenario, where there is room for interpretation of the woman’s willingness to engage in a sexual interaction. Perceptions of consent in the scenario will be measured with eight follow up questions including: Do you agree that Sally consented to the sexual interaction? (1=strongly disagree, 7=agree), How would you rate Sally’s behaviour to refuse sexual intercourse (1=not justified, 7=justified), How would you rate David’s behaviour? (1=not violent, 7=violent), How do you think Sally would perceive David’s behaviour (1=not threatening, 7=threatening). How do you think David would perceive Sally’s behaviour to stop the sexual interaction? (1=not justified, 7=justified), Do you agree that Sally had the right to stop the sexual interaction? (1=strongly disagree, 7=agree), How serious is this situation on the scale below? (1=not serious, 7=serious).

As aforementioned, Study 1 includes four categories of women, which are an acquaintance, a de-facto, an ex-stripper and an ex-sex worker. The reason for choosing these four categories of women was to create scenarios, which included women with different levels of perceived promiscuity. The assumption was that the de-facto would be perceived as the least promiscuous, as she is in a stable relationship and consequently would be assumed to only have sexual relations with her partner, whereas the ex-sex worker would be perceived as the most promiscuous for the obvious reason that she had sex with multiple different men. Further, men might perceive women that engage in sex work as having a higher sex drive or being more sexually outgoing, which might impact on perceptions of consent. Consequently, Study 1 includes measures of sexual intent. As aforementioned, Abbey (1982, 1987) suggested that perceived flirtatiousness,
seductiveness and promiscuity impact upon perceptions of sexual intent. Thus, Study 1 includes questions, which aim to measure sexual intent of the woman depicted in the scenario: How flirtatious was Sally in the scenario? (1=not at all, 7=extremely), How seductive was Sally in the scenario? (1=not at all, 7=extremely), How promiscuous was Sally in the scenario? (1=not at all, 7=extremely), How indicative was Sally’s behaviour of wanting to engage in a sexual interaction? (1=not at all, 7=extremely). The Social-Sexual Effectiveness Scale (Quackenbush, 1989) was included as research on sexual intent suggests social sexual effectiveness impacts on perceptions of sexual intent. The importance in this distinction of different categories of women lies in its underlying implications if consent is perceived differently. It could show that certain stereotypes about women still exist in today’s society, which in turn could show that some women are more likely than others to be victims of sexual assault or rape. Further, as mentioned before, jurors in rape cases are often random members of the community and if Study 1 shows stereotypical views are still present it might have an impact in rape trials. Therefore, the first aim of Study 1 is to examine if men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on the category of woman they are presented with.

This current study differs from the previous research, as it does not seek to compare male to female perceptions, rather it focuses on men’s perceptions of consent. This was seen as important, as past research suggests men are more likely to be the instigators of sexual interactions and consequently are more likely to be perceivers of sexual consent (Check & Malamuth, 1983). Therefore, the second aim of Study 1 is to examine if there are certain factors that may explain differences in men’s perceptions of consent. Past research indicated it is unlikely
that misperceptions of consent are a contributing factor to sexual assault and rape, as the differences in perceptions of consent are relatively small between men and women (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). Rather it might be the case that sexually aggressive men are more likely to use misinterpretations as an excuse for rape and tend to ignore and reinterpret signals of consent to suit their own agenda (Hickman & Muehlenhard). Consequently Study 1 has the aim to examine whether traits that are related to sexually aggressive behaviours differentiate men’s perceptions of sexual consent. The traits chosen to measure sexual aggressive behaviours were based on theories of sexual aggression.

The first theory was the confluence model of sexual aggression by Malamuth et al. (1991). This theory was chosen, as it has been shown that the confluence model helps to differentiate which men are more likely to misperceive sexual intent (Jacques-Tiura, et al., 2007). Study 1 will not apply the confluence model as such, as it is not the aim to see whether the confluence model is an effective model to explain different perceptions of sexual consent. Rather, Study 1 uses a variety of measures included in the hostile masculinity pathway. The concept of hostile masculinity is having distrust in women in addition to adversarial views about relationships, which justify sexual dominant behaviour (Malamuth et al.). The hostile masculinity pathway was considered as particularly important as past research has shown that the measures included, which are adversarial sexual beliefs, rape myth acceptance, sexual dominance, hostility towards women and acceptance of interpersonal violence, are useful to distinguish men who became sexually coercive and aggressive (e.g. Margolin, et al., 1989; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Willan & Pollard, 2003). Consequently, the following measures are included in Study 1: Adversarial Sexual Belief Scale,
The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, The Hostility Towards Women Scale, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale and the Sexual Dominance Scale.

The second theory included is Ward et al.’s (1995) attachment theory of sexual aggression. Ward et al. used the Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) questionnaire to measure their attachment theory of sexual aggression, which is therefore included in Study 1. Attachment theory of sexual aggression has not been applied yet to measure different perceptions of consent. However, Ward et al.’s theory of sexually aggression provides distinctions of types of sexual aggressive behaviour depending on people’s attachment style. In particular, the three insecure attachment styles might lead to sexually aggressive behaviours. For example, Ward et al. proposed that some men who have a dismissive/avoidant II attachment style are likely to engage in coercive behaviours to have their needs met. In turn, men who adhere to a fearful attachment style have not been found to be hostile or aggressive and they do not use coercion in sexual interactions. These distinguishing features between the attachment styles might also impact upon perceptions of sexual consent as someone has a more dismissive attachment style might be more likely to perceive a woman has consented in a rape scenario, due to them using more sexually coercive methods. As mentioned in the introduction chapters, a consequence of poor attachment is that it can lead to loneliness, which has also been found to be a contributing factor to sexually aggressive behaviours (e.g. Marshall, 2010). Therefore, a measure of loneliness (the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale) is included in Study 1 to gather whether loneliness impacts upon perceptions of sexual consent.
Study 1 aims to get a comprehensive picture about men’s perceptions of sexual consent. A factor that has not been considered so far in research about sexual consent is how experiences with sex workers might impact upon perceptions of consent. Clients of sex workers are not targeted as a separate participant population in Study 1, rather participants from the general population will be asked if they have ever visited a sex worker. The rationale behind this was that sexual experiences with sex workers might differentiate these men from those in the general population in terms of how they perceive women who are promiscuous, which could impact upon their perceptions of consent when the four different categories of women are considered. Further, the establishment of sexual consent might be different when men interact with a sex worker than with a woman in the general population, which might influence how these men perceive consent in general and not just within the client sex worker interaction.

It is hypothesised that:

(1) There will be no significant differences in men’s ratings whether the woman has consented to the sexual interaction between the escalated scenario and the non-escalated scenario;

(2) There will be no significant difference in men’s ratings of the woman’s right to stop the sexual interaction between the escalated and non-escalated scenario;

(3) There will be a significant difference in men’s ratings of levels of coercion attributed to the sexual interaction between the escalated and non-escalated scenario;
(4) There will be no significant difference of men’s ratings of levels of sexual intent attributed to the woman between the escalated and non-escalated scenario;

(5) Men who rate higher on personality measures related to sexually aggressive behaviour will be more likely to perceive the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario;

(6) Men who rate higher on personality measures related to sexually aggressive behaviour will be more likely to perceive the woman has less right to stop the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario;

(7) Men who rate higher on personality measures related to sexually aggressive behaviour will be less likely to perceive the woman was coerced into to the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario;

(8) Men who rate higher on personality measures related to sexually aggressive behaviour will be more likely to perceive the woman as showing sexual intent in the escalated scenario;

(9) The men’s perceptions of sexual intent will influence perceptions of the three measures of consent (consent, coercion, justification). The more intent men attribute to the woman the more likely they will be to perceive she has consented to the sexual interaction, the less likely they will be to view the woman has been coerced and the less likely the will be to view the woman has a right to stop the sexual interaction;

(10) Men would perceive that the ex-stripper, ex-prostitute and de-facto would have less right to stop the sexual interaction than the acquaintance;
(11) Men would be more likely to agree that the ex-stripper, ex-prostitute and the de-facto consented to the sexual interaction than the acquaintance;

(12) Men would perceive the acquaintance as more coerced into the sexual interaction than the ex-stripper, ex-prostitute and the de-facto;

(13) Men would perceive the ex-stripper, the ex-prostitute and the de-facto as showing more sexual intent than the acquaintance;

(14) Men who are clients of sex workers will differ in their ratings of consent and the four categories of women than men in the general population;

Method

Participants

The sample included 199 men of which 13 were excluded due to not fitting the criteria of being heterosexual. In addition to being heterosexual, participants had to be men and over the age of 18 years. Participants were recruited online, via Facebook and a variety of forums that were considered to attract men (Pleasure Forum Australia, Men’s Line Australia, Australia Forum – Topix, Aussi Car Forum). Participants ranged from 18 to 57 years. The mean age of the participants was 28.8 years of age with a $SD=8$. Table 1 provides a description of the sample’s demographic characteristics, experiences with sex workers and with visiting strip clubs.
Table 1
Demographics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Overall (N=186)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (in years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sexual partner</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual sexual partner</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monogamous sexual partner</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with parents</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living alone/with friends</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with lover/sex partner</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living alone</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living with partner</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been to sex worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Demographics Specific to Clients of Sex Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (in years)</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sexual partner</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual sexual partner</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monogamous sexual partner</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with parents</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living alone/with friends</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with lover/sex partner</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living alone</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living with partner</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

*Demographics Specific to Clients of Sex Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for visiting a sex worker</th>
<th>Overall Sample (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomplicated Sex</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high sex urge</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex with a variety of women</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only sexual outlet</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less STD</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular service</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

Potential participants were recruited over the internet and were provided with a Plain Language Statement (PLS, see Appendix 1) that informed them of the aims of the study and potential risks and benefits for them and the wider community. In addition, the PLS outlined what is required from the participants and explained what is involved in the consent process. The questionnaire included 12 sections. Section 1 included questions regarding the demographic status of participants as well as their sexual experiences. Section two included case scenarios that described a sexual interaction between a man and woman. Section 3 to Section 12 included a variety of standard questionnaires designed to measure participants’ personality characteristics.

Section one. Demographic details included age, sexual orientation, and relationship status. Additionally, participants were asked about their experiences with sex workers and visiting strip clubs. Details are provided in Table 1.

Section two. For the purpose of this study, four different versions of a fictitious vignette depicted a date situation followed by a sexual interaction between a man and a woman. The creation of the vignettes was orientated on prior research conducted into the area of sexual aggression, and violations and misperceptions of consent, which also utilised vignettes (e.g. Basow & Minieri, 2011; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Margolin, et al., 1989; Willan & Pollard, 2003). The vignettes in prior studies all depicted a scenario that helped to get an understanding of who the people are in the scenario and what the association is between the two people: in a relationship, acquaintances, or strangers that just met at a bar. Further the scenarios followed a sequence of interactions such as the
couple having just met in a bar, or are on a date, which was then followed by a description of a sexual interaction. The study used a 2 (escalated vs non escalated scenario) x 4 (acquaintance, de-facto, ex-stripper, ex-prostitute) factorial design and consequently eight different versions of the questionnaire were utilised. The vignettes varied the two independent variables: category of woman (acquaintance, de-facto, ex-stripper, prostitute) and degree of escalation (escalated versus non-escalated). Each of the participants were randomly presented with two of the eight vignettes. The first vignette was always one of the four possible variations of the non-escalated scenario and the second vignette was always one of the possible four versions of the escalated scenarios. The vignettes provided the participants with information about the man and the woman in the scenario as well as the situation they were in. All vignettes are provided in Appendix 2. The following is an example for one of the possible the vignettes:

Sally is in her mid twenties and has just started work at a real estate company. At the yearly Christmas party she was introduced to employees from other branches and this is where she met David. David is in his mid thirties and has been working for the company for nearly 12 years. During the party they spent most of the time talking to each other and they discovered some shared interests such as travelling and reading. David invited Sally to contact her in the future if she wanted any tips on how to be successful in the business. At the end of the Christmas party, David asked Sally for her mobile phone number so they could talk about the business, which Sally happily provided.

After a few later phone conversations about business the conversation topics became less about business and David finally asked Sally out on a dinner date. After dinner, David asked Sally to come home with him to have a cup of coffee and Sally agreed to this. At the apartment David and Sally were sitting on the couch, listening to some music they both enjoyed, drinking coffee. After a while David and Sally started to
kiss. David put his hand on Sally’s breasts caressing them. Sally started to stroke David’s back and kissed him more passionately. After a while David tried to open Sally’s jeans.

At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David said that Sally had been chasing him for months and that she played games now. Sally again asked David to stop and repeated that she did not want to have sex with him. David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, forced himself onto her and had sex with her.

The vignettes were followed by a series of questions in response to the scenario. The aim of these questions was to measure if participants perceived the interaction as consensual. In addition, the questionnaire aimed to examine how much sexual intent men attribute to the women depicted in the scenario as perceptions of sexual intent may be used by men to rationalise rape (e.g. her actions indicated that she intended to have sexual intercourse and therefore a “no” means “yes”). By varying the category of woman depicted in the scenario the questions also aimed to examine if participants view consent differently depending on the category of woman they are presented with. In order to get a comprehensive understanding of the participants’ perceptions the questionnaire included quantitative as well as qualitative questions.

Firstly, participants were required to rate how flirtatious, promiscuous and seductive was the woman depicted in the scenario. These variables were chosen to measure sexual intent based on past literature (Abbey, 1982, 1987). These questions intended to examine how much sexual intent the participants attributed to the woman’s behaviour in the vignette. As this study tried to examine how perceptions of sexual consent vary depending on different categories of women
the author created a consent measure. Factor analysis revealed three factors to measure sexual consent, which were: consent, justification, and coercion.

**Section three.** The last part of the questionnaire included a variety of personality measures. The measures were chosen based on past research examining sexual aggression. The reason for utilising these measures was to examine if there is a relationship between certain personality characteristics and perceptions of sexual consent. The following measures were used:

*The Social-Sexual Effectiveness Scale (Quackenbush, 1989).* The Social-Sexual Effectiveness Scale (Quackenbush) was developed to assess men’s perceived social-sexual effectiveness when they are dating and have sexual relationships. The scale includes 14-items and responses are rated on a Likert-Scale (1= *Never or almost never true to*, 7= *Always or almost always true*). For example, items included are: “I know what to say to a woman” or “I have difficulty to perceive interest from a woman”. Scores could range from 14-98 with higher scores reflecting greater confidence and comfort when interacting with women. The cronbach alpha for the scale in the current study was .50.

*The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980).* The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, et al.) is an altered version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978) that measures a person’s subjective feelings of loneliness as well as feelings of isolation. The scale includes 20-items, which are rated on a Likert-Scale ranging from 1= *Never*
to 4=Often. Example items are: “I feel in tune with people around me” and “I lack companionship”. The scale has a high internal consistency (α=.94). The cronbach alpha for the scale in the current study was .92

*Rape Myth Acceptance (Burt, 1980).* Burt’s 19-item self-report rape myth acceptance scale aims to examine adherence to common myths about rape. Out of the 19 items 11 measure beliefs about justifiability of rape and that rape is often the woman’s fault. The 11 items are scored on a 7 point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 7=strongly disagree) and includes questions such as “Do women who get raped while hitchhiking deserve what they get?” The other items include two questions measuring perceptions of false reporting (“What percentage of women who report rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?”) of rape and 6 items regarding the likelihood of believing someone was raped depending on who reports it (e.g. an Indian woman, a neighbourhood woman, a black woman). The last 8 items are scored on a 5 point Likert scale. Higher scores on the scale indicate higher RMA beliefs. Burt (1980) reported a .88 cronbach alpha estimate for the RMA. The cronbach alpha for the RPA in the current study was .75

*Hostility towards Women Scale (HTW) (Check, Malamuth, Elias, & Barton, 1985).* The hostility towards women scale aims to measure men’s hostile beliefs about women. The scale includes 30-items (true-false) e.g. *I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them* or *I feel upset by even slight criticism from a woman.* Higher scores reflect higher hostility. The scale
has a cronbach alpha of .78. The cronbach alpha for the scale in the current study was .75

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence scale (AIV) (Burt, 1980). The AIV is a six item self-report scale, which aims to measure the participant’s agreement with statements involving violence against women (e.g. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force). The items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale. Burt (1980) reported a cronbach alpha of .586. The cronbach alpha for the scale in the current study was .60.

Adversarial sexual beliefs scale (ASB) (Burt, 1980). The adversarial sexual beliefs scale intends to measure expectations people have of relationships such as those that are exploitative, or where people are manipulative, sly or cheat and opaque to the other person’s understanding (e.g., A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her; In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man). Burt (1980) reported a cronbach alpha of .802. The cronbach alpha for the ASB in the current study was .64.

Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). The Relationship Scale Questionnaire is a 30 item questionnaire, which intends to measure individuals characteristic attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing) in close relationships (e.g., I find it difficult to depend on other people). The items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The Relationship Scale
Questionnaire does not measure attachment in a categorical manner. It should instead be seen as a continuous measure of attachment. The cronbach alpha for the RSQ in the current study was .67

**Sexual Dominance Scale (Nelson, 1979).** Nelson (1979) investigated feelings and sensations that motivate people to engage in sexual behaviour. His subscale of sexual dominance included 8-items such as “I enjoy the feeling of having someone in my gasp”. The scale has been adopted by a variety of researchers to measure hostile masculinity (e.g. Abbey et al. 2006, Malamuth et al., 1995). The sexual dominance subscale has demonstrated strong convergent (.47) and the discriminant validity (.77) (Nelson). The cronbach alpha for the scale was in the current study was .66

**Procedure**

The study was approved by the Human Ethics Advisory Group of the Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences at Deakin University (HEAG-H) (HEAG-H 10_2012) (See Appendix 3). The questionnaire was first advertised on Facebook and various forums inviting males to participate in the study. Participants were required to follow a link that would lead them to the online questionnaire. Upon opening the link, participants could read a recruitment poster that clearly outlined that to be eligible to participate in the study they would need to be male, over the age of 18 years old and heterosexual.
The recruitment poster further introduced the purpose of the study. If participants were interested in partaking in the study they would first access a PLS that outlined that the current study sought to examine men’s perceptions of sexual consent within sexual interactions. Additionally, the PLS outlined the voluntary nature of the study, the possible risks involved if they completed the study as well as benefits for them and the wider community. The PLS also informed the participants about confidentiality and that informed consent was implied if they chose to complete the study.

If participants chose to partake in the study they were first required to provide some demographic information about themselves (as described above). Then participants were presented with one of the possible four options of the non-escalated vignette. Participants were randomly assigned to the vignettes in order to ensure there were approximately the same numbers of participants in each of the vignettes. They were instructed to read the vignette and answer a set of questions regarding the presented vignette. The same procedure was repeated with the escalated vignettes. After completion of this section participants were instructed to answer the above described personality questionnaires.

Data collection required eight months and after completion data was analysed in SPSS version 21 for Windows. Descriptive statistics were obtained about demographic information to get an understanding of the participants’ characteristics. To address the hypotheses, independent samples t-tests and MANOVA were conducted.
Results

Data preparation

Data were screened to detect missing cases through a missing value analysis in SPSS 21 and checked for outliers. A total of 140 cases with missing values for the dependent variables were identified. It was expected that the variables related to sex workers (e.g., “Have you ever been a client of a sex worker?”) missing data would be found, as the majority of participants would not be clients of sex workers. Since missing cases were found to be random and made up to be less than 5% of data points, problems are less serious and therefore missing data was not substituted (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). Data were not screened for correct data entry as the questionnaire was online and therefore data were directly transferred into SPSS 21.0. Even though univariate outliers were found, the cases were not deleted, as they were a legitimate part of the sample (Tabachnick & Fidell). Instead, as outlined further below transformations were undertaken to reduce the impact of outliers.

Factor analysis of consent measure

A principal component analysis (PCA) using an oblique rotation (oblimin) was conducted on the 7 items that were considered to measure consent and the 4 items measuring sexual intent. The items considered to measure sexual consent included: Do you agree that Sally consented to the sexual interaction?; How would you rate Sally’s behaviour to refuse sexual intercourse?; How would you
rate David’s behaviour?; How do you think Sally would perceive David’s behaviour?; How do you think David would perceive Sally’s behaviour to stop the sexual interaction?; Do you agree that Sally had the right to stop the sexual interaction?; How serious is this situation on the scale below? The items considered to measure sexual intent included: How flirtatious was Sally in the scenario?; How seductive was Sally in the scenario?; How promiscuous was Sally in the scenario?; How indicative was Sally’s behaviour of wanting to engage in a sexual interaction?

To test if the sample size was adequate for a PCA the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was used. The KMO suggested that the sample is adequate to conduct a PCA, KMO=.748 (good according to Field, 2009) and all KMO for the individual items were well above the accepted value of .5. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant $\chi^2 (55) = 493.3, p<.001$, and therefore the correlations between the items were large enough to conduct a PCA. The initial analysis showed four components when applying Kaiser’s criterion of an eigenvalue of 1 explaining a total of 65.89% of the variance. The scree plot confirmed the outcomes of the PCA and four components were retained in the final analysis. The items that cluster on the same components suggest that component 1 represents perceptions of sexual intent (How flirtatious was Sally in the scenario?; How seductive was Sally in the scenario?; How promiscuous was Sally in the scenario?; How indicative was Sally’s behaviour of wanting to engage in a sexual interaction?), component 2 represents perceptions of agreement to a sexual interaction and therefore consent (Do you agree that Sally consented to the sexual interaction?), component 3 represents perceptions of coercion (How would you rate David’s behaviour?, How serious is this situation on the scale below? ) and
component 4 represents perceptions of the right to stop (justification) a sexual interaction (How would you rate Sally’s behaviour to refuse sexual intercourse?, Do you agree that Sally had the right to stop the sexual interaction?). Due to the theoretical underpinning, sexual intent was not seen as a measure of consent, as theory suggests sexual consent and intent, even though related, are not the same concept.

**Testing the assumption of normality for the dependant variables**

Tests of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) indicated that the three measures of consent (consent, coercion, justification) and the measure of sexual intent are non-normal distributed. As the majority of the depended variables were moderately-to-severely negatively skewed, three transformations were executed to test if normality can be improved. According to Tabachnick and Fidell, (2007) a square root transformation $\sqrt{K-X}$ should be applied to moderate negative skewed data, a logarithmic transformation $\log_{10}(K-X)$ for substantial negatively skewed data and a reciprocal transformation for severe j-shaped data $(1/(K-X))$. As the severity of skewness varied between the dependent variables in the escalated and non-escalated scenario all three transformations were performed. None of the transformations improved normality and tests of normality were still significant. In addition histograms and p-plots indicated that there was no substantial improvement between the transformed and untransformed data. Therefore, the untransformed data was used for data analysis.
Differences of male perceptions on the three measures of consent and the measure of sexual intent between escalated and non-escalated scenario

To address hypotheses one to four, four paired-samples t-tests were conducted to test whether male perceptions of the three measures of consent (consent, coercion, justification) and sexual intent differ between the escalated scenario and the non-escalated scenario. The results showed that participants perceived that the woman has consented to the sexual interaction to a significantly higher rate in the non-escalated scenario ($M=4.71$, $SD=2.00$) than the escalated scenario ($M=1.60$, $SD=1.30$), $t(177)=18.41$, $p<.05$, $r=.13$. A significant difference was found for justification to stop a sexual interaction. Men perceived the woman had more right to stop the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario ($M=13.34$, $SD=1.63$) than in the non-escalated scenario ($M=12.73$, $SD=2.15$), $t(180)=4.29$, $p<.05$, $r=.53$. Participants perceived the woman as significantly more coerced into the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario ($M=12.81$, $SD=2.29$) than in the non-escalated scenario ($M=3.51$, $SD=1.86$), $t(181)=40.56$, $p<.05$, $r=-.08$. Participants perceived that the woman in the non-escalated scenario showed more sexual intent ($M=13.56$, $SD=4.36$) than the women in the escalated scenario ($M=11.96$, $SD=4.23$), $t(168)=-5.75$, $p<.05$, $r=.63$.

As the assumption of normality was violated the t-tests were followed up by a non-parametric test (Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test) in order to see whether the results are robust. The results supported the results of the paired sampled t-tests. Participants perceived that the woman has consented to the sexual interaction to a significantly higher rate in the non-escalated scenario ($Mdn (Median)=5$) than the escalated scenario ($Mdn=1$), $z=-10.291$, $p<.05$, $r=-.54$. A significant difference
was found for justification to stop a sexual interaction. Men perceived the woman had more right to stop the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario ($Mdn=14$) than in the non-escalated scenario ($Mdn=14$), $z=-4.303$, $p<.05$, $r=-.23$.

Participants perceived the woman as significantly more coerced into the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario ($Mdn=13$) than in the non-escalated scenario ($Mdn=3$), $z=-11.598$, $p<.05$, $r=-.61$. Participants perceived that the woman in the non-escalated scenario showed more sexual intent ($Mdn=13$) than the women in the escalated scenario ($Mdn=12$), $t(168)=-5.846$, $p<.05$, $r=-.31$.

The impact of personality measures and sexual experience on perceptions of consent

Participant’s perceptions of consent were measured using four continuous dependent variables. The means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for this analysis are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

*Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum score for the Three Dependent Variables Measuring Consent and the One Measure of Sexual Intent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent*</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion*</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification*</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent*</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-escalated scenario*
Eight multiple regression analysis were conducted to test the hypothesis that certain personality characteristics will influence men’s perceptions of consent (consent, justification and coercion) and sexual intent in the escalated and non-escalated scenario. The eight predictor variables were: HTW, Social Sexual Effectiveness, Attachment Style, RMA, Sexual Dominance, Loneliness, ASB and AIV. The minimum sample size to test the multiple correlation coefficient ($R$) is calculated by $N = 50 + 8m$ and to test individual predictors by $N \geq 104 + m$, where $m$ is the number of independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Consequently the current sample of 186 was considered large enough to conduct this analysis. In regression analysis the assumptions are more concerned with distributional errors rather than the actual raw score. Residuals were tested for the assumptions. The assumptions of multicollinearity as measured by tolerance and VIF scores and homoscedasticity, as examined via scatterplots, have been met. Slight abnormalities have been found for the assumption of normality between the residuals and consequently the generalisation of results beyond this sample may be limited (Field, 2009).

For all three measures of consent (consent, justification, coercion) direct multiple regressions were used to explore the hypotheses. The first two multiple regression examined the impact of the eight predictor variables on men’s perception if the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the escalated and non-escalated scenario. There was a positive correlation of residuals as assessed by Durbin-Watson statistic (1.181) for the escalated scenario the non escalated scenario Durbin Watson statistic (1.778) for the non-escalated scenario. However as the Durbin Watson statistic value is above 1 it can be ignored (Field, 2009). The results for the multiple regression are presented in Table 4.
Table 4  
*Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables predicting Men’s Perception of Consent in the Escalated and Non Escalated Scenario*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE&lt;sub&gt;B&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexdominance</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure attachment</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.146*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *p<.05; B = unstandardised regression coefficient; SE<sub>B</sub> = Standard error of the regression coefficient; β= standardised coefficient

The regression model was significant $F(12,157)=2.62, p<.01$ and personality traits accounted for 17% ($R^2=.17$) of the variance (11% adjusted) in perceptions of consent. Sexual dominance ($sr^2 = 2.4\%$), having a secure attachment style ($sr^2 = 6.5\%$) and loneliness were ($sr^2 = 2.1\%$) significant unique predictors. The regression model for the non-escalated scenario was not significant $F(12,155)=.677, p>.01$.

The second multiple regression examined the impact of the eight predictor variables on men’s perceptions of how coerced the woman was into the sexual interaction. There was a slight positive correlation of residuals as assessed by Durbin-Watson statistic (escalated scenario=1.779, non-escalated 1.890).

Table 5 outlines the result for the multiple regression.
Table 5

Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables predicting Men’s Perception of Coercion in the Escalated and Non-Escalated Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE_B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexdominance</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05; B = unstandardised regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the regression coefficient; β = standardised coefficient.

The regression model was significant $F(12,158)=2.36, p<.01$ and accounted for 15% ($R^2=.152$) of the variance (8.7% adjusted) in perceptions of coercion. Sexual dominance was a significant unique predictor and explained 3% of the variance. The regression model for the non-escalated scenario was not significant $F(12,157)=1.632, p>.01$.

The last multiple regression for examined the relationship of the eight predictor variables and men’s perceptions regarding whether the woman had the right to stop the sexual interaction (justification). There was a positive correlation of residuals as assessed by Durbin-Watson statistic 1.771 for the escalated scenario and the non-escalated scenario (1.757). The results are shown in Table 6.
Table 6

*Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables predicting Men’s Perception of Justification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE_B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial sex beliefs**</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio sexual effect</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape myth acceptance</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial sex beliefs</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure attachment</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p*<.05; B = unstandardised regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the regression coefficient; β = standardised coefficient

** Results for escalated scenario

The regression model was significant $F(12,156)=4.57$, *p*<.01 and personality traits accounted for 26% ($R^2=.26$) of the variance (20% adjusted) in perceptions of a woman’s right to stop the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario. Adversarial sexual beliefs was a significant unique predictor and explained 6.8% of the variance. The regression model for the non-escalated scenario was significant $F(12,159)=6.97$, *p*<.01 and personality traits accounted for 34.5 % of the variance (29.5% adjusted). Social sexual beliefs (3.06% of the variance), rape myth acceptance (3.5% of variance), adversarial sexual beliefs (11.1% of variance), secure attachment ( 3.4% of variance) and loneliness (2.4% of variance) were significant unique predictors.
A last multiple regression was conducted to examine if personality measures predict men’s perception of sexual intent in the escalated and non-escalated scenario. There was a slight positive correlation of residuals as assessed by Durbin-Watson statistic (escalated scenario=1.961, non-escalated 1.994). Table 7 presents the results for this multiple regression.
Table 7

**Summary of Regression Analyses for Personality Traits predicting Men’s Perception of Sexual Intent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE_B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial sex beliefs</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05; B = unstandardised regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the regression coefficient; β = standardised coefficient

The regression model was non-significant for the escalated scenario $F(12,148)=1.33, p>.01$. The regression model was significant for the non-escalated scenario $F(12,154)=2.93, p<.01$ and personality traits explained 18.6% ($R^2=.186$) of the variance in sexual intent. Adversarial sexual beliefs was a significant unique predictor ($sr^2 = 3.4\%$).

**Sexual intent and its relationship to male perceptions of sexual consent**

Four regression analysis were conducted to test whether perceived sexual intent of a woman relates to the four measures of sexual consent. The results showed that perceptions of intent predict perceptions of consent ($F(1,171)=6.15, p<.05$, Durbin Watson=2.092) and justification to stop a sexual interaction ($F(1,169)=5.7, p<.05$, Durbin Watson=1.992). However, perceived sexual intent of a woman had no impact on perceptions of sexual coercion ($F(1,172)=.886, p>.05$, Durbin Watson=1.787).
Differences of male perceptions on the three measures of consent depending on the category of woman

Study 1 focuses on different perceptions of consent in the rape scenario only, as it may explain if the status of a woman may increase the risk of her being raped. In order to test if male perceptions of consent differ depending on the category of woman they were presented with in the escalated scenario, a 3 x 4 between-subject Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The analysis included 3 dependent variables (consent, coercion and justification) and one independent variable with four levels (scenario: acquaintance, de-facto, ex-stripper, ex-prostitute). A correlation analysis was performed prior to the MANOVA to test the correlation between the dependent. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested that MANOVA is most reliable if the depended variables are either highly negatively correlated or moderately correlated in either direction. As can be seen in Table 8 the dependent variables are meaningfully correlated and therefore MANOVA was considered as an appropriate analysis.
Table 8

Pearson Correlations associated with the Consent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>-.253**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coercion</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.384**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Justification</td>
<td>-.253**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

The assumption of homogeneity of variance covariance matrices was violated (Box’s $M = 212.992, p<.001$). As the variances and covariances were larger in the cells with smaller samples than in cells with larger samples, Pillai’s criterion was adopted to test for multivariate significance (Olson, 1979). The MANOVA showed a statistically significant multivariate effect, using Pillai’s trace $V(9, 528)=7.31, p<.01$. The Leven’s test of homogeneity of variance was violated for consent $F(3,176)= 5.57, p<.01$, for coercion $F(3,176)= 31.3, p<.01$ and for justification $F(3,176)= 16.02, p<.01$ and therefore a more stringent alpha level was adopted to test for univariate significance. The Univariate test-statistics suggest that perceptions of consent $F(3,176)=3.884, p<.01$, coercion $F(3,176)=24.76, p<.01$ and justification $F(3,176)= 8.973, p<.01$ significantly differ depending on the category of woman.

**Post-hoc analysis.** A series of post hoc analysis (Games-Howell) were conducted to examine individual differences across four levels on the independent variable. The Games-Howell statistic was chosen as it is the most robust
procedure when the sample sizes and population variances were unequal (Field, 2009). As the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated, results were followed up by nonparametric statistics (Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney) to confirm the robustness of the results. Because of the increased number of significant tests and the consequent likelihood of an increased Type I error a more stringent alpha level was adopted ($p<.01$).

**Post-hoc results.** The post hoc analysis showed that two out of the three dependent variables (coercion and justification) were statistically significantly different between the four levels (acquaintance, de-facto, ex-stripper and ex-prostitute) of the independent variable. The post hoc test for coercion showed that men perceive the acquaintance, the ex-stripper and the ex-prostitute as significantly more coerced to the sexual intercourse than the de-facto. In addition, men perceived a de-facto as having less right to stop a sexual interaction than an acquaintance, an ex-stripper or an ex-prostitute. Even though, the Univariate test statistics showed that there is a significant difference for consent based on the four levels of the independent variables, the post hoc analysis showed that individually this difference is not large enough to be significant on a $p<.01$ level. The post-hoc test shows that men do not perceive consent significantly different depending on the category of woman they are presented with. However, a similar trend can be observed when compared to the outcomes of coercion and justification. Men perceive that the de-facto is more likely to have consented to the sexual interaction than the other three categories of women.

Due to the violations of assumptions of normality the results were again followed up with a non-parametric test. The results from the non-parametric test
supported the results from the MANOVA. To test for multivariate significance a
Kruskal-Wallis test was performed. The results showed that men’s perceptions of
coercion ($H(3)=56.476, p<.01$), consent ($H(3)=12.18, p<.01$) and justification
($H(3)=26.26, p<.01$) were significantly affected by the category of woman.
Mann-Withney tests were used to follow up the univariate findings:

**De-facto compared to Acquaintance**

It appeared that men perceived the de-facto as having consented more, as
indicated by an average rank of 52.09 to the sexual interaction compared to the
acquaintance who had an average rank of 39.7, $z=-2.77, p<.01$. In addition, the
de-facto was perceived as significantly less coerced (average rank 28.66) to the
sexual interaction than the acquaintance (average rank 60.90), $z=-6.20, p<.01$ as
well as the de-facto was perceived to have less right to stop the sexual interaction
(average rank 35.15) than the acquaintance (average rank 53.03), $z=-4.06, p<.01$.

**De-facto compared to ex-stripper**

It appeared that men perceived the de-facto as having consented more
(average rank 51.40) to the sexual interaction than the ex-stripper (average rank
39.02), $z=-2.693, p<.01$. In addition, the de-facto was perceived as significantly
less coerced (average rank 31.07) to the sexual interaction than the ex-stripper
(average rank 58.70), $z=-5.26, p<.01$ as well as the de-facto was perceived to
have less right to stop the sexual interaction (average rank 35.43) than the ex-
stripper (average rank 52.78), $z=-3.90, p<.01$. 
De-facto compared to ex-prostitute

It appeared that men perceived the de-facto as having consented more (average rank 51.64) to the sexual interaction than the ex-prostitute (average rank 39.88), \( z = -2.55, p < .01 \). In addition, the de-facto was perceived as significantly less coerced (average rank 29.59) to the sexual interaction than the ex-prostitute (average rank 60.05), \( z = -5.833, p < .01 \) as well as the de-facto was perceived to have less right to stop the sexual interaction (average rank 37.29) than the ex-prostitute (average rank 51.89), \( z = -3.135, p < .01 \).

As can be seen, the results from the non-parametric tests mainly support the results from the MANOVA. The only difference was found for the variable consent. While the post hoc analysis showed no significant difference of men’s perceptions of consent between the de-facto and the other three categories of woman, the non-parametric results indicated that there is a significant difference. As the non-parametric tests are seen as more robust when assumptions of normality are violated the results from the non-parametric tests will be used for discussion.

Differences of men’s perceptions on sexual intent depending on the category of woman

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to test whether men’s perceptions of sexual intent differ depending on the four categories of woman. Although there was not an equal number of participants in
each group Leven’s test of homogeneity of variance was not violated, $F(3,170)=.255, p>.01$. The ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference between men’s perceptions of sexual intent depending on the four categories of woman $F(3,170)=1.094, p>.05$.

The non-parametric test (Kruskal-Wallis) supports the results obtained in the ANOVA. Sexual intent was not significantly impacted by the four categories of women $H(3)=2.795, p >.05$.

**Differences of perceptions between clients and non-clients of sex workers on the three measures of consent and the measure of sexual intent depending on the category of woman**

A factorial MANOVA was conducted to test whether males who have been or are a client of a sex worker influences perceptions of consent depending on the scenario they are presented with. The assumption of homogeneity of variance covariance matrices was violated (Box’s $M = 212.992, p<.01$) and therefore Pillai’s criterion was used to test for significance. The results showed that there is a main effect for escalated scenario $V(9,516)=4.41, p<.01$. Post-hoc tests were not conducted as this result was expected due to the MANOVA results listed above. No significant main effect was found for being a client of a sex worker on the consent measures $F (3,170)=2.22, p<.01$. There was no significant interaction effect between scenarios and having ever been a client of a sex worker $F(9,516)=.63, p >.01$. 

**Discussion**

The objective of this current study was to examine men’s perceptions of sexual consent. Specifically, the study aimed to examine if men’s perception of consent differ depending on situational factors such as perceptions of consent in a rape scenario versus a non-rape scenario. Second, it was examined if personality traits (e.g. hostility towards woman and attachment style) and the perceived sexual intent of a woman impact men’s perceptions of consent. Third, it was explored if men’s perceptions of consent differ depending on the category of woman (acquaintance, de-facto, ex-stripper, ex-prostitute) they are presented with in the escalated scenario. Fourth, it was examined whether sexual intent impacts upon the three measures of sexual consent (consent, justification, coercion). Lastly, it was examined if a specific subpopulation of men, in this case clients of sex workers, differ regarding their perceptions of consent compared to the non-clients in the sample.

It was found that men’s perceptions on the three measures of consent and the measure of sexual intent differ depending on whether they are presented with the escalated scenario compared to the non-escalated scenario. In addition, personality traits, in particular those associated with the hostile masculinity pathway of Malamuth’s et al.’s (1991) Confluence model of sexual aggression, impacted upon the three measures of sexual consent. Further it was found that perceptions if sexual intent impact upon perceptions of sexual consent. Perceptions of consent further differ depending on what category of women men were presented with. Specifically, men perceived that the de-facto woman has
less right to withdraw consent, was less coerced into the sexual interaction and was perceived as more consenting than the other three categories of women. 

Lastly, sex worker clients’ perception of sexual consent do not differ from men’s perceptions of consent in the general population.

**Men’s perceptions of the three measures of sexual consent and sexual intent to a sexual interaction in different scenarios (escalated vs. non-escalated)**

The first four hypotheses concerned men’s perceptions of the three measures of consent (consent, justification, coercion) and the measure of sexual intent in the escalated scenario and the non-escalated scenario. In summary, it was hypothesised that men’s perception would differ regarding coercion but not the two other measures of consent (consent, justification) and sexual intent in the escalated scenario compared to the non-escalated scenario, which was partially supported. Specifically, men were more likely to perceive the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the non-escalated (woman has not been raped) scenario compared to the escalated scenario (woman has been raped). Men perceived the woman had more right to stop the sexual interaction and that the woman was more coerced in the escalated scenario than in the non-escalated scenario. They also perceived the woman in the non-escalated scenario as showing more sexual intent than the women in the escalated scenario.

As the woman in both scenarios (rape versus non-rape) verbally refused sexual intercourse it was predicted that there would be no difference in perceptions of consent depending on the scenario. However, the findings showed that men perceived the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the non-
rape scenario to a significantly higher rate than in the rape scenario. This suggests that the verbal disagreement in the case scenario was not seen as a clear indicator that the woman in the non-rape scenario refused consent. As mentioned previously, past research (Krahe, et al., 2000; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Osman, 2003) suggests that some men believe women engage in token economy thinking, meaning that women say no to a sexual interaction when in fact they mean yes.

The findings from the current study support the notion of token resistance to sex, as men tended to agree the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the non-rape scenario but not in the rape scenario, where it became clear that the woman did not want to engage. As previously mentioned, past research indicated that perceptions and engagement in token resistance occur due to adherence to sexual scripts (Check & Malamuth, 1983). These sexual scripts are based on a double standard that depicts women as the passive recipient of sexual advances and whose role is the gatekeeper. According to sexual script theory, women who indicate sexual interest and initiate sexual activity may be viewed negatively. Consequently and traditionally, a woman is supposed to refuse a man’s sexual advances, regardless if she wants to engage in sexual activity or not. In contrast men are supposed to initiate sexual activity and convince women to engage in sexual intercourse and persist even if the woman verbally refuses consent. According to this theory, it is acceptable for men to persist in their sexual advances, even if the women verbally indicates that she refuses the intercourse, which is due to men’s belief that women engage in token resistance (Check & Malamuth). Osman (2003) found that men with a strong belief that women engage in token resistance to sex are less likely to perceive a rape
scenario as actual rape. Even though this current study did not measure endorsement of token resistance, it is possible that some participants adhere to beliefs such as token resistance and sexual scripts.

The findings in the non-escalated scenario did not end in rape and therefore it may have been less clear for participants that the woman actually did not want to engage in the sexual interaction. In the non-escalated scenario the participants had the opportunity to interpret the woman’s behaviour as trying to adhere to sexual scripts and not wanting to be perceived as promiscuous rather than actually not wishing to participate in the sexual interaction. In contrast, it was made clear in the escalated scenario that the woman did not want to engage in the sexual interaction as the men had to apply force to have sexual intercourse with the woman.

Other factors that may have impacted on the variations of men’s perceptions of consent may have been that some men assumed the woman communicated consent to the sexual intercourse by engaging in reciprocal kissing and intimate touching. As aforementioned, past research (Hall, 1998) found that people frequently use non-verbal indicators such as kissing, getting closer and intimate touching to signal consent. Hall further suggested that people are more likely to give overt consent to the initial sexual activity (e.g. kissing) and sexual intercourse rather than for each sexual activity that follows in a sequence. It may have been that men’s perception of consent varied as a function of the different ways consent can be communicated and steps involved in a sexual activity. Even though Hall (1998) suggested that people are more likely to give overt consent to sexual intercourse, some participants might not have seen this step as necessary.
Some may have perceived that the woman has consented to sexual intercourse as she consented to the kissing and intimate touching. Burt (1980) suggests that some men misperceive a woman’s engagement in sexual activities, such as necking or petting, as consent to sexual intercourse.

It might have also been that the participants interpreted the actual dating behaviours, such as the woman coming to the man’s apartment, as willingness to engage in a sexual interaction. Past research (Muehlenhard, 1988; Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas, 1985) has found that certain dating behaviours impact men’s perceptions of a woman’s sexual intent. Muehlenhard, Friedman and Thomas’s study showed that men rated raping a woman as more justifiable and attributed more sexual intent to the woman when the woman agreed to a date in the man’s apartment. Even though the date in Study 1 took place in a restaurant, the woman agreed to come to the man’s apartment for coffee after the date, which might have been misinterpreted by the men in the study as a willingness to engage in sexual intercourse.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that men would perceive the woman as having the same right to refuse the sexual interaction in the non-escalated and the escalated scenario. This was not supported as the findings showed men perceived that Sally had more right to refuse the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario than in the non-escalated scenario. It has to be acknowledged that the scores obtained suggest most men agreed that a woman has the right to stop a sexual interaction. One reason for the significant difference in the results may have been found as the seriousness of the situation became more apparent when Sally got raped. The fact that there is a difference between the two scenarios, however, suggests there
may be certain circumstances where men do not perceive it as justified that a woman refuses consent to a sexual interaction.

Past research suggests that men generally overestimate women’s intentions to engage in sexual interactions (e.g. Abbey, 1982; Abbey, 1987; Abbey & Melby, 1986). For example, research showed men overestimated the woman’s intent to engage in sexual intercourse if the woman engaged in other sexual activities such as body touching (Willan & Pollard, 2003). The participants in this study might have perceived the woman as having the intention to engage in sexual intercourse as she engaged in other sexual activities. In addition, Willan and Pollard showed that men feel frustration after a woman engaged in preliminary sexual activity (such as intimate touching and mutual masturbation) and then refuses consent to sexual intercourse even though they did not perceive the initial sexual interactions as consent to intercourse. Muehlenhard (1988) found that men who overestimated a woman’s sexual intent and felt led on perceived rape as more justifiable. The participants in this current study might have perceived the woman as leading the men on, as she engaged in kissing and letting the men touch her breast and therefore perceived that her refusal was not justified or less justified in the non-escalated scenario.

It has to be considered that this current study has four different categories of women including a woman in a relationship and two types of women (ex-stripper, ex-prostitute) that may have been perceived as promiscuous. It may have been the case that men’s perceptions were impacted by the sexual history and relationship status of the woman they have been presented with. Past research (e.g. Humphreys, 2007, Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000)
indicates that a woman has less right to refuse a sexual interaction if she has a sexual history or is in a relationship. As Shotland and Goodstein (1992) suggested, if a man has a sexual history with a woman he has a legitimate right to have further sexual intercourse with her. In addition, Shotland and Goldstein showed that if a woman has more than 10 prior sexual partners she was perceived as obliged to have sexual intercourse. Humphreys (2007) also reported that with increasing duration of a relationship people perceive a decreased necessity for a man to ask for consent verbally. Nonverbal indications of consent were also perceived just as appropriate as verbal.

Men perceived the woman in the escalated scenario as more coerced into the sexual intercourse than the woman in the non-escalated scenario, which supports hypothesis three. This was expected, as there was no method (verbal or physical) of coercion present in the non-escalated scenario. Coercion in the scenario was indicated by the following: “David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, forced himself onto her and had sex with her.” The fact that men perceived this as coercion in the rape scenario indicates that men do not perceive forms of coercion as justified to gain consent.

Lastly, it was hypothesised 4 that men would perceive the women in the scenarios express equally as much sexual intent in the escalated scenario than in the non-escalated scenario. The findings did not support this hypothesis and indicated that men perceived the woman in the non-escalated scenario with more sexual intent than in the escalated scenario. It may be that people’s perception of sexual intent was influenced in the rape scenario as the woman got raped at the end of the scenario, which indicates the woman did not intend to have sexual
intercourse. As mentioned above the woman clearly asked the man to stop the sexual interaction in both scenarios. The fact that men attribute more sexual intent to the women in the non-escalated scenario suggests again that they might engage in “token economy” thinking. Only when the woman was raped did men recognise that the woman actually meant ‘no’ when she asked the man to stop the sexual interaction. Therefore, they may attribute less sexual intent to the women in the non-escalated scenario. This therefore suggests that men do misperceive women’s sexual intentions to sexual interactions.

Overall the findings suggest that men do not solely base their decision about sexual consent on verbal signals. The results indicated that men only acknowledged the woman’s verbal refusal as non-consent once it was made apparent that the man raped the woman in the scenario. This implies that men take other situational factors into account when they make a decision if consent has been given or not. It appears that men do endorse token economic thinking. In addition, it may be the case that men’s perceptions differ depending on the relationship status of the woman and her sexual history. Furthermore, this current study compared differences of consent depending on a rape versus a non-rape scenario. This helped to establish if misperceptions do indeed exist rather than assuming men use possible ambiguous situations as an opportunity to coerce women into sexual interactions.
Personality factors and their influence on men’s perceptions of sexual consent

It was hypothesised that a variety of personality factors would impact on perceptions of consent. The hypothesis was partially supported. The purpose of including personality measures was to investigate if they can help to explain differences within men’s perceptions of sexual consent. As clearly indicated above, consent is a complex concept and the findings above indicate that men do not conceptualise consent as ‘given’ or ‘not given’, rather perceptions of consent appear to fall on a continuum somewhere between refusal of consent and consent has been given. The findings of Study 1 showed that, as a whole, personality factors explain some variations of where men fall on this continuum of consent. In particular, personality traits that have been associated with hostile masculinity appear to be the driving factors that differentiated men’s perceptions of the three measures of sexual consent (consent, coercion, justification). Further, it appears that the impact of personality factors on men’s perceptions of consent differs in the non-escalated scenario and in the escalated scenario.

The results showed that perceptions of consent were significantly impacted in the escalated scenario but not in the non-escalated scenario. In particular, men who rated higher on sexual dominance were more likely to perceive that the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the escalated scenario. Malamuth (1986) suggested that there is a relationship between attitudes that represent sexual dominant behaviour and sexual aggression. The findings of this study are in line with this research as the man in the scenario clearly coaxes
the woman into the sexual intercourse and, consequently, engages in sexually aggressive behaviour. It might be the case that men who enjoy to sexually dominate women are more likely to perceive coercive behaviours as part of a sexual interaction and, therefore, misperceived this sexual interaction as more consensual than men who do not enjoy sexual dominant behaviours.

In addition, the findings showed that men with a more secure attachment style are less likely to perceive the woman in the rape scenario has consented to the sexual interaction. This is in line with past research, which suggests that people who have a secure attachment style will be less likely to be sexually aggressive (Ward et al.’ 1995). This current study focused on Ward et al.’s attachment model of sexual offending. Ward et al. utilised Bartholomew’s (1990) and Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) model of attachment to construct his theory. Within this attachment model, Bowlby’s (1969, 1973, 1980) theory was extended in that it does not only include internal working models (internal working models of the self and others based on childhood attachment style) but these internal working models are dichotomised as either positive or negative. Ward et al. proposed that having an insecure attachment style (insecure, dismissive, preoccupied) can contribute to sexually aggressive behaviour. In turn, people with a secure attachment style are able to engage in adult relationships that are characterised by high levels of intimacy, warmth and acceptance (Bartholomew, Bartholomew & Horowitz). The fact that secure attached men in this current study perceived the rape scenario as less consensual indicates that secure attached men might be better at interpreting women’s verbal and non-verbal cues correctly.
Personality traits did not impact on male perceptions of coercion in the non-escalated scenario, which is likely to have occurred as there was no physical violence present in the non-escalated scenario. However, they impacted on perceptions of coercion in the escalated scenario. The findings showed that men who rate higher on sexual dominance are less likely to perceive the woman in the escalated scenario as coerced. This is in line with Malamuth’s et al.’s (1991) hostile masculinity pathway of which sexual dominance is one of the two key concepts. The underlying assumption of this pathway is that some men have anxiety related to relationships with women and being rejected. Women may be perceived as powerful because of their sexual appeal, which in turn can be particularly threatening to men (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995). Malamuth, Feshbach, and Jaffe (1977) suggest that coercion against women may be a strategy for men to reduce this anxiety. This suggests some men might not recognise a coercive sexual interaction as non-consensual, as this might be a strategy and thus normalised behaviour within their own sexual interactions to reduce their own anxiety within relationships with women. This is in line with Muehlenhard and Falcon’s (1990) study which suggests men, whose attitudes reflect male dominance and acceptance of traditional gender roles, are more likely to have engaged in verbal sexual coercion and forceful rape. However, Study 1 did not measure whether participants have engaged in sexually coercive behaviours. It might be that men who rate higher on sexual dominance are more likely to perceive sexually aggressive behaviour as normal, which in turn impacts on their perceptions of what consensual sexual activity is.

Lastly, the impact of personality traits on justification was examined. The results showed that adversarial sexual beliefs contributed to men’s perceptions of
a woman’s right to stop the sexual interaction in the escalated and non-escalated scenario. Specifically, the higher men rated on rape myth accepting beliefs, adversarial sexual beliefs and loneliness the less likely they perceive a woman to have the right to stop a sexual interaction. The findings are again in line with Malamuth et al.’s (1991) confluence model of sexual aggression. Rape myth accepting beliefs and adversarial sexual beliefs are both measures of hostile masculinity. As mentioned above, men who adhere to beliefs in line with the hostile masculinity pathway may be more inclined to use coercive methods to gain sexual access to women. Malamuth, Linz, Heavy, Barnes and Acker (1995) mentioned that men adhering to such beliefs are more likely to equate sex with power rather than an expression of love. The findings from Study 1 support this, as some men did not perceive that a woman has the right to stop the sexual interaction, which in turn controls the woman and thereby gives the men power.

The finding that men who rate higher on loneliness perceived a women’s right to stop a sexual interaction might be due to the fact they crave intimacy and, therefore, are less likely to accept a woman’s refusal to sexual intercourse. Previous research (Marshall, 1989, 1993) has found a link between loneliness, intimacy and sexual offending behaviour. Marshall and Hambley (1996) conducted a study to examine the relationship between loneliness, rape myth acceptance and hostility towards women. They found that loneliness and intimacy are related to rape myths acceptance and hostility towards women. It may be the case that the men who rated higher in loneliness in this current study endorse rape myth accepting beliefs and have more hostile attitudes towards women, which explains why these men may perceive a woman does not have the right to stop a sexual interaction.
Further, men who rated as being more securely attached and more socio-sexual effective were more likely to perceive the woman in the scenario has the right to stop the sexual interaction. This again is in line with past research on attachment styles (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Ward, et al., 1995). As mentioned above, people with a secure attachment style are able to engage in adult relationships that are characterised by high levels of intimacy, warmth and acceptance (Bartholomew, Bartholomew & Horowitz). Quackenbush (1989) reported that men who are socio-sexual effective are more likely to accurately interpret sexual cues within sexual interactions. This study supports this, as the men in this current study who were more socio-sexual effective were more likely to interpret a woman has the right to stop the sexual interaction.

Out of the eight personality measures included in Study 1 it appears that six may be able to help explain differences in men’s perceptions on the three measures (consent, coercion, justification) of consent. Three (rape myth acceptance, sexual dominance, adversarial sexual beliefs) out of the six personality measures that have shown to be able to differentiate men’s perceptions of consent are part of the Malamuth’s et al.’s (1991) hostile masculinity pathway within the confluence module of sexual aggression. Hostile masculinity was conceptualised as having distrust in women in addition to having adversarial views about relationships, which in turn justifies sexual dominant behaviour. In addition, Malamuth et al. suggested that men who prefer casual sexual interactions over long-term commitments have an impersonal sexual orientation, which leads to more sexually aggressive behaviour.
The results further suggest that a person’s attachment style impacts on how consent is perceived. As indicated, more securely attached individuals were more likely to recognise that the woman has not consented to the sexual interaction. Ward et al. (1995) proposed a comprehensive theory on attachment styles to explain sexual offending behaviour. The findings of Study 1 did not reveal a significant link between the three insecure attachment styles and perceptions of consent. However, the current study supported the notion that a person with a secure attachment style is more likely to accept a woman’s ‘no’ as well as he is more likely to view that a woman has the right to stop the sexual interaction than someone who is less securely attached. In addition, Ward et al.’s model of attachment incorporates notions of intimacy deficits such as loneliness to differentiate between the different attachment styles. Even though the insecure attachment styles did not have a significant impact on perceptions of the three measures of consent, the results suggest that men who are more lonely are less likely to recognise a woman’s disagreement to a sexual interaction. Furthermore, lonely men were found to be less likely to view that a woman has the right to stop the sexual interaction.

In summary, personality traits can help to understand men’s differing perceptions of consent. The results from the current study suggest that men with more negative views towards women are less likely to perceive a sexual interaction as non-consensual or that the woman has been coerced into the sexual interaction, as well as they are less likely to perceive that a woman has the right to stop a sexual interaction.
Differences of perceptions of sexual intent on the three measures of sexual consent in the escalated scenario

It was hypothesised that men’s perception of consent, coercion and justification would be influenced by perceptions of sexual intent in the escalated scenario. The hypothesis was partially supported. The more sexual intent participants attributed to the women in the scenario the more participants perceived the woman has consented to the sexual interaction. In addition, the results showed that men perceived a woman has less right to stop a sexual interaction if she was perceived as showing more sexual intent. However, perceptions of sexual intent did not significantly impact on perceptions of coercion. This suggests the more sexual intent is attributed to a woman’s behaviour the more likely men are to misperceive sexual consent.

Differences of male perceptions on the three measures of consent depending on the category of woman

The findings showed that men consider consent, coercion and the right to stop a sexual interaction different when a de-facto woman is involved rather than any of the other three categories of women. As has been seen from the comments above, it appears that a woman in a sexual relationship is seen as more obliged to have sexual intercourse. This is in line with past research that suggested relationship length influences perceptions of consent (e.g. Humphreys, 2007, Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000). As mentioned above, Humphreys found that with increasing relationship length people perceived it as
less necessary to verbally ask for consent and that non-verbal consent was okay to be assumed. Further, in Humphreys’s study participants perceived violence depicted in the scenario as less harmful if sexual intercourse occurred before.

This suggests that being in a relationship is more important than the sexual history of a woman when it comes to perceptions of sexual consent, as the ex-stripper and the ex-prostitute were perceived as having more right to stop the sexual interaction, were seen as more coerced and were also perceived as having less consented to the sexual interaction than the de-facto. This is not in line with past research (Shotland and Goodstein, 1992) that suggests the number of sexual partners impacts upon perceptions of consent in that a woman with more sexual partners is more obliged to have sexual intercourse.

The finding suggests that men’s perceptions do differ depending on the type of woman they are presented with. However, even though there are some differences it appears that men only differentiate between a woman in a relationship and all other women. It further appears that perceived promiscuity or previous sexual relationships have less impact on men’s perceptions of consent than previously assumed. The most important implication of these findings is that it appears men still hold the perception that a woman in a relationship is less likely to be harmed by sexual coercive behaviours than a woman who is assaulted or raped by an acquaintance. Further, there still appears to be a notion that rape in a relationship is not possible or is not as serious as in a rape situation with a stranger. Even though rape in marriage was acknowledged as an offence in 1991 (High Court of Australia), it appears that women in a relationship are still viewed
as the sexual property of the men and therefore are obliged to have sexual intercourse with the men regardless if they wish to do so or not.

**Differences between sex worker clients’ perception of sexual consent and sexual intent and non-clients’ perceptions**

The results showed that there are no significant differences between perceptions of clients of sex workers and non-clients in terms of perceptions of consent depending on the different categories of woman. This result was expected as past research suggests that men who are clients of sex workers do not differ in terms of their demographic characteristics from non-clients. Consequently, clients of sex workers also perceived that the de-facto woman had less right to stop the sexual interaction, was less coerced into the sexual interaction and was more likely to have consented to the sexual interaction.

A methodological limitation of Study 1 is the categorisation of women. This study included an acquaintance, a de-facto, an-ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute. The rationale for choosing those categories was to have variation in terms of how promiscuous the women would be perceived. However, the inclusion of an ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute might have impacted on the detection of differences, as these women do not work in the professions anymore. The women could have possibly been perceived as more promiscuous if the scenario depicted them as a prostitute and a stripper. The reason for choosing those four categories of women was to ensure that the scenarios are similar enough to be comparable. It was important to keep the background story that led up to the sexual interaction as consistent as possible. Further, Study 1 did not aim
to examine perceptions about sex workers or strippers as such rather it aimed to examine the impact of perceived promiscuity on perceptions of sexual consent. However, it is recommended that future research addresses this and include three extremes such as a married woman, a sex worker and an acquaintance.

It can be concluded that men’s perceptions of sexual consent within sexual interactions vary depending on the situation, their personality traits, amount of sexual intent attributed to the woman and the category of woman involved. Further, it appears that men engage in token economy thinking, which may contribute to misunderstandings and misperceptions of sexual consent. Men do not perceive a woman’s verbal disagreement as a clear indication of non-consent but rather rely on their own interpretations of the situation to determine if consent has been given. Further, it appears that men perceive consent differently within a relationship than within a first sexual interaction scenario. It is not surprising that consent is perceived as different within relationships, however an important outcome to consider is that men perceived the rape in the relationship scenario as less coercive than in the other scenario, which indicates that myths about the possibility of rape in a relationship are still present. Study 1 showed that men’s perceptions of consent do fall on a continuum and that some of the differences on where men’s perceptions of consent fall can be explained by personality differences. In general, it appears that men who have more hostile masculinity traits perceived the rape scenario as more consensual than men who rate lower on these traits.
CHAPTER FIVE

Study 2: Clients of sex workers and sexual consent

As discussed in the previous chapters, research on sexual consent has mainly focused on how sexual consent is communicated and perceived. Past research has focused on differences between male and female perceptions and communication of consent. A variety of factors, such as the relationship status and sexual history of a person, have been investigated that may help to explain what informs perceptions of consent. However, past research on sexual consent has specifically investigated what constitutes consent within a sexual interaction if the sexual interaction is paid for. On the surface it may appear that sexual consent within sex work is clear as the sexual interaction is paid for and therefore the sex worker consented to provide certain sexual services once the payment has been accepted. However, past research (e.g. Church, Henderson, Barnard, & Hart, 2001) indicates that sex workers are frequently victims of sexual assault. Church et al. mentioned that specifically outdoor prostitution was associated with more violent behaviours from clients. Therefore, it is important to examine the sexual interaction between the client and the sex worker in terms of sexual consent.

The aim of Study 2 is to examine what clients think they are purchasing and how they perceive consent within the client and sex worker interaction. Perceptions of consent may vary depending on what clients perceive they are buying (e.g. the person, a body, a service or time). Past research has not examined the client’s perspective on what they think they are buying when they seek the services of a sex worker and what this means in terms of how consent is negotiated between the sex worker and their clients.
Therefore, Study 2 aims to examine perceptions of sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction and what the clients of sex workers think they are buying. In particular, this study focuses on the clients’ experiences on how sexual consent is communicated within the client and sex worker interaction. Further, Study 2 aims to examine if clients of sex workers perceive and communicate consent differently when they sexually interact with women in the general population. As sexual consent might be different for these men within the client and sex worker interaction than with a woman in the general population, the differences can be used to further extrapolate information about communication and sexual consent. Clients of sex workers are also likely to have sexual interactions with women in the general population and part of this current study aims to examine how sexual interactions with sex workers may impact on perceptions of sexual consent when these men interact with women in the general population.

Very little is known about clients of sex workers. Past research on sex work has mainly focused on public safety and risks to public health from sex work (Pitts, Smith, Grierson, O'Brien, & Misson, 2004). While in the recent past more research has investigated prostitutes themselves (e.g., Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Cusick, 1998; Dalla, Xia, & Kennedy, 2003; Gilchrist, Gruer, & Atkinson, 2005; Maguire & Nolan, 2011; Oselin, 2008; Potterat, Rothenberg, Muth, Darrow, & Phillips-Plummer, 1998; Vanwesenbeeck, Graaf, Zessen, Straver, & Visser, 1994; Williamson & Folaron, 2003), relatively little research has been done on clients of prostitutes (Monto & Julka, 2009). It has been argued that this lack of research may be due to a sexual double standard in which women are seen as responsible for men’s deviance from the norm (Davis, 1993). Further, it has
been emphasised that it is difficult to collect data on clients due to the fact that customers of sex workers often want to stay hidden from public attention (McKeganey & Barnard, 1996).

Most studies conducted into clients of prostitutes have recorded some demographic information about the clients. Such studies have found that clients are a demographically heterogeneous group that does not differ significantly from non-clients. For example, Perkins (1999) reported a wide age range (under 21 to over 70 years) in her sample of 667 Australian men who are clients of prostitutes. Further, a large number of clients had been married (over two thirds) or were married (40%) at the time of the interview. A variety of educational levels was also represented. Ten percent of the sample had a tertiary degree, 23% had qualified trade certificates, 35% had some level of secondary education and 13% had obtained Year 12. The results showed that these men are represented in all sorts of employment from white collar to blue collar or unemployed. Nearly half of the sample indicated that they follow some sort of religion: Catholics (31.5%), Anglican (9.5%), Protestant (17%) and other Christian (17%). Other religious groups named were Muslim, Hindu and Jewish. The findings regarding the demographics in Perkin’s study have been found to be similar across many other studies (e.g. Busch, Bell, Hotaling, & Monto, 2002; Coughlan, Mindel, & Estcourt, 2001; Farley, Macleod, Anderson, & Golding, 2011; Holzman & Pines, 1982; Klein, Kennedy, & Gorzalka, 2009; Monto & Hotaling, 2001; Monto & Julka, 2009; Moore, 1999; Perkins, 1999; Pitts, et al., 2004; Preston & Brown-Hart, 2005; Xantidis & McCabe, 2000).
A number of studies (e.g. Holzman & Pines, 1982; Monto & Julka, 2009; Xantidis & McCabe, 2000) have examined factors that motivate clients to visit sex workers. Pitts, Smith, Grierson, O’Brien and Misson (2004) conducted a study about clients of sex workers in Victoria, Australia. Part of their study was to examine motivational factors. Their method included two different versions of a questionnaire of which one included questions regarding visiting sex workers. The participant sample included 4,905 people recruited at the Sexpo exhibition in Melbourne. Out of the 4,905 respondents 1,225 received the version including the questions about visiting sex workers. Out of these 1,225 participants 612 were men, 601 were women, three were transgender and nine did not specify their gender. The limitation of this study is that it is unclear if people visiting an event such as Sexpo are representative for the wider population. The results showed that the main reasons given by men for visiting a sex worker were: to avoid a relationship, to get specific services, sex with prostitutes meant less trouble, for entertainment, company, sexual relief or from using alcohol or drugs.

These results support the findings of an earlier study conducted by Perkins (1999). Perkins used phone interviews conducted by a sex worker using a standardised set of questions. The participants were 667 male clients of female prostitutes from a national Australian sample. The results showed that motives to seek prostitutes were: for company, uncomplicated sex, sex with a variety of women, relief of stress, they had a high sex urge, it was the only sex available and sex workers are cleaner.

In addition to motivational factors, studies looked at personality characteristics of clients (Preston & Brown-Hart, 2005; Xantidis & McCabe,
Xantidis and McCabe conducted a study to examine if clients of sex workers can be distinguished on three particular personality characteristics from non-clients. Xantidis and McCabe hypothesised that clients would adopt less feminine sex roles, exhibit lower social-sexual effectiveness and higher levels of sensation seeking behaviour than non-clients. Their sample included 66 clients of sex workers and 60 non-clients. The clients were recruited from inner city brothels in Melbourne, Australia. This limits the study as the sample was recruited from only one particular site and therefore does not include all forms of sex work. Consequently, it cannot be assumed that clients from street workers or other types of sex workers would present with the same personality characteristics. The result supported the hypothesis and showed that clients are distinguishable from non-clients on these personality characteristics.

A small number of studies (Moore, 1999; Sawyer, Metz, Hinds, & Brucker, 2001) have examined clients’ attitudes regarding sex workers and prostitution. Sawyer et al. investigated attitudes towards prostitution in relation to several descriptive statistics. Their participants included 140 men, who were arrested for alleged use of a sex worker and were taking part in a program designed to educate men about the impact prostitution has on the sex workers. This may be a limitation of this study as it was not specified if the men already received any educational program before they participated in the study. If they have already participated, this may have influenced their attitudes and therefore it would influence the results. The methods used included the MMPI-2, although only a small part of the sample was assessed on this ($N=28$), and the Attitudes Toward Prostitution Scale (ATPS). The ATPS measures attitudes toward prostitution and sex workers, common beliefs about prostitution and sex workers.
(e.g. “Prostitutes enjoy their work”) and attitudes toward marriage and family behaviour (e.g. “It would be ok if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute”). The results showed that older and more educated men were more likely to support legalisation of prostitution than younger and less educated men. Further, the older and more educated group of men was less likely to believe inaccurate myths about prostitutes and prostitution than the younger and less educated group.

A limited number of studies have addressed attitudes towards women and rape myths acceptance and how they may contribute to violence towards sex workers. Busch, Bell, Hotaling and Monto (2002) conducted a study to investigate clients’ perceptions of women focusing on rape myths acceptance, entitlement to power and control as these may explain violence toward prostitutes. Their participants included 1,342 men arrested for soliciting a prostitute and, at the time of the study, were in a first offender rehabilitation program in the USA. One major limitation of the study was that the participants were in a rehabilitation program in which negative attitudes toward women might already have been addressed. Therefore, the results might not give an accurate account of the perception of women these men had before they had been arrested. The method used was a self-report questionnaire containing 87 items. The results showed that overall in the sample there was a low assent of rape myths acceptance. However they found that certain factors influence the endorsement of power and control factors. Men with lower levels of education, higher usage of pornographic videos, feelings of guilt about sex, sexual conservatism, having experienced a break up during the past year and starting to use a sex worker at an earlier age, were more likely to view themselves as entitled to power and control over women.
In summary, research on clients of sex workers has provided insight into who they are (e.g. Holzman & Pines, 1982; Perkins, 1999; Rissel, et al., 2003; Xantidis & McCabe, 2000). From this research it appears that clients of sex workers do not differ in terms of their demographic characteristics from the wider population. Clients of sex workers are represented within a wide age range, employments, education levels, religious backgrounds and within a variety of marital statuses. Motivational factors to seek sex workers were examined, which showed that clients have a variety of reasons such as wanting uncomplicated sex (Pitts, et al., 2004). Some studies examined sex worker clients’ attitudes towards sex work and sex workers as well as women in the general population (Busch, et al., 2002; Sawyer, et al., 2001). The findings showed that rape myth acceptance was low amongst clients of sex workers, however, lower education levels, higher usage of pornographic videos, feelings of guilt about sex, sexual conservatism and going through a break up during the past year impacted upon views of entitlement to control women.

As can be seen from this review, research on clients of sex workers has not investigated how clients of sex workers perceive consent within the client and sex worker interaction. However, sexual consent may be particularly important to investigate in this context, as research indicates that sex workers are particularly vulnerable to sexual and other assaults (Miller & Schwartz, 1995; Sullivan, 2007). This is not to say that clients of sex workers are the sole reason why sex workers are frequently victims of sexual assault and rape.

Study 2 is exploratory in nature, as previous research has not examined sex worker clients’ perceptions of consent. One aim of Study 2 is to get a
comprehensive understanding of how clients of sex workers conceptualise consent within the client and sex worker interaction. In order to achieve this aim, some of the included questions are purely qualitative, while others require a yes/no response followed by a request to explain why they chose yes or no: How do you negotiate what sexual service you would like from the sex worker? Is it common to bargain with the sex worker for the price of the service? (Yes/No, Please explain why/why not) Is it important that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction with you? (Yes/No, Please explain why/why not) and, What does consent within a sexual interaction mean to you? Even though past research has examined demographic data on clients, Study 2 aims to collect demographic data to gain an understanding of who the clients are in Study 2. Further, Study 2 aims to investigate where clients of sex workers seek the services of sex workers, whether they seek the same sex worker and their reasons for visiting sex workers. It is seen as important to examine where clients of sex workers seek the services of sex worker, as the establishment of sexual consent might differ depending on where clients seek a sex worker. In addition, past research has indicated that street workers are at higher risk of sexual assault and rape than other types of sex workers (Miller & Schwartz, 1995). Consequently, it might be that clients who visit street sex workers might have different characteristics than other clients, which could also impact on perceptions of sexual consent. The third aim of Study 2 was to gain an understanding of how consent might be negotiated between the client and the sex worker. At times, past research conceptualised reasons/motivations to seek sex workers into what clients think they are buying (e.g.Bernstein, 2001). Study 2 clearly distinguishes between motivational factors, such as seeking sex workers to buy particular sexual services or to have sexual
encounters with a variety of women, from the meaning of purchase. The third aim of this study is to examine what the meaning of purchase is for clients of sex workers. The meaning of purchase was conceptualised based on arguments of what a sexual labour contract includes such as the person, the body of the sex worker or a service (O’Connell Davidson, 2002). The following question will be asked to measure the meaning of purchase: *In your opinion, when you interact with a sex worker, what is it that you are buying: the time, a particular service, an emotional connection, the sex worker’s body, the whole person, or other?* This is considered as important in regards of what constitutes sexual consent within the interaction between a client and a sex worker. For example, a client that may perceive he bought the person may not consider it necessary to ask for consent for specific services as he might consider the sex worker as his property. In turn a client who perceived he bought the services may seek consent for each of the services he wishes to have performed. The meaning of purchase consequently might impact upon whether or not clients perceive the payment for the sexual service as the only form of consent within the sexual interaction between them and the sex worker. In addition, this study also wanted to examine if clients of sex workers perceive consent differently within the client and sex worker interaction compared to sexual consent within a non-sex worker sexual interaction. Study 2 further aimed to examine whether the personality characteristics used to explain differences in perceptions of consent within the general population can also explain differences between perceptions of sexual consent within clients of sex workers.
It was hypothesised that:

(1) Men will differ in their ratings of whether payment signifies sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction.

(2) Depending on the meaning of purchase, ratings of whether or not payment signifies consent will differ between clients.

(3) Ratings of perceptions whether payment signifies consent will differ depending on personality traits.

(4) Ratings of perceptions of the meaning of purchase will differ depending on personality traits.

**Method**

**Participants**

The sample included 28 men recruited over the internet using a forum for clients of sex workers in Australia. In addition, RhED (Resourcing Health & Education in the Sex Industry), an organisation that provides information regarding health and safety for sex workers, posted the questionnaire on their webpage. A number of brothels (25) were contacted regarding their willingness to advertise the online questionnaire, however, without success. As the study aimed to examine clients of sex workers and their experiences within the client and sex worker interaction, in particular how they perceive and convey sexual consent, all respondents were required to be over 18 years of age and be a regular client of a sex worker. Participants’ ages ranged from 21 to 70 years. The mean age of the participants was 41.61 years of age ($SD=12.67$). Table 9 provides a description of
the sample’s demographic characteristics, the frequency of visiting sex workers and the last time they had visited a sex worker.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics and Frequencies Visiting Sex Workers</th>
<th>Overall Sample (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (in years)</td>
<td>41.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Frequency %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with parents</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living alone/with friends</td>
<td>12 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-living with lover/sex partner</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living alone</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/widowed/separated living with partner</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sexual partner</td>
<td>15 (53.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual sexual partner</td>
<td>5 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monogamous sexual partner</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest achieved Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>10 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>18 (64.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last time visited sex worker</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last week</td>
<td>14 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a month ago</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6 months ago</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months ago</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a year ago</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How regular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>5 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a month</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>6 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a year</td>
<td>6 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

Potential participants were recruited over the internet through puntersplanet.com, which is a forum where Australian clients of sex workers communicate about their experiences. In addition, participants were recruited with the help of the Resourcing Health and Education in the Sex Industry (RhED) organisation, which published the questionnaire on their Facebook page as well as their organisation webpage. Potential participants were provided with a Plain Language Statement (PLS, see Appendix 4) that informed them of the aims of the study and potential risks and benefits for them and the wider community. In addition, the PLS outlined what is required from the participants and explained what is involved in the consent process. The questionnaire included 12 sections. Section 1 included questions regarding the demographic status of participants such as age and marital status. Section two included questions regarding their experiences with sex workers and how consent is communicated within the client and sex worker interaction as well as questions examining the client’s perceptions of women in the general population. Section three to section 10, included a variety of standard questionnaires designed to measure the participant’s personality characteristics.

Section one. Demographic details included age, sexual orientation, marital status, amount of sexual partners, time spent in a sexual relationship and highest achieved education level. Details are provided in Table 9.
Section two. For the purpose of this study, the researcher created a questionnaire (see Appendix 5) that aimed to examine clients’ experiences within the client and sex worker interaction. Based on past literature the questionnaire included items regarding the clients’ reasons to visit sex workers such as company, uncomplicated sex, a high sex urge and having sex with a variety of women (Bernstein, 2001; Holzman & Pines, 1982; Monto & Julka, 2009; Pitts, et al., 2004). This study also aimed to get a better understanding of the client’s perspective about the interaction with the sex workers and what consent means within this interaction. Qualitative questions were included in order to examine men’s perceptions about the interaction between them and the sex worker and how sexual consent is communicated. For example, How do you initiate contact with the sex worker? Please explain. How do you negotiate what sexual service you would like from the sex worker? Please explain. To get a better understanding what consent means within the interaction between a sex worker and a client, participants were asked some quantitative questions. For example, When you pay for the sexual services of a sex worker, does this signify sexual consent?, which were followed up by qualitative questions where participants were asked to explain their response. For detailed information about the questionnaire see Appendix 3.

Section three. The last part of the questionnaire included a variety of personality measures. The measures utilised were chosen based on past research examining sexual aggression. The reason for utilising those measures was to examine if there is a relationship between certain personality characteristics and perceptions of sexual consent. The same personality measures as in Study 1 were
used for the purpose of Study 2. For details please refer to procedure section of Study 1.

**Procedure**

Application was made to the Human Ethics Advisory Group of the Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences at Deakin University (HEAG-H). Ethics approval was granted (HEAG-H 10_2012) (See Appendix 6). The questionnaire was first advertised on Facebook, inviting males to participate in the study. Participants were required to follow a link that would lead them to the online questionnaire. Upon opening the link, participants could read a recruitment poster that clearly outlined that to be eligible to participate in the study you needed to be male, over the age of 18 years old and heterosexual. The recruitment poster further introduced the purpose of the study. If participants were interested in partaking in the study they would first access a PLS that outlined that the current study sought to examine men’s perceptions of sexual consent within sexual interactions. Additionally, the PLS outlined the voluntary nature of the study, the possible risks involved if they completed the study as well as benefits for them and the wider community. The PLS also informed the participants about confidentiality and that informed consent was implied if they chose to complete the study.

If participants chose to partake in the study they were first required to provide some demographic information about themselves (as described above). Then participants were presented quantitative and qualitative questions related to their experiences with sex workers and how they perceive consent within the
sexual interaction between them and the sex workers, as well as how this interaction differs or not with women in the general population. After completion of this section participants were instructed to answer the above described personality questionnaires.

Data collection required six months and after completion data was analysed in SPSS version 21 for Windows. Descriptive statistics were obtained about demographic information to get an understanding of the participants’ characteristics. To address the hypotheses, independent frequency analysis and binary logistic regressions were conducted.

To analyse qualitative open-ended questions and written comments, thematic analysis was conducted. Thematic analysis is used to identify, analyse, and report patterns within the qualitative accounts in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In contrast to thematic discourse analysis, thematic decomposition analysis and interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), a thematic analysis is not bound to a pre-existing theoretical framework. Thematic analysis is divided into two methods: a realist/essentialist method and a constructionist method. The realist/essentialist method analyses the experiences, meanings and reality of participants while a constructivist methods looks at how events, realities, meanings and experiences are influenced by a range of discourses operating within society (Braun & Clarke).

For the purpose of this current study, a realist/essentialist approach was used as this current study was, in particular, interested in the experiences that reflect the meanings, reality and experiences of clients within the client and sex worker interaction rather than how these experiences are influenced by societal
norms. The analysis followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) guidelines for a thematic approach. Braun and Clarke mentioned that it is important to consider what counts as a theme. According to Braun and Clarke, there is no specific criteria for what counts as a theme, but ideally there will be a number of instances of the theme across the data set. There are a variety of options on how to decide if a theme is important or not. First it can be based on the number of times the theme occurs within a data item (in the case of this study, how often the theme emerges within one participant’s account) or how often the theme occurs across the entire data set (examining if the theme occurs in accounts of different participants). As this current study did not conduct interviews but used open answered questions within an online questionnaire, participants’ responses are not extensive enough to examine themes within each participant’s account. Therefore key themes were examined across different participant’s accounts. Whether or not a theme is considered as a key theme does not rely on how often a theme occurs but rather if it captures important information in relation to the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Another important decision to make in regards to what analytic approach to use is whether the realist/essentialist approach should be done in an inductive/data driven way or a theoretical/deductive way (Patton, 2003). As this current study collected data to answer certain research questions rather than research questions evolving from the data a deductive approach will be applied. Further, the data will be analysed on a semantic level, meaning that the themes are identified within explicit or surface meanings of what participants have written. To go beyond just a pure description, data will be summarised and broader meanings and implications will be discussed.
Results

Data preparation

Data were screened to detect missing cases and check for outliers. Since missing values were found to be at random and made up less than 5% of data points, missing values were replaced by the means as any form of substitution would have similar outcomes (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Data were not screened for correct data entry as the questionnaire was online and therefore data were directly transferred into SPSS 21.0. Two univariate outliers were identified within the data. However, outliers were not excluded, as they were a legitimate part of the sample (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

What are the clients’ motivations to seek a sex worker’s services and which type of sex worker do they prefer

A frequency analysis was conducted in order to understand men’s perceptions about the reasons for visiting sex workers, what type of sex worker they seek and if they use the same sex worker. The results showed that clients of sex workers have more than one reason to visit sex workers. Table 10 shows the results from the frequency analysis.
Table 10

Frequency Analysis for Perceptions about Visiting Sex Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for visiting sex workers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less STD’s</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomplicated Sex</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High sex urge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only available sexual outlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sex worker</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage parlour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of same sex worker</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative responses in relation to the questions regarding reasons for visiting, type and use of same sex worker

To analyse the qualitative data, responses for each of the questions were copied from the questionnaire into a word document. The current study collected data to
answer certain research questions and therefore a deductive approach will be applied (Patton, 2003). Codes were developed to identify themes and those codes were applied to the data set to identify common themes. Reliability of the themes was considered by comparing code frequencies (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012).

Four participants stated that they seek sex workers for other reasons. These reasons were: “fun”; “a fantasy that a woman wants to have sex with me”; “I just love women with all their differences”; and “I love to pleasure women”. The nine participants that sought sex workers at other services all mentioned they were of private escorts/workers.

To get a better understanding of clients’ perceptions of why they choose to seek the services of the same sex worker or a different sex worker, the quantitative questions were followed up with an open-ended qualitative question. Specifically, participants were asked to explain why they either choose to seek the same or a different sex worker. Out of the 28 men in this current study, 10 stated they prefer to go to the same sex workers. Out of the these, nine clients answered the open-ended question and six provided explanations that suggested they perceive the sex worker as a friend or they have a personal relationship with the sex worker. The following quotes highlight this perception:

Familiarity, established relationship and friendship (#10).

Have a good relationship, its like catching up with old friends ... (#12)

I have been seeing her for four years. I view her as a friend (#18).
I am looking for a specific connection more than a fantasy. It’s more like an ongoing friends with benefits or love affair except its paid for. Its hard to find the right girl but once I do I keep seeing her generally until she moves on (#23).

Good chemistry and connection with the lady, which has allowed all encounters to evolve and also become more intimate (#14)

The other reason that appears to be important to clients who prefer to seek the service from the same sex worker/workers is that the sex worker knows what the clients wants, as indicated by the following:

- Less hassles, understands what I want/like (#22)
- Comfort, reliability of service (#19)
- She knows what I enjoy and I know what she enjoys and from there we can expand on our experiences and try new things (#12).

For those 18 men who prefer to seek a different sex worker, 17 provided a verbal response. Twelve participants reported they prefer to have sexual interaction with a variety of women. The following statements were provided by the participants:

- Variety (#4).
- Variety is the spice of life (#13)
- I enjoy sex with a variety of women (#16)
- Because I enjoy the variety and like the excitement of sex with a new person (#6)
Since I am seeking sexual relief outside of the marital bed, I prefer to explore a variety of women (#21).

The other reason seems to be that the same sex worker is not available.

Where I live there are only touring sex workers available but would develop a relationship with a single sex worker if available (#11).

Not always available (#15).

Not always available (#18).

**What do men think they are buying and does payment signify consent**

As the sexual interaction between a client of a sex worker and the sex worker differs from a sexual interaction in a non-sex work environment, clients were asked to report their perceptions on a variety of questions related to consent.
Table 11

Client's Perceptions of Consent and Related Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do clients think they are buying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional connection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does payment signify consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it common to bargain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it important that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed mind during sexual interaction about sexual interaction requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative responses in relation to consent

The three men that mentioned they are buying something else than the options given to them stated the following: a fantasy that this woman wants to have sex with me; a sensual relaxing time together; and an experience like no other.

In order to get a better understanding of how clients of sex workers determine if payment indicates consent, they were asked to provide reasons for why they perceive that payment either signifies consent or not. Seventeen out of the 28 men perceived payment as signifying consent. The results of the thematic analysis suggest that men who answered yes fall into two categories. It appears
that some men perceive the interaction purely as a business transaction and therefore money signifies consent. The second theme that became apparent was that payment does indicate consent but within limits. The following statements provide examples for the perception of the sexual interaction as a business transaction:

It’s a commercial contract (#13).

Well…If I pay for a Mars bar at the check-out I have ‘consent’ to leave the store with that Mars bar. Same principle applies (#16).

If she doesn’t consent then don’t accept the money (#9).

Sex worker is offering to partake of/engage in specific sexual activities, generally clearly specified prior to payment being received. This is part of a business transaction. The rules of engagement are generally clear, that is, what sexual acts the worker will or will not engage in (#21).

Statements that indicate that some men perceived the payment as only one part of consent are as follows:

Yes to a point. The sex worker should always have the right to reject my booking at the point of payment. If she should change her mind mid-way through the booking, I would respect that. If I suspect the sex worker was being forced to see me against her will, I’d leave (#1).

The exchange of money indicates clear acceptance. It signifies initial, in principle consent, which can be withdrawn at any time (#6).

Strictly speaking, when you pay, you are paying for her time. However, the provision of sexual services is implied. More so at a brothel than a private escort. However, it is consensual for the acceptable sexual
interaction, so if you suddenly pull out a small animal intending for it to be used as part of sexual play, that is off the cards (#13).

Generally speaking I would say yes but if you are pushing her boundaries and being a complete arsehole and she says no then no it is. (#11).

The eleven men that stated payment does not signify consent appeared to perceive consent as more complex than just being signified through payment. Some men stated that payment is only the first step to consent and they indicated that there needs to be verbal or non-verbal signals to cue willingness to engage in the sexual interaction:

Paying alone is only part of her consent, then you constantly need that verbal or non verbal feedback that reassures she's willing to keep engaging in sexual activities as the session progresses (#11).

There has been no other communication towards her willingness to proceed (#17).

Consent is usually verbal (#19).

Firstly, in brothels, payment is made, then in the room an STD check occurs. At this point (though this has never happened to me) they may refuse to perform the service. After they give the all clear and signify, verbally or nonverbally, that they are happy to perform the service, then I believe their consent is given, and only to the service that was negotiated (#24).

Participants also indicated that payment does not equal consent as the sex worker has to right to withdraw consent due to various factors:
One can pay for sex but consent can be withheld if the patron acts in a negative manner. Hasn't happened with me but I have heard of such things. Simple payment does not equate consent alone (#3).

It’s still her body and she can withdraw consent at any time (#25).

Payment allows you into her company and that the agreed services will hopefully be met but payment doesn't guarantee that they will be. This can depend on your interactions with the sex worker at the beginning of the meeting. Usually the sex worker will initiate the proceedings (#12).

It's quite likely to end in sex. But things can always change for a variety of reasons (e.g. one time a girl hit her head on a cupboard while getting undressed - so that was the end of that. We caught up a few days later instead) (#20).

One participant stated that he did not believe he paid for sex, rather he paid for the time of the sex worker and therefore payment signifies consent:

I don't believe that the money paid to a sex worker is for sex, I believe that it’s for her time, sex just happens to be the desired way of spending the time together, she still has the choice to leave or throw you out of the room (#22).

The only participant in this current study who seeks sex workers in a massage parlour described that consent is communicated differently in massage parlours than in brothels and therefore payment does not signify consent:

Not in the case of a massage girl. While it's known that extras are on offer, and those extras are frequently reported in reviews online giving the name of the girl, the services and the price, very descriptively by
customers.... it's still discretionary and those services may not be on offer to me. The price may also vary. I've had massages from some girls that also involved full penetrative sex, for which they refused to accept money for. On the other hand, some girls want $100 for a 3 minute handjob and are angry if you don't come straight away. I guess it's very much like dating a non sex worker in that sense. Very rarely I frequent full service brothels, which will usually describe in detail the services the girl offers, and the price. In that case it's very blatant and upfront and if you paid for anal then you would expect to receive that service. She still has the right to withdraw her consent (very unusual, but I've heard of it happening to some overly endowed guys) but I'd expect to also get my money back since I have paid for that service (#23).

All of the participants in this current study stated that it is uncommon to bargain with a sex worker the prices for services. There appears to be three different reasons for men in this current sample for why they usually do not bargain with the sex worker. The first reason seems to be that the sex worker may be offended or it is considered as disrespectful, as indicated by the following statements:

I may offend the escort and I don't think many see bargaining with good eyes (#2).

It is unprofessional and considered offensive (#3).

It’s uncool and disrespectful to the worker. I don't haggle with my doctor either (#20).
The other reason appears to be that some men simply accept the price that the sex worker set for her services:

Prices are usually pre-determined (#19).

She sets her rates, if I don't like them I don't see her (#21).

Set prices (#16).

For the same reason I don't negotiate in a restaurant. She is offering a service, and she has a price. Even if I feel it's high I'll generally pay, but if the service is poor I won't return (#23).

Some men appear to feel uncomfortable and find it disrespectful to bargain with the sex worker:

It’s uncool and disrespectful to the worker. I don't haggle with my doctor either (#20).

It feels rude to negotiate on a set price (#17).

It is common to bargain, but I’m not interested in the process (#15).

Not in my nature, if too dear I move on to another (#4).

The participants in this current study were asked why it is important for them that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction with them. This was considered as relevant as it is related to the concept of consent. All participants but one answered that it is important for them that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction. Four reasons evolved from the answers provided from the participants. First it appears that some men find it sexually stimulating if the sex worker enjoys the experiences:
Mutual pleasure is stimulating. If I wanted a starfish experience I'd stick with my partner (#8).

It is more pleasurable that way and satisfies both of us (#13).

It gets me off (#14).

More fun that way (#17)

For other men it appeared to be important to know that they can please the sex worker, as it makes them feel good about themselves:

It makes for a more complete experience. It "strokes my ego" to think that this woman has enjoyed her time with me - even if her enjoyment is feigned. It makes me feel happy when she greets me with a smile, a hug and a kiss on a return visit - rather than a scowl that says "not you again ..." (#18).

I like giving and pleasing and them telling me they enjoyed it and invite me to come back again (#11).

Want some feedback and not to be a cold fish (#9).

The third reason appears that some men hope the sex worker does want to have sex with them:

I like to think it is not a completely one sided affair (#13).

Sex is always an exchange no matter if it’s paid for or not. I get no enjoyment from sex with a lady who isn’t enjoying it…(#23).

I feel a deeper connection with her. You hope she enjoys our time together and looks forward to the next encounter (#12).
Lastly some men indicated that they do not get satisfaction out of the sexual interaction if the sex worker is hurt, forced or uncomfortable:

…If she really doesn’t want to have sex with me but forces herself it always ends badly. (#4)

Well maybe not so much as I do from a sexual satisfaction point of view, but it’s important that she feels at ease and comfortable…(#2)

As sexual consent within a sex worker and client interaction includes the negotiation of sexual services prior to the sexual interaction it was deemed as important to examine how sexual services are negotiated during a sexual interaction. Only seven out of the 28 men stated that they changed their mind about a sexual act that was not agreed upon at the outset of a sexual interaction. The responses of the seven clients differed and, therefore, no themes could be found. However, these are the participants’ experiences:

Politely. Something like "I didn't ask about this before, but can we do this?" Or, "How do you feel about doing this/me doing this to you?". Or "I'm interested in this, have you ever done that before?" If they say no, that's the end of it (#1).

By making physical overtures and gauging reaction. Sometimes by asking if the response is not obvious (#8).

Her enjoyment is also my enjoyment and (if things are going well) vise-versa (#20).
It's a sort of vague question again, because I don't generally negotiate at the outset. Verbal consent is rarely given at massage shops, but consent is clearly denied verbally and physically when something is not on offer so it's somewhat similar to negotiating sex in a relationship. Often the girl will lead/initiate even if somewhat obliquely. For example if Spanish is available she will often 'accidentally' rub her breasts on your penis. Even at the first meeting, if she is trying to feel you out for whether you are interested in only a massage or would like more she will often rub her crotch on your arm, or 'accidentally' stroke your balls. So I guess since I don't know what is on offer I go into it expecting only a massage. If something more is on offer I might be interested if I like the girl (#23).

I asked if we could change the agreement, and asked how much more it would cost, paid the difference at the end of the visit (#25).

I often do not request genital sex in favour of a hand job or blow job (#27).

When dangerous situation/location is revealed. Return Lady to the meeting area (#28).
Do clients of sex workers differentiate between women in the general population and sex workers?

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easier to communicate and interact with a sex worker</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of consent differs interacting with a sex worker and a non-sex worker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To gain an understanding if clients in this current study experience a difference when they interact with women in the general population than with a sex worker, participants were asked to explain if they find it easier to communicate with a sex worker than a woman in the general population and why/why not. The following statements indicate that interactions and communication with sex workers are more honest, without having to play games and are uncomplicated:

- Honesty and transparency. A successful interaction usually makes one feel "safe", free of judgement, making communication much more honest and open (#3).
- Minimal mind games (#14)
Uncomplicated (#16).

Certainly easier on a sexual or intimate level - because the whole seduction "game" is bypassed. I have little trouble interacting with women on a professional level in my "real" life (#18).

With a sex worker it’s a business transaction and you are purchasing a service. Much like servicing your car. Other women complicate things. I find it hard to relax with regular women (#25).

The clients who thought communication is not easier with a sex worker than a woman in the general population indicated that they do not differentiate between women in the general population and sex workers:

They may be sex workers but they're still real women (#4).

All women are women. I don't consider sex workers any more or less because of their occupation. Some are pleasant to chat to, others much less so, but the variety is no more or less than I would expect of any woman (#24)

Other participants mentioned that they do not find it easier as they do not have problems communicating with people in general:

I find it about the same. I don't have trouble communicating with people, women or men alike (#1).

Have no trouble communicating with or interacting with all women. It’s the "relationship" stuff that is an issue (#9).

I have no difficulty communicating and interacting with women other than sex workers but obviously on a different level (#11)
To be able to establish if sex worker clients’ perceptions of consent differ depending if they interact with a sex worker or a woman in the general population, they were asked to provide qualitative responses to whether they think consent differs and why/why not. The responses suggest that some men considered consent within an interaction with a woman of the general population as less clear than consent within a client and sex worker interaction:

- Lines are blurred with non sex workers (#16).

- Because a business transaction is agreed to. A non sex worker can require differing levels of communication before sex can be considered (#28).

- Consent is (generally) verbally discussed frankly and openly (with a sex worker)...non sex work consent can frequently be non-verbal (#3).

- Consent with a sex worker is established, at least in principle, when money is accepted. With a civilian woman the moment of unequivocal consent might not occur until physical activity of some sort (eg kissing) had already occurred (#6).

- Consent normally is more nuanced. Consent with a sex worker is very straightforward (#27).

- Because a business transaction is agreed to. A non sex worker can require differing levels of communication before sex can be considered (#28).

Others perceived payment is the only difference between consent within a client and sex worker interaction compared to consent within a sexual interaction with a woman in the general population:
I'm not paying general women to have sex with them (#7).

It differs in that the exchange of money implies consent for a sexual encounter to commence within certain boundaries. It bypasses the need for the "seduction process". But once the encounter begins, the same rules apply. No still means no (#18).

Consent is implied with the transaction of money (#19)

Lastly, some men perceived consent within a sex worker client interaction differs as the situation is more relaxed and men can ask for consent for specific sexual services:

Again more relaxed setting due to the sex worker knowing why you have visited them, may have previously discussed the proceeding events and the sex worker will usually initiate the proceedings (#12).

Suggestions and flirtation has to be more veiled and you’re not always worrying that a compliment can be taken the wrong way (#14).

I can be a lot more explicit about the sex acts I want with a sex worker. As there is no ongoing relationship, I can ask about sex acts, positions, etc, which I would not ask of another woman because I could potentially risk damaging or changing the relationship (#24).

Eleven out of the 28 participants perceived that there are no differences between sexual consent within a sex worker and client interaction compared to a sexual interaction with a woman in the general population. The theme that became apparent was that sexual consent needs to be established regardless of the payment:
There's no reason it should. Consent is consent, non-consent is non-consent, irrespective of whether I've paid (#1).

The only difference between the two is the money transaction otherwise there is no difference (#9).

The payment is simply the gateway to the sex worker spending time with you and consenting to sexual interaction. However, during the sexual interaction, there still needs to be a level of consent for what acts will be performed. For women in the general population, if she agrees to go home with you, that's the first part. But what happens in the bedroom still requires consent. (#10)

Some men made it clear they do not differentiate women based on whether they are sex workers or not. Therefore they perceive sexual consent as the same:

They are all women in the end and real people, not objects (#4).

I treat all women, sex worker or not, the same (#5).

I consider myself a normal everyday person, whether I fuck a prostitute or a woman I meet elsewhere I would like to think they would like to be treated as a normal person as well. So same manners apply for sex and non sex workers (#15).

Both are human who deserve to give consent (#17).

Lastly, men stated that what distinguishes consent within a sex worker interaction from a non-sex worker interaction is that it is clearer but the underlying principle of consent does not differ:
Communication is more direct and generally faster with a sex worker. But the underlying principal is the same (#20).

No, you need the same reassurance from both, even if arranging to have sex with a sex worker may be much more straightforward, as one can often bypass other social conventions (#2).

As explained above, I mostly see massage workers for whom sex is not advertised. You are paying for their time, and if they choose to give their body, emotions, or extra services then it may or may not be at a price. Even sex workers can feel embarrassed about being too explicit and killing the mood verbally, so signals of consent are given nonverbally much like dating a girl. As in a sexual encounter with a non sex worker, I’d make tentative advances and look for feedback. I think sex workers are much clearer about their signals though - they’re openly encouraging to the point of being comical, or overly emphatic about you not doing that thing. It's quite clear even though it's non-verbal. Dating a regular girl is often a bit more grey. It's harder to know how kinky they are until you really know them, and the first steps towards a sexual relationship can be very hit and miss. She may be a bit ambivalent herself, and may regret the next day what she did or didn't do (#23).

**The clients’ explanation of what consent means to them**

To explore how clients of sex workers conceptualise sexual consent they were asked what consent means to them within a sexual interaction. Some men answered the question in regards to consent within a sex worker interaction. The
answers suggest that consent for some of the clients implies willingness and agreement from the sex worker to engage in the discussed service after payment:

That, after payment and subsequent communication, the sex worker is willing to indulge in intercourse (#3).

Willingness to engage in the particular acts being proposed or clearly understood to be expected by the client (#6).

Permission to have the agreed services (#28)

Allows for the agreed upon services to begin such as sexual intercourse, kissing, touching etc. However excludes anything not previously discussed which could include spanking and other forms of rough play but basically anything that was not agreed to (#12).

The sex worker has agreed for certain sexual acts to be performed during the interaction (#10).

If it's paid explicitly for a specific service and the girl accepts the money then she has given consent for you to perform that service ie. if you paid for a blow job only, full sex, anal, a handjob, or whatever, and she takes the money, then she has consented to that even if she hasn't verbally said 'go ahead and fuck my ass'. She still has the right to retract her consent for whatever reason, but I'd be expecting a refund (#23).

Some clients perceive consent within the client and sex worker interaction as involving an ongoing process within the interaction:

It means they have said yes to various things. They have the right to say no to anything they wish. Paying a fee is just a transaction, however does not give a client free reign (#25).
Consent is an ongoing issue. Each step requires consent. If, for example a worker says "don't do that I'm ticklish" then consent for whatever you were doing that tickled has been withdrawn (#20).

Fully informed consent is knowledge not only that sexual interaction or sexual intercourse will occur, but also that it is a negotiated activity, which both parties are able to renegotiate, agree to or stop should they so wish. Further, I consider informed consent to include a sound understanding of the physical, mental and social risks and impacts of the sex act undertaken. As I only engage sex workers in legal brothels, and only those who speak English well, I assume that they are familiar with these risks and impacts and have determined for themselves that they understand them and agree to them in this context. I put a lot of truck in this and because of this I avoid brothels where sex workers are largely from overseas, and have a poor grasp of English, as I would be less assured that fully informed consent is given (#24).

A number of participants provided their perceptions of consent in general and not just within a client and sex worker interaction. Some men stressed the importance of verbal and non-verbal consent:

Any sort of verbal or non-verbal communication that shows that the other participant wants to have sex (#17).

This is tricky. If a lady says no to an interaction consent is withdrawn and you must stop. This can be a verbal interaction or can be a hand pushed away, a head turned, a pulling away. If I'm concerned she's not happy I stop and ask if I'm unsure (#4).
Other participants were less specific in terms of verbal or non-verbal communication of consent, however, the answers suggest that consent implies willingness and each of the involved parties has the right to stop the interaction at any time. In addition some participants indicated that for someone to be able to consent they need to have the mental capacity to understand the consequences of their interaction:

That both partners are willing participants in any and all sexual interactions, and that it may be withdrawn at any time by either party without notice (#1).

Generally means a willingness to participate in mutually acceptable sexual acts (#11).

That permission is given for the interaction to commence. That permission remains in place for the duration of the interaction. That permission is willingly and knowingly given. That both parties are able to give permission - i.e. not under the influence of alcohol or drugs (or asleep), or with some mental incapacity (#18).

**Regression analysis to examine if personality traits and demographic factors impact upon clients’ views about purchase and consent**

To sensibly run a logistic regression a minimum of at least 10 cases per predictor plus 10 extra are required to avoid statistical problems such as instability of estimates, unrealistically small standard errors and biased p-values (Norman & Streiner, 2007). As this study only included 28 participants it was impossible to run a multinomial logistic regression, and therefore binary logistic
regressions were conducted. Due to the small sample size and the fact that this current study is exploratory in nature the decision about which logistic regressions should be conducted was strongly guided by the correlations between the dependent and independent variables. Table 13 depicts the significant correlations between the variables under examination. The following variables were included in the table: 1. Social Sexual Effectiveness 2. Loneliness 3. Adversarial Sexual Beliefs 4. Preoccupied Attachment Style 5. Whether men chose to visit the same sex worker or not (Same SW) 6. Whether they thought payment signifies consent (Pay) 7. Whether they thought they are buying the time (Time) of the sex worker 8. Whether they thought they are buying an emotional connection (Emotion) with the sex worker or 9. Whether they thought they are buying the whole person.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sossexaffec</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.450*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>-.434**</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbelief</td>
<td>-.601**</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.383*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Assumptions of logistic regression. To test the assumption of linearity of the logit binary logistic regressions were run for each of the dependent variables and its predictor variables. All the interaction terms between the predictor variables were non-significant and consequently the assumption of linearity of the logit has been met. Further, the predictor variables were tested for multicollinearity. All of the VIF scores were lower than 10 and all of the Tolerance scores were larger than .01 for the predictor variables, indicating that there is no multicollinearity.

Logistic regression for whether payment signifies consent and a preoccupied attachment style

A binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to test sex worker clients’ perceptions on whether payment for a sexual service indicates sexual consent. As mentioned above, due to the limited amount of participants and the exploratory nature of the study, decisions on what regressions to conduct were guided by the correlations between the variables. The correlation analysis suggested that a preoccupied attachment style is significantly related to
perceptions regarding whether payment signifies consent. The results showed adding a preoccupied attachment style to the model significantly improved the predictive validity of the initial model $\chi^2(1)=4.88, p<.05$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .22$. A preoccupied attachment style had a Exp (B) of 1.38.

**Logistic Regression to determine if personality traits impact upon a client’s perceptions of what they are buying**

Three separate binary logistic regressions were conducted to test whether personality factors impact upon a client’s perceptions on what they are buying: the time of the sex worker or an emotional connection with the sex worker. Even though clients mentioned other options, such as buying a particular service and the sex worker’s body, correlation analysis suggested that personality characteristics only impact on buying time, the whole person and emotional connection. The correlation analysis showed a significant correlation between time and loneliness. The binary logistic regression to loneliness significantly improved the predictive validity of the initial model, $\chi^2 = 5.67, p<.05$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .30$. Loneliness had a EXP (B) of 1.11. Further, the correlation analysis showed a significant correlation between the whole person and adversarial sexual beliefs. The binary logistic regression to test if adversarial sexual beliefs improve the predictive validity of the original model was significant, $\chi^2 = 4.11, p<.05$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .19$. However adversarial sexual beliefs was not a significant unique predictor. Further, the correlation analysis showed that social sexual effectiveness contributes to clients’ perceptions regarding if they think they are buying an emotional connection with the sex
worker. The logistic regression showed that social-sexual effectiveness improves the predictive validity of the original model, $\chi^2 = 6.35, p < .05$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .29$. The EXP(B) for social sexual effectiveness was 1.088.

Do adversarial sexual beliefs impact if people choose the same sex worker or a different sex worker

Correlational analysis showed that adversarial sexual beliefs are correlated to the client’s preference if they seek different sex workers or the same sex worker. The results showed that adversarial sexual beliefs significantly improves the predictive validity of the original model, $\chi^2 = 11.75 p < .05$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .48$. The EXP (B) for adversarial sexual beliefs was 1.266.

Discussion

The aim of this current study was to examine clients of sex workers and experiences within the sex worker and client interaction. Specifically, this study examined what the meaning of the purchase is for clients of sex workers and how they conceptualise sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction. In addition, this study tried to explore how clients of sex workers conceptualise consent in general (not just within the interaction with a sex worker) and if they think communication and sexual consent differs when they interact with a woman in the general population. Further, it was examined how attitudes and beliefs influence the client’s perceptions of what they think they are buying when
purchasing the services of a sex worker; if they think payment signifies consent and if they choose to seek the services of the same or a different sex worker.

Overall, it was found that clients of sex workers are a heterogeneous group. Clients varied in their reasons for seeking sex workers: whether they chose to seek the services of the same or a different sex worker; their interpretation of what they are purchasing; whether or not they perceived payment signifies consent within the client and sex worker interaction; and whether they thought sexual consent differs between a sexual interaction with a sex worker or a woman in the general population. Generally, it appeared that the clients in this current study have a good understanding of what constitutes consent. They indicated that they used verbal and non-verbal signals of consent.

The meaning of purchase in this study was conceptualised in two ways: the reasons for seeking a sex worker and what the client thinks they are buying. First, participants were asked what their reasons were for seeking sexual interactions with a sex worker. The findings indicate that clients of sex workers have more than one reason to seek the services of a sex worker. Nearly all participants mentioned uncomplicated sex as a reason to seek the services of a sex worker, followed by wanting a variety of women, company, having a high sex urge and getting stress relief. Less important reasons were it was the only sexual outlet available and getting a particular service. A small number of participants stated that there were other reasons, which included: fun, a fantasy that a woman wants to have sex with me, I just love women with all their differences and I love to pleasure women. These reasons are in line with past research (e.g. Perkins, 1999; Pitts, et al., 2004) on clients of sex workers and indicate that the sample in
this study does not differ in regards to their reasons why they seek sex workers from other samples of clients. The fact that a larger proportion of men indicated that the reason for visiting a sex worker is uncomplicated sex indicates that the sexual interaction with a sex worker is perceived as different than with women in the general population.

The findings indicated that the most favoured way of seeking a prostitute is within a brothel, followed by private escorts/sex workers, escort agencies and massage parlours. The least favourite place to seek a sex worker was on the street. Clients were also asked to report if they seek the services of the same sex worker or a different sex worker. Nearly half of the participants stated that they seek the services of the same sex worker.

Most men who seek the same sex worker stated that they have established a friendship or an emotional connection with the sex worker. Past research did not specifically examine reasons for why clients visit the same sex worker. However, past research has found that clients perceive the sex worker as a friend or think they have an emotional connection with the sex worker (Plumridge, Chetwynd, Reed, & Gifford, 1997). Plumridge et al. found that clients of sex workers explain and justify their visits to sex workers by asserting that the commercial exchange is a mutual emotional and sexual relationship between the client and the sex worker. Research on sex workers themselves suggests that sex workers do not perceive the interaction in the same way. Sanders (2006) reported that the sex workers viewed their work as including emotions, however rather than seeing it as a friendship sex workers saw themselves as counsellors, psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers, who are performing emotional
work with clients, acting as confidants to clients who disclose personal secrets and stressors. This suggests that while the sex workers conceptualise the talking and listening as emotional work clients think that an actual emotional relationship does exist between them and the sex worker.

The other reason that appears to be important to clients who prefer to seek the service from the same sex worker is that the sex worker knows how to satisfy their sexual needs. Again, past research did not specifically examine the relationship of having a satisfying sexual encounter and whether clients seek the same sex worker or not. Rather, past research examined factors that are related to this concept such as having a high sex urge or seeking a particular sexual service (Perkins, 1999). However, it is clear that having sexual needs met is an important motivator for clients to seek sex workers. This indicates that some clients perceive they can not get their sexual needs met within relationships or sexual interaction with women in the general population. There might be a variety of reasons for this such as clients might find it easier to communicate their needs to a sex worker. It might also be the case that some men lack a sexual partner and therefore seek out the same sex worker to satisfy their particular needs. Further, it might be the case that some clients want specific services that they would not ask from their own partner out of fear of being judged or rejected.

The main reason clients stated to seek a different sex worker is that they enjoy having sexual encounters with a variety of women. This is supported by past research as a number of studies have found one of the reasons for men to seek sex workers is that they enjoy sleeping with a variety of women (Perkins, 1999). This indicates that some men do have difficulties having monogamous
sexual relationships. The other reason stated by men in this current study was that they sought different sex workers as the same sex worker is not always available, which indicates that their preference would be to seek the services of the same sex worker if it would be possible.

What impacts upon clients’ choices to seek the same or a different sex worker

The findings show that men who have more adversarial sexual beliefs are more likely to choose the same sex worker than a different sex worker. Burt (1980) reported adversarial sexual beliefs are beliefs that view sexual relationships as exploitative and that people involved in the relationship are sly, manipulative, cheating and not to be trusted. As the relationship with a sex worker is not a standard sexual relationship, people that adhere to these beliefs might feel that the relationship with a sex worker is safer than a relationship with a woman in the general population as the purpose of the relationship is clearly defined. As could be seen from the reasons given to choose the same sex worker in the verbal responses, clients perceived that they have an emotional connection with sex workers as well as a friendship. It might be that men who adhere to adversarial sexual beliefs try to avoid feeling they are in an untrustworthy, exploitative relationship and therefore establish relationships with sex workers.
What is the meaning of purchase

As mentioned above the meaning of purchase in this study was conceptualised in two ways: the reasons for seeking a sex worker and what clients think they are buying. Consent in sex work has not been examined from a client’s perspective. Rather, questions related to consent have been examined from a feminist perspective which focussed on issues related to if a woman can ever consent to being a sex worker rather than examining what determines consent between the client and the sex worker’s sexual encounters. In order to understand this interaction and how consent is conceptualised, it was considered as necessary to examine what men think they are purchasing as this could impact upon their perceptions of what constitutes consent.

It was found that the clients in this current study do not have one concrete view on what they are buying, rather it is a combination of factors, as clients provided multiple views on what they are buying. The most frequently given responses were time, the service, the body of the sex worker and the whole person. A smaller proportion of men thought they are buying an emotional connection. This indicates that the meaning of purchase for the clients cannot be categorised, as previously assumed.

It was hypothesised that personality factors would impact upon meanings of purchase. This hypothesis was supported. Specifically, the findings indicated that loneliness impacts upon the men’s perception that they buy the time of the sex worker. Loneliness has not been researched yet as factor for clients to seek sex workers, however the findings of this current study suggest that men who are more lonely think they are buying the time of the sex worker, which might suggest that they seek some form of companionship. Holzman and Pines (1982)
found that half of clients in their study identified a desire for companionship as part of the reason for seeking a sex worker.

Further, men in the current study are more likely to think they are buying an emotional connection with the sex worker if they are less social-sexually effective. Lower social sexual effectiveness ratings indicate that the person is less comfortable and confident in dating and sexual situations when interacting with women (Quackenbush, 1989). Xantidis and McCabe’s (2000) examined clients of sex workers in terms of personality characteristics including social-sexual effectiveness. They found that clients of sex workers who sought friendships or romance in the relationship with the sex worker had lower levels of social-sexual effectiveness than clients who saw the relationship as a business transaction. The findings from the current study support Xantidis and McCabe’s findings and suggest that clients who might have difficulty to interact socially and sexually with women in the general population are more likely to seek emotional and sexual connections with sex workers.

**Does payment signify consent**

It was hypothesised that, depending on the meaning of purchase, perceptions of whether or not payment signifies consent will differ between clients. However, this hypothesis was not supported. Rather the findings showed that a preoccupied attachment impacts upon a client’s perceptions if payment signifies consent or not. Specifically, clients with a more preoccupied attachment style are more likely to perceive payment signifies consent.
As aforementioned, Ward et al. (1995) referred to a preoccupied attachment style as fearful/ambivalent and people with this attachment style have a negative view of themselves and a positive view of others. Ward et al proposed that people with a preoccupied attachment style view themselves as unworthy to be loved and tend to seek approval of others. Therefore, these people seek partners that they can control and who admire them, as this will give them a feeling of security. In addition, Ward et al. stated that preoccupied attached people view relationships in sexual terms, as they meet their needs for security and affection through sexual interaction. By paying for a sexual service and perceiving the payment as consent, men with a preoccupied attachment style might meet their need for security and control over the sex worker. It might be that for those men the sexual interaction with a sex worker is perceived as more secure than an interaction with a woman in the general population.

The verbal statements men provided to explain why they perceive payment signified consent suggested that men fall under two categories. The first category of men described sexual consent as a business transaction. The second category of men are those that perceived consent as signified by payment but stated that even though payment signifies consent there are limits and the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent if the circumstances of the sexual interaction change.

This might suggest that, in particular, the first category of men who perceive sexual consent as indicated by the payment and perceive the sexual interaction as a business transaction, might be less likely to perceive that the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent. It might be that the sex worker is perceived as the man’s property during the time of the sexual interaction.
In contrast, men who indicated payment does not signify consent perceived consent within the sexual interaction with a sex worker as more complex. These men conceptualised consent involving verbal and non-verbal cues in addition to the payment and an indication of willingness to continue the sexual interaction. Participants also indicated that payment does not equal consent, as the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent due to various factors such as the client behaving inappropriately. There also appeared to be a difference in how consent is communicated depending on where clients seek sex workers. The findings indicated that consent is communicated differently in massage parlours compared to brothels. It has to be acknowledged that this is only the perspective of one participant as only two participants sought the services of a sex worker in massage parlours. However, it is still noteworthy as it might provide further insight into perceptions of consent. From the verbal account of this client it appears that consent is more indirect. This client described that compared to brothels where prices and services sex workers offer are described in the brothel, he gathered information about the services women offer in massage parlours via online reviews. However, he describes that prices and services might differ for different clients.

An interaction that was considered important in terms of sexual consent was how clients negotiate if they have changed their mind during the sexual interaction with the sex worker about what service they would like to receive. Most of the men (75%) in this current study stated that they do not change their mind about the service they requested at the outset of the interaction. However, those men that have changed their mind indicated they ask for permission if they can receive a different service and that the sex workers, either through verbal or
non-verbal cues, indicate if they agree to the change of service or not. This suggests that the men in this current study do ask for consent if they would like to change the service they receive from the sex worker.

Further, the participants were asked if it is common to bargain with the sex worker about the prices they charge for particular sexual services. All of the participants stated that it is uncommon to bargain with sex workers. There appears to be three different reasons for men in this current sample for why they usually do not bargain with the sex worker. The first reason seems to be that the sex worker may be offended. The other reason appears to be that some men simply accept the price that the sex worker set for her services. Lastly, some men appear to feel uncomfortable and find it disrespectful to bargain with the sex worker.

Part of a sexual interaction that indicates willingness and might signify that consent is given could be conceptualised as mutual enjoyment of the sexual interaction. If one of the parties does not enjoy the sexual interaction the sexual interaction could be forced and therefore consent could be perceived as violated. Even though the sex worker might not really enjoy the sexual interaction she could still pretend to do so, which therefore could communicate consent to clients. Therefore, participants in this study were asked if it is important that the sex worker enjoys the interaction. All participants but one answered that it is important for them that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction. The findings from the verbal comments indicated that for some men it is important that the women enjoy the sexual interaction not for the women’s sake but for their own sexual pleasure. Others clearly indicated that they do not get satisfaction out of
the sexual interaction if they feel the sex worker is uncomfortable, gets hurt or has to force herself to have sexual intercourse with them. For other men it appeared to be important to know that they can please the sex worker, as it makes them feel good about themselves. The last reason appears that some men hope the sexual interaction is reciprocal, as in there is a real connection and interpersonal interaction between themselves and the sex workers. This indicates that only some men use the enjoyment or pretended enjoyment of the sex worker as an indicator that the woman may not feel comfortable, is getting hurt or has to force herself to engage in the sexual interaction.

The findings also indicated that those clients who rated higher on beliefs accepting interpersonal violence were less likely to think that they bought an emotional connection with the sex worker. People with beliefs that interpersonal violence is acceptable tend to think that coercion and force are legitimate ways to get compliance in intimate and sexual relationships (Burt, 1980). It might be that the clients in the current study who adhere to this belief do not think they bought an emotional connection, as they do not seek emotional connections in relationships with women in general. Rather their relationships might be defined by force and coercion instead of an emotional connection.

**Do clients of sex workers differentiate between communicating and sexually interacting with a woman in the general population and sex workers?**

The findings of this current study showed that 60.7 % of men perceived it as easier to communicate with a sex worker than a non-sex worker. The men who stated that it is easier to communicate with a sex worker perceived the
communication with the sex worker as more honest and uncomplicated, without having to play games. It appeared some men perceived that when they were communicating with women in the general population ‘mind games’ are played, and clients stated it is therefore easier to feel relaxed and not be judged.

In contrast, men who stated there is no difference in communicating with a sex worker or a woman in the general population think that they do not have problems communicating with people in general. The other reason appeared to be that some of the men who thought there is no difference in communication did not differentiate between sex workers and women in the general population.

Clients were also asked to indicate if they perceived communication of sexual consent differs within a sexual interaction with a sex worker or a woman in the general population. More than half of the participants (60.7%) stated that communication of sexual consent does not differ between a sexual interaction with a sex worker compared to a woman in the general population.

The participants in the current study provided a variety of reasons for why they thought consent does not differ. However, most of them perceived consent as clearer in the client and sex worker interaction as, according to them, consent is openly discussed within the sex worker and client interaction. The responses indicated that men perceived consent can be blurred when interacting with women in the general population as consent is often communicated through non-verbal cues. Another reason for why men perceived consent is communicated differently was they perceived the payment as an indicator of consent within the client and sex worker interaction. Lastly, some men perceived consent within a client and sex worker interaction differs as the situation is more relaxed and they
felt they can ask the sex worker openly about specific sexual acts they would like to engage in. These findings indicate the men in this current study who thought communication of consent differs when they interact with a sex worker compared to a woman in the general population, perceive consent within in the client and sex worker interaction as more direct and clear.

A larger proportion of men indicated they thought there were no differences between communicating sexual consent within a client and sex worker interaction compared to a sexual interaction with a woman in the general population. The participants indicated that payment is not enough to establish consent and therefore consent still needs to be established in the same manner than with a woman in the general population. Other men clearly indicated that sex workers are also women and not objects, who deserve to give or withdraw consent like any other woman. Lastly, men stated that consent within a sex worker interaction is clearer, however the underlying principle of consent does not differ. They indicated that consent can be given non-verbally or verbally much like when interacting with a woman in the general population.

The client’s explanation of what consent means to them.

The participants in this current study were requested to provide a response to a qualitative question asking them what consent within a sexual interaction means to them. The question did not specifically ask about clients’ perceptions of consent within the client and sex worker interaction. However, some men answered the question in regards to what sexual consent means to them within a sex worker interaction. The answers suggest that consent for some of the clients
implies willingness and agreement from the sex worker to engage in the discussed service after payment. They indicated that the consent within this interaction refers to the specific sexual services that were discussed and payed for before the sexual interaction commenced. This indicates that there is no flexibility in terms of the sexual services during the sexual interaction, like in a non-sex worker sexual interaction where sexual acts often follow a sequence.

In contrast, other participants indicated that in their perception sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction is an ongoing process that does continue beyond the initial agreement and payment, as both parties should have the right to renegotiate. These men stated that consent needs to be established for each individual step. In addition, these men perceived that the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent at any point. It was also indicated the sex worker needs to have an understanding of the mental, social and physical risks of the sexual interaction.

Other participants provided their perceptions of consent in general and not just within a client and sex worker interaction. The perceptions of consent are similar to some of the perceptions mentioned by men who talked about the meaning of sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction. The participants mentioned that consent involves verbal and nonverbal communication. Other participants were less specific in terms of verbal or nonverbal communication of consent, however the answers suggest that consent implies willingness and each of the involved parties has the right to stop the interaction at any time. In addition, some participants indicated that for someone to be able to consent they needed to have the mental capacity to understand the
consequences of their interaction. For example participants mentioned that the other person should not be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, should not be asleep or be mentally impaired.

The verbal descriptions provided by the men in this current study are in line with past research about non-clients’ perceptions and communication of consent. For example Hall’s (1998) study on college students’ communication of consent found that consent can either be verbal or nonverbal. The participants in this study also thought that communication of consent can be verbal or nonverbal. Even though some participants indicated that consent within the client and sex worker interaction is signified by the payment, some indicated that the payment is not enough and that the sex worker has the right, just like a woman in the general population, to withdraw consent at any point.

One of the limitations of this current study is its relatively small sample size. Due to this the results have to be interpreted with caution and may not be generalised to other clients of sex workers. The sample is also exclusively Australian and therefore the results may not apply to clients of sex workers in other countries, as there are likely to be differences in attitudes towards sex work, sex workers and women in general, which in turn might impact on attitudes towards sexual consent within sex work. Another limitation of this research is the participants in this study were highly educated and mainly sought the services of sex workers in brothels or of private sex workers/escorts. It appeared that sexual consent may be communicated differently if sex workers are sought in massage parlours or on the street, as brothels and private sex workers/escorts appear to have a set list of services and prices that are communicated to the clients.
This research is explorative in nature as sexual consent has not been examined in a sex work context. Future research could further expand on this topic by examining clients of street or massage parlour sex workers, as past research suggests street sex workers are the sex workers who are most frequently exposed to violence. In addition, future research could expand on the relationship between personality measures and perceptions of sexual consent, as this study had a relatively small sample and therefore some associations might have not been detected due to a lack of power. Further, it should be examined whether clients who seek the services of a sex worker on the street differ in terms of their personality characteristics from clients who seek sex workers in other locations, as street sex workers are frequently victims of sexual assault and rape.

Generally, it can be said that the clients of sex workers in the current study appear to have a clear understanding of what constitutes consent within the client and sex worker interaction. In particular those clients that indicated the payment of the sexual interaction does not signify consent do respect the sex worker’s right to give and withdraw sexual consent within the sexual interaction with them. In addition, it seems that clients’ perceptions of consent do not differ from perceptions of consent in the general population. The clients in this current study are not one homogenous group. Clients appeared to have different reasons for why they seek sex workers.
CHAPTER SIX

General Discussion

The aim of this thesis was to examine male perceptions of sexual consent within sexual interactions. As aforementioned, sexual consent research (e.g. Hall, 1998; Humphreys, 2007) has mainly focused on comparing female versus male views on consent such as how sexual consent is communicated and how it is perceived. This past research has shown that sexual consent is a complex concept, and perception and communication of consent differ between the genders. However, there might not only be differences in communication and perception of sexual consent between genders but also within the genders.

Both studies in this thesis focused exclusively on male perceptions of consent. This was considered as particularly important for a variety of reasons. First, past research has indicated that men are generally more likely than women to perceive sexual consent has been given within sexual interactions, which may lead to misperceptions of sexual consent (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Humphreys, 2007; Lim & Roloff, 1999). Misperceptions of sexual consent have the potential to lead to unwanted sexual advances. Abbey (1987) found that more women than men describe having been kissed or touched inappropriately due to their friendliness being misperceived as sexual attraction. Violations, such as an unwanted kiss or unwanted touching, are usually resolved without any further issues, however, misperceptions of consent might still have the potential to harm the receiver of the unwanted sexual attention. Further, traditional sexual script theory suggests that men are more likely to be the instigators of sexual interactions (Check & Malamuth, 1983). Consequently, men are more likely to be
the perceivers of sexual consent and therefore it was seen as important to examine if there are factors that impact upon different perceptions within men (Hickman & Muehlenhard).

As Study 1 aimed to get a comprehensive view of what impacts on men’s perceptions of sexual consent this thesis included a specific subpopulation of men: clients of sex workers. The relevance of this was seen in that men who are clients of sex workers do not exclusively have sexual interactions with sex workers but also with women in the general populations. Research on clients of sex workers has shown that these men are often married or in relationships. For example, Perkins (1999) showed that two thirds of the men who were clients of sex workers have ever been married and 40% were still married at time the study was conducted. It is difficult to determine the exact percentage of men who seek sex workers due to the stigma attached to sex work and being a client, however, it is estimated that approximately 15.6% of Australian men have paid for sex (Rissel, et al., 2003). Engaging in sexual interactions with sex workers might impact upon men’s views about sexual consent and therefore might have implications for women in general. Further, it was considered as important to examine how sexual consent is communicated and perceived within the sex worker and client interaction, as sex workers are frequently victims of sexual assault.

Overall the findings of Study 1 suggest that men’s perceptions of sexual consent are impacted by a variety of factors. The findings showed that the actual outcome of a sexual interaction (rape versus non rape) influenced men’s perceptions if the woman has consented to the sexual interaction or not. Despite
the fact that non-consent in both of the scenarios (rape versus non-rape) was indicated by a direct verbal statement of non-consent (the woman asking the man to stop the sexual interaction), men’s answers regarding if the woman has consented to the sexual interaction differed between the two scenarios. Interestingly some men did not perceive this direct verbal statement of non-consent as a refusal to sexual intercourse in the non-rape scenario, rather the ratings indicated some ambiguity. This indicates that when it was not made clear that the woman was raped, the direct verbal statement was not perceived as the only signal of consent and men used other factors to try and establish if consent was given or not.

As mentioned in the discussion of the first study, it might have been that men interpreted the woman’s behaviour as engaging in token economy to sex, thinking that the woman said no to the actual sexual interaction when she actually wanted to engage in the sexual interaction in order to adhere to traditional gender roles, where women are not supposed to openly express sexual interest and are seen as gatekeepers (Krahe, et al., 2000; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Osman, 2003). This thought that the woman actually wanted to engage in the sexual interaction despite her verbal refusal, might have been perpetuated as the woman in the scenarios engaged in other sexual activities such as kissing and intimate touching. This could have been interpreted as a willingness to engage in sexual intercourse, as past research has shown people use kissing and intimate touching as non-verbal forms to communicate consent (Hall, 1998; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). In addition, Burt (1980) suggests that some men misperceive a woman’s engagement in sexual activities such as necking or petting as consent to sexual intercourse. The fact that the woman was described to
have agreed to come to the man’s apartment after the date is another factor that
had the potential to impact on men’s perception that the woman has consented to
the sexual interaction. As Muehlenhard (1988) and Muehlenhard et al. (1985)
have suggested, men over interpret women’s dating behaviours such as coming to
a man’s apartment as implying willingness to have sexual intercourse, which
cause some men to perceive rape as more justifiable.

Statistical analysis showed that the concept of sexual consent also
includes perceptions of coercion and the right to stop the sexual interaction. Men
perceived that the woman had more right to refuse the sexual interaction in the
escalated scenario than in the non-escalated scenario. As mentioned previously, it
has to be acknowledged that the scores obtained suggest that most men strongly
agreed that a woman has the right to stop a sexual interaction in both of the
scenarios. However, the difference in justification scores between the rape versus
the non-rape scenario indicates that there are certain circumstances where men
perceive it is less acceptable for a woman to refuse a sexual interaction.

It might be possible that the difference in these findings can be explained
by the impact attributions sexual intent has on perceptions of consent. As
mentioned above men perceive situations and behaviours as more sexual than
women do, which might lead to men thinking a woman wants to engage sexually
(Abbey, 1987). In the rape scenario it became apparent that the woman did not
intend to engage in sexual intercourse. Further, men might have also been less
likely to perceive that the woman has led the man on and therefore men might
have perceived that the woman had more right to refuse the sexual interaction in
the rape scenario. As Muehlenhard (1988) suggested, some men might perceive
rape as more justifiable if they perceive the woman has led them on. The fact that the woman in the scenario engaged in other sexual activities might have been perceived as willingness to engage in sexual intercourse. In addition, as previously mentioned, the physical intimacy and kissing might have been perceived as a non-verbal communication of consent to sexual intercourse (Hall 1998, Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). In addition, Willan and Polland (2003) showed that men feel frustration after a woman engaged in preliminary sexual activity (such as intimate touching and mutual masturbation) and then refuses consent to sexual intercourse even though they did not perceive the initial sexual interactions as consent to intercourse. Therefore, men might have attributed more willingness to engage in sexual intercourse in the non-rape scenario, which in turn might explain why some men perceived it as less justified that the women refused the sexual intercourse in the non-rape scenario.

It has to be considered that Study 1 included four different categories of women including a woman in a relationship and two types of women (ex-stripper, ex-prostitute) that may have been perceived as promiscuous. It may have been the case that men’s perceptions were impacted by the sexual history and relationship status of the woman they have been presented with. Past research (e.g. Humphreys, 2007, Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000) indicates that a woman has less right to refuse a sexual interaction if she has a sexual history or is in a relationship. As Shotland and Goodstein (1992) suggested, if a man has a sexual history with a woman he has a legitimate right to have further sexual intercourse with her. In addition, Shotland and Goldstein showed that if a woman has more than 10 prior sexual partners she was perceived as obliged to have sexual intercourse. Humphreys (2007) also reported that with
increasing duration of a relationship people perceive a decreased necessity for a man to ask for consent verbally as well as nonverbal indications of consent were perceived just as appropriate as verbal.

The third measure of consent in Study 1 was coercion. Men perceived the woman in the escalated scenario as more coerced into the sexual intercourse than the woman in the non-escalated scenario. This result was expected, as there was no method (verbal or physical) of coercion present in the non-escalated scenario. Coercion in the rape scenario was indicated by the following “David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, forced himself onto her and had sex with her.” The fact that men perceived this as coercion in the rape scenario indicates that men do not perceive forms of coercion as justified to gain consent as suggested within the sexual script theory (Check & Malamuth, 1983).

Lastly, sexual intent was included in Study 1. Initially it was expected there would not be any difference in perceptions of sexual intent between the two scenarios. However, men’s perceptions of intent were also different between the rape and the non-rape scenario. Men perceived the woman in the non-rape scenario showed more sexual intent than in the rape scenario. This further supports the notion that men’s perceptions are impacted by the outcome of a sexual scenario rather than the direct cues given by the woman. The fact that men attribute more sexual intent to the woman in the non-rape scenario suggests again that they might engage in “token economy” thinking. Only when the woman got raped do men recognise that the woman did not intend to engage in the sexual interaction. This therefore suggests that men might misperceive women’s sexual intentions to sexual interactions.
As indicated by the findings above, men are more likely to agree that consent has not been given to a sexual interaction and a woman has more right to stop the sexual interaction once it was made clear that the woman was coerced into sexual intercourse. This indicates that some men were ambiguous about whether consent had been given or not in the non-rape scenario even though the woman clearly asked the man to stop the sexual interaction. Further, it should be clear that a woman always has the right to stop a sexual interaction regardless of the circumstances, however the findings indicated that some men do not think this the case.

One of the specific aims of this thesis was to establish what might explain differences in men’s conceptualisations of sexual consent. As aforementioned, men do not appear to conceptualise consent as ‘given’ or ‘not given’ rather perceptions of consent appear to fall on a continuum somewhere between refusal of consent and consent has been given. Factors that were examined to explain these differences were personality traits, attitudes and beliefs about women and rape. This thesis focused on personality traits, attitudes and beliefs that were associated with sexually aggressive behaviours and stem from theories of sexual offending behaviours. The measures included hostility towards women, rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence, sexual dominance, loneliness and attachment style. As Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) suggest, miscommunication of consent is unlikely to be a contributing factor to sexual assault, rather sexually aggressive men might ignore or misconstrue signals of consent to suit their own purpose, using miscommunication as an excuse for rape.
The findings of Study 1 suggest that personality traits, attitudes and beliefs that are in line with sexually aggressive behaviour do help to distinguish where men’s perceptions fall on a continuum of the three measures of consent (consent, justification, coercion). The impact of sexually aggressive beliefs, attitudes and traits became particularly apparent in the rape scenario. Sexual dominance was one of the traits that appeared to help differentiate where men fall on the continuum of sexual consent. Men who rated higher on sexual dominance were more likely to perceive that the woman consented to the sexual intercourse in the rape scenario as well as they perceived her as less coerced. As previously mentioned, the results from Study 1 are in line with past research on sexually aggressive behaviours such as Malamuth’s et al.’s (1991) confluence model of sexual aggression. Malamuth’s et al. (1991) proposed that some men have anxiety related to relationships with women and being rejected; and sexual coercion against women may be a strategy for men to reduce this anxiety. This suggests that some men might not recognise a coercive sexual interaction as non-consensual as it may be a normalised behaviour to reduce their own anxiety related to relationships with women. This is in line with Muehlenhard and Falcon’s (1990) study which suggests that men whose attitudes reflect male dominance and acceptance of traditional gender roles are more likely to have engaged in verbal sexual coercion and forceful rape. However this study has not measured if participants have engaged in sexually coercive behaviours. It might be that men who rate higher on sexual dominance are more likely to engage in sexually coercive behaviours, which in turn impacts on their perceptions of what consensual sexual activity is. The findings of this study are in line with this research as the man in the scenario clearly coerces the woman into sexual
intercourse. Therefore, the findings suggest that men who rate themselves as enjoying sexually dominant behaviour are more likely to misperceive coercive behaviour as consensual.

Personality traits appeared to impact some men’s ability to perceive sexual consent more correctly than others. Those men who had a more secure attachment style were less likely to perceive the woman has consented to the sexual interaction in the rape scenario. This is in line with past research, which suggests that men who have a secure attachment style will be less likely to be sexually aggressive (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Ward, et al., 1995). The fact that secure attached men in this current study perceived the rape scenario as less consensual indicates that secure attached men might have more ability to interpret a woman’s verbal and non-verbal cues correctly.

Lastly, personality traits were found to distinguish where men’s perceptions fall in terms of a woman’s right to refuse a sexual interaction. Specifically, the higher men rated on rape myth accepting beliefs, adversarial sexual beliefs and loneliness the less likely they perceived a woman to have the right to stop a sexual interaction. The findings are again in line with Malamuth et al.’s (1991) confluence model of sexual aggression. Rape myth accepting beliefs and adversarial sexual beliefs are both measures of hostile masculinity. As mentioned above, men who adhere to beliefs in line with the hostile masculinity pathway may be more inclined to use coercive methods to gain sexual access to women. Loneliness and intimacy deficits are related to rape myths acceptance and hostility towards women (Marshall & Hambley, 1996). It may be the case that the men who rated higher in loneliness in this current study endorse rape myth
accepting beliefs and have more hostile attitudes towards women, which in turn explains why these men may perceive a woman does not have the right to stop a sexual interaction. In contrast, men who rated as being more securely attached and more social-sexual effective were more likely to perceive the woman in the scenario has the right to stop the sexual interaction. This indicates that men who are psychologically more healthy and effective interacting with women appear to be more accurate in determining what constitutes sexual consent.

Apart from personality traits, attitudes and beliefs that are supportive of sexually aggressive behaviour, Study 1 was interested in the impact that different categories of women have on perceptions of consent. The three measures of consent: consent, coercion and the right to stop a sexual interaction were perceived differently when a de-facto woman was depicted in the scenario rather than any of the other three categories of women. Men perceived the de-facto woman had less right to stop a sexual interaction and was less coerced into the sexual interaction than the acquaintance, the ex-stripper and the ex-prostitute. Further, the de-facto was perceived as more consenting to the sexual interaction than the other three categories of women. Past research has found that with increasing length of a relationship people are more likely to use non-verbal cues to communicate consent as well as there is a perceived obligation to have sexual interactions with partners (e.g. Humphreys, 2007, Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000).

However, past research also suggested that sexual history, such as how many sexual partners a person had, influences perceptions of consent in a similar way to relationship length. This implies that people who are perceived as sexually
promiscuous might be more likely to be seen as obliged to have sexual intercourse and therefore may be perceived as having less right to refuse consent (Shotland and Goodstein, 1992). A clear representation of this perception could be seen in rape trials, where sex workers or women that were perceived as sexually promiscuous had difficulties to prove they refused sexual consent. This was the case as promiscuous women were perceived as less trustworthy and less affected by sexual assault than women who were perceived adhering to more traditional gender roles where women are not supposed to have sexual interactions with multiple partners. In this current study, the ex-stripper and the ex-prostitute were perceived the same as an acquaintance in regards to the three measures of consent and as having more right to stop the sexual interaction. They were also seen as more coerced and perceived as having less consented to the sexual interaction than the de-facto. This suggests that the men in the current study do not perceive the sexual history of a woman as indicators of her ability to consent or refuse consent to sexual interactions. Furthermore, the results indicate that men perceived the ex-sex worker and ex-stripper as coerced into the sexual interaction, which indicates that they perceive sex workers can get raped.

As mentioned above this thesis aimed to get a comprehensive picture of men’s perceptions of consent and therefore included a subpopulation of men, which were clients of sex workers. The results showed that there are no differences between clients of sex workers and non-clients in terms of perceptions of consent depending on the different categories of women. This result was expected as past research suggests that men who are clients of sex workers do not differ in terms of their demographic characteristics from non-clients. However, the results contribute to the limited available information on clients of sex
workers, their interactions with the sex worker and what constitutes consent within the client and sex worker interaction. Therefore the second study of this thesis examined this in further detail.

As previously mentioned, it might be assumed that sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction is unambiguous. The client seeks to buy a sexual service and signals consent by handing over money to the sex worker. The sex worker, in turn, consents by accepting the client’s money. Consequently it is seemingly clear that both parties involved in this interaction are aware about what the proceedings are and what they have consented to. The findings from the current study indicate that some men indeed perceive payment as consent, however, for others payment is only one small part in addition to verbal and non-verbal communication of consent. Generally, a client’s perception of what constitutes consent can be divided into two categories. The first was those men that considered purchasing a sexual interaction as a business transaction and therefore the payment was perceived as consent. It appeared that those men perceived the sex worker and the sexual interaction they purchased as their property, as indicated by participants’ verbal statements such as “If I pay for a Mars bar at the check-out I have ‘consent’ to leave the store with that Mars bar. Same principle applies”.

In contrast, the second category of clients stated that payment does not equal consent. Reasons provided were, for example, that the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent if the circumstances of the sexual interaction change. These men conceptualised consent involving verbal and non-verbal cues in addition to the payment as well as an indication of willingness by the sex worker
to continue the sexual interaction. There also appeared to be a difference in how consent is communicated depending on where clients seek sex workers. The findings indicated that consent is communicated differently in massage parlours compared to brothels. It appeared that communication of consent is more indirect and, at times, in the form of non-verbal cues at massage parlours, whereas clients that sought sex workers in brothels mentioned they negotiated consent verbally by asking which services would be on offer and how much they cost.

Within an interaction between a man and a woman in the general population it appears that consent is unlikely to be given to each individual sexual interaction but rather that consent is given for the initial sexual interaction such as reciprocal kissing and then sexual activity follows a sequence (Hall, 1998). However, within a client and sex worker interaction sexual activities are less spontaneous, as the clients pay for a particular service such as vaginal intercourse, which appear to be verbally negotiated and consented to before the sexual interaction commences. However, there might be instances where clients change their mind about the service during the sexual interaction and therefore it was considered as important to examine how this communicated to the sex worker as well as how consent was established in this situation.

About three quarters of the men involved in this study stated they usually do not change their mind about the service they want during the sexual interaction. Men who stated they have changed their mind before informed that they do ask for permission if they can receive a different service and indicated that the sex workers, either through verbal or non-verbal cues, let them know if they agree to the change of service or not. This indicates that the men in this
current study use direct verbal methods of consent if they would like to engage in a different sexual activity. It appears that clients of sex workers accept the limits to the sexual interaction with sex workers, as in only certain sexual activities are performed, which were agreed upon at the outset of the sexual interaction. Further, clients of sex workers appear to be clear about the importance of asking for consent for each individual interaction.

Part of a sexual interaction that indicates willingness and might signify consent is given could be conceptualised as mutual enjoyment of the sexual interaction. All participants but one answered that it is important for them that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction. There appear to be three categories of clients in terms of why it is important that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction. The first category of clients are those that perceived the sex worker’s enjoyment as an important tool to increase their self-esteem or gain sexual pleasure from. The second category of clients, are men who hope the sexual interaction is reciprocal, as in there is a real connection and interpersonal interaction between themselves and the sex workers. The third category includes clients who are more likely to be concerned about the sex worker’s wellbeing. These clients indicated that they do not get satisfaction out of the sexual interaction if they feel the sex worker is uncomfortable, gets hurt or has to force herself to have sexual intercourse with them. This indicates that only the third category of men use the enjoyment or pretended enjoyment of the sex worker as an indicator that the woman may not feel comfortable, is getting hurt or has to force herself to engage in the sexual interaction and therefore as a non-verbal signal of consent.
The participants in this current study were asked what consent within a sexual interaction means for them. It was not specified that the sexual interaction should be seen within a sex worker context. However, some men answered the question in regards to what sexual consent means for them within a sex worker interaction. The answers suggest that consent for some of the clients implies willingness and agreement from the sex worker to engage in the discussed service after payment. Willingness and agreement are part of consent within any sexual interaction, which indicates that these men do have a global understanding of sexual consent and apply this within the sex worker context. Clients stated that consent within sex work refers to the specific sexual services that were discussed and payed for before the sexual interaction commenced. Other participants indicated that in their perception sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction is an ongoing process that continues beyond the initial agreement and payment, as both parties should have the right to renegotiate. These men stated that consent needs to be established for each individual step and that the sex worker has the right to withdraw consent at any point.

Other participants provided their perceptions of consent in general and not just within a client and sex worker interaction. The perceptions of consent are similar to some of the perceptions mentioned by men who talked about the meaning of sexual consent within the client and sex worker interaction. The participants mentioned that consent involves verbal and nonverbal communication. Other participants were less specific in terms of verbal or non-verbal communication of consent, however the answers suggest that consent implies willingness and each of the involved parties has the right to stop the interaction at any time. In addition, some participants indicated that for someone
to be able to consent they need to have the mental capacity to understand the consequences of their interaction. For example, participants mentioned that the other person should not be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, should not be asleep or mentally impaired.

It appears that open communication of sexual consent is a frequent behaviour within sex interactions between clients and sex workers. A contributing factor to the open communication might be that more than half of men perceive it as easier to communicate with a sex worker than a non-sex worker. The men who stated that it is easier to communicate with a sex worker perceived the communication with the sex worker as more honest, without having to play games and is uncomplicated, especially in relation to sex. It appeared that some men perceived that when they were communicating with women in the general population ‘mind games’ are played, and clients stated it is therefore easier to feel relaxed and not being judged. Feeling judged might make it difficult for those men to openly communicate with women in the general population about their sexual preferences and desires and, therefore, instead of asking verbally about consent, they may use non-verbal forms of consent.

Participants were specifically asked if they perceived communication of sexual consent differed when interacting with a sex worker compared to a woman in the general population. The participants who stated that consent differs fell into three categories. The first category of men are those that thought the payment differentiates communication of consent between a sexual interaction with a sex worker and a woman in the general population. The second category are those that perceived consent as blurred when interacting with a woman in the general
population due to using non-verbal signals of consent, whereas consent is openly discussed when interacting with a sex worker. And the last category of men are those that wished to engage in specific sexual acts that they would not feel comfortable to talk about with women in the general population but are able to discuss with a sex worker as they perceive the interaction is more relaxed. These findings indicate that the men in this current study who thought communication of consent differs when they interact with a sex worker compared to a woman in the general population, perceive consent within in the client and sex worker interaction as more direct and clear.

However, a larger proportion of men indicated that they thought there are no differences between communicating sexual consent within a client and sex worker interaction compared to a sexual interaction with a woman in the general population. The participants indicated that payment is not enough to establish consent and therefore consent still needs to be established in the same manner as with a woman in the general population. Other men clearly indicated that sex workers are also women – and not objects – who deserve to give or withdraw consent like any other woman. Lastly, men stated that consent within a sex worker interaction is clearer, however the underlying principle of consent does not differ. They indicated that consent can be given non-verbally or verbally much like when interacting with a woman in the general population.

The verbal descriptions provided by the men in this current study are in line with past research about perceptions and communication of consent within the general population. For example, Hall’s (1998) study on college students’ communication of consent found that consent can either be verbal or nonverbal.
The participants in this study also thought that communication of consent can be verbal or nonverbal. It appeared that men’s perceptions of sexual consent within sex work is relatively structured. Consent to the sexual service is discussed before commencement of the sexual acts and there appears to be a strict adherence to only engage in sexual acts that have been previously discussed. It appears that sexual consent within a client and sex worker interaction is more clearly negotiated and openly communicated than in sexual interaction in a non-sex work environment. As indicated by the verbal statements of the participants, it appears that these men feel it is often part of the procedure when engaging with a sex worker to talk about which sexual services will be performed and therefore sexual consent is communicated for each individual sexual service. Further, some men indicated that they find it easier in general to communicate with a sex worker than with women in the general population as well as they feel more relaxed talking about the sexual activities they would like to engage in. This indicates that sexual consent is clearer communicated, as there is less reliance on non-verbal cues within a client and sex worker interaction than sexual interactions within the general population.

The clear distinguishing between a sexual interaction in a sex work context and a sexual interaction between two people in the general population is that the men pay for the sexual interaction. As aforementioned, perceptions of sexual consent might be influenced by what men perceive they are buying such as the service, the body of the sex worker, the whole person and so forth. This was seen as important as a client who perceives he bought a service might be more likely to only engage in those sexual interactions that were agreed upon at the outset. However, a man who might think he bought the whole person might be
more likely to perceive the sex worker as his property for the time being, and therefore might think he has the right to perform sexual acts without asking for permission. Consequently, one of the aims was to examine this in further detail.

The outcomes showed that men do not have one concrete view on what they are buying, rather it is a combination of factors, as clients provided multiple views on what they are buying. The most frequently given responses were time, the service, the body of the sex worker and the whole person. A smaller proportion of men thought they were buying an emotional connection. None of these factors appeared to have a correlation with if they perceived payment as a signal of consent within the client and sex worker interaction. However, certain personality characteristics impacted upon whether men thought they bought the time of the sex worker, an emotional connection or the whole person.

Specifically, the findings indicated that loneliness impacts upon men’s perception that they buy the time of the sex worker. Loneliness has not been researched yet as a factor for clients to seek sex workers, however the findings of this current study suggest that men who are more lonely think they are buying the time of the sex worker, which might suggest they seek some form of companionship. Holzman and Pines (1982) found that half of clients in their study identified a desire for companionship as part of the reason for seeking a sex worker.

Further, the findings suggest that men in the current study are more likely to think they are buying an emotional connection with the sex worker if they are less social-sexually effective. Lower social sexual effectiveness ratings indicate that the person is less comfortable and confident in dating and sexual situations
when interacting with women (Quackenbush, 1989). Xantidis and McCabe (2000) examined clients of sex workers in terms of personality characteristics including social-sexual effectiveness. They found that clients of sex workers who sought friendships or romance in the relationship with the sex worker had lower levels of social-sexual effectiveness than clients who saw the relationship as a business transaction. The findings from the current study support Xantidis and McCabe’s findings and suggest that clients who might have difficulty to interact socially and sexually with women in the general population are more likely to seek emotional and sexual connections with sex workers.

As mentioned above, what men thought they were buying did not impact upon whether they perceived payment as a signifying consent, however the findings showed that men with a more preoccupied attachment style are more likely to perceive payment as signifying consent. Men with a preoccupied attachment style view themselves as unworthy to be loved and tend to seek approval of others. Their preferential partner is someone they can have control over and who admires them, as this will give them a feeling of security (Ward et al., 1995). Consequently, these men might perceive sexual control over the sex worker as they are more likely to perceive payment as consent. It is possible that these men are less likely to perceive the sex worker has the right to withdraw sexual consent, as this would undermine their control over the sex worker and therefore contribute to their anxiety.
Limitations

There are potential limitations to the current research. One such limitation is the relatively small sample size in both studies. This thesis only looked at men’s perceptions of consent and therefore women were excluded, which increased the difficulty to obtain a large sample size. Past research has found that women are more likely than men to participate in surveys (Sax, Gilmartin, Lee, & Hagedorn, 2008; Smith, 2008). Consequently, the choice of sample for this study in itself made the process to obtain a large sample size more difficult. However, the researcher refrained from using a more convenient sample such as University students, as this would have limited the generalisability of the results. In addition, most of the past research only included college students as their sample and therefore this thesis aimed to extend upon this sample.

The small sample size in Study 1 contributed to a number of statistical issues. First, sample sizes within the cells measuring perceptions of consent for the four different categories of women was unequal and did not reach the suggest minimum number of 50 within each cell. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variance and covariance for MANOVA was violated, however this was addressed by using an appropriate criterion to establish significance for multivariate effects. However, the small number of participants in each cell might have prohibited statistical detection of differences of men’s perceptions of consent between the acquaintance, the ex-stripper and ex-prostitute.

Another statistical limitation in Study 1 was that most of the assumptions were violated. In particular the assumptions of homogeneity were violated in the
MANOVA and regression analysis. Again, the assumptions were addressed by adjusting the alpha levels to be more stringent and follow up parametric tests with non-parametric test. The issue of violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance was partly due to the nature of the questions. Participants were asked to provide responses regarding consent to sexual scenarios. Most of the participants were fairly accurate in their perceptions of the three measures of consent and therefore all of the dependent variables were highly skewed. It was considered to convert the continuous measures of consent into categorical variables. However, research suggests that continuous variables should not be transformed into categorical variables due to a variety of negative consequences, such as a loss of information and power, an increase in type I error and an introduction of bias due to data derived cut-off points (Altman, Lausen, Sauerbrei, & Schumacher, 1994; Irwin & McClelland, 2003; MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, & Rucker, 2002; Royston, Altman, & Sauerbrei, 2006).

A methodological limitation of this study is the categorisation of women. This study included an acquaintance, a de-facto, an-ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute. The rationale for choosing these categories was to have variation in terms of how promiscuous the women would be perceived. However, the inclusion of an ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute might have impacted on the detection of differences, as these women do not work in the professions anymore. The women could have possibly been perceived as more promiscuous if the scenario depicted them as a prostitute and a stripper. However, the decision to use an ex-stripper and an ex-prostitute as categories was based upon the fact that the researcher aimed to create scenarios that were as similar as possible in terms of the background story to avoid possible biases.
As mentioned above, Study 2 had also a small sample size. This limited the options to statistically analyse the results. For example, to sensibly run a logistic regression a minimum of at least 10 cases per predictor plus 10 extra are required to avoid statistical problems such as instability of estimates, unrealistically small standard errors and biased p-values. As this study only included 28 participants it was impossible to run a multinomial logistic regression, and therefore binary logistic regressions were conducted. Due to the small sample size decisions on what regressions should be performed were purely based on statistical grounds rather than theoretical grounds, which might have led to the loss of important information. Consequently, the results have to be interpreted with caution, and should not be generalised beyond this study.

The sample is also exclusively Australian and therefore the results may not apply to clients of sex workers in other countries. Another limitation of this research is that the participants in this study were highly educated and mainly sought the services of sex workers in brothels or of private sex workers/ escorts. It appeared that sexual consent may be communicated differently if sex workers are sought in massage parlours or on the street, as brothels and private escorts/sex workers appear to have a set list of services and prices that are communicated to the clients. In addition, past research (Miller & Schwartz, 1995) has indicated that street sex workers have the highest rates of sexual assault out of sex workers and therefore clients who seek street sex workers may differ in their attitudes of consent.

However, even though the second study’s results might not be generalisable to the wider population of clients of sex workers, the inclusion of qualitative data in the form of open-ended questions regarding clients’
experiences and follow up quantitative responses, gained insight into not only how clients process the sexual interaction and consent within sex work but also provided some information on how they perceive interactions and consent with women in the general population.

**Implication of the studies**

There are a number of implications that have arisen from this thesis. First it became clear that, for men, verbal forms of consent are not clear indicators of refusal to sexual interactions. This became apparent as men were ambivalent about whether or not the woman had consented to the sexual interaction in the non-rape scenario despite her verbal refusal to sexual intercourse. This indicates there were other factors, such as interpreting the woman coming to the apartment as an indicator of willingness to sex, involved when evaluating if the woman had consented to the sexual interaction. It is unlikely that misperceptions of consent due to over-interpretation of willingness lead to sexual assault or rape. The outcomes of the studies clearly indicated that most men did not agree in the rape scenario that the woman had consented to the sexual interaction, which indicates that most men do not agree with using coercion to gain sexual access to women. However, these misperceptions do have the potential to lead to sexual assault and consequently it would be important to educate men, women and adolescents about the necessity to not only acknowledge verbal signals of consent but also clearly communicate whether or not the sexual interaction is wanted.

There is a dilemma in terms of the role women play in making sure their non-sexual behaviour is not misperceived by men. On the one hand it should be suggested that women should be advised that some of their non-sexual
behaviours, such as going to a man’s apartment without having the intention to engage sexually, might be misperceived as sexual and therefore women should be wary about their behaviour. However, this means that women would have to restrict their behaviours, although it is men who overestimate or ignore signals of consent. Further this indicates that women are sexualized within interactions, which raises the question as why this is the case.

Media images have been found to contribute to the sexualised way women are perceived. Hatton and Trautner (2011) suggested that representations of both men and women were increasingly sexualised, however representations of women were sexualized to a greater extent. In addition, they suggest that there was a change in sexualised representations, however these changes only affected women and not men. They speak of hypersexualisation of women, meaning that women were assigned a combination of signals of sex such as body position and extent of nudity. Media images of women were often presented in ways suggesting sexual accessibility, such as lying on a bed or spreading their legs wide open, which in turn was suggested contributes to sexual objectification of women.

Research on sexualised presentations of women has found that these images increase negative attitudes toward women, increasing attitudes supportive of sexual aggression, and excuse sexual violence and harassment against women (Kalof, 1999; Machia & Lamb, 2009; MacKay & Covell, 1997; Malamuth, Addison, & Koss, 2000). It might be that the sexualisation of women in the popular media also impacts upon perceptions of sexual consent.

From past research and this current research on sexual consent and intent, it is known that men overestimate and perceive sexual consent and intent
differently compared to women. In particular, men attribute sexuality into women’s non-sexual behaviour. It appears that there is a form of acceptance within the wider society that men view interactions in more sexualised ways, nearly as if this is something that can be expected from men. However, it should be examined what the actual causes of these gender differences are in perceptions of consent and sexual intent as, at the moment, it seems that women are the ones who have to modify their behaviour in order to be safe from sexual harassment. It is unclear if women realise that their non-sexual behaviours are interpreted as sexual and consequently this is something that should be made aware to them through educational programs. It appears that, through clear communication about both men and women’s intentions, misunderstandings could be avoided. For example, men who ask women back to their apartment in the hope that the woman does engage sexually should clearly outline this and therefore the woman involved can make an informed decision about whether or not she wishes to do so.

The second implication of this study is that men can be differentiated by their personality characteristics in terms of where they fall on the continuum of consent. Men who rated higher in terms of traits that might lead to sexual aggression and men who were more lonely were more likely to misperceive sexual consent measures in the escalated scenario. This indicates that those men might be more likely to engage in coercive behaviours as they either choose to ignore refusal of sexual consent or are unable to read signals of consent accurately. These personality measures could possibly be a factor that should be considered in cases of sexual assault and rape trials where men deny consent has been refused.
The fact that the men in this study perceived the de-facto as having less right to refuse a sexual interaction, having been less coerced to the sexual interaction and was more likely to be perceived to have consented to the sexual interaction, indicates that women in a relationship are still seen as the sexual property of men. This means that it might be difficult for women who get raped in relationships to establish that rape has occurred and that they are real victims of rape. As indicated by the results, men were ambiguous about the de-facto’s right to refuse sexual intercourse, if consent to the sexual interaction was really refused and how coerced she was. Further, it might be that men in relationships are more likely to engage in verbal and physical coercion to access sexual interactions, as there appears to be the notion that men have an inherent right to access sex in relationships.

The implications of this thesis can be extended to law enforcement in rape cases concerning victims in relationships or married women. Juries should be informed about stereotypes surrounding rape in marriage and relationships, as it appeared from the findings that women within relationships appeared to be less likely to be viewed as ‘a real victim of rape’. Consequently, if juries adhere to these stereotypes they might be more likely to perceive the impacts of rape as less serious, or perceive the victim as less coerced, which might lead to non-convictions. This, in turn, would further strengthen the notion that women in relationships are the sexual property of men, which would perpetuate the belief that verbal and physical coercion for sex is justified in relationships.

Both studies examined the sex worker client’s perspective. Clients of sex workers did not differ in their perceptions of consent in terms of categories of women. However the second study indicated that clients of sex workers use, in
addition to payment within the sexual interaction of the sex worker, mainly verbal forms of consent. Generally, it appeared that most of the clients in this study had a very good understanding of what consent entails. It might be that the structured procedures to establish consent at the outset of the sexual interaction with the sex worker has increased their understanding of what sexual consent entails, which in turn appears to have increased the client’s sensitivity to signals of consent. It might be that these men use this understanding of consent when interacting with women in the general population. In fact, a larger proportion of clients stated that for them consent does not differ between a woman in the general population and a sex worker. Those men that indicated it does differ recognised that signals of consent are more blurred when interacting with women in the general population, which does indicate that these men might be more careful when making sure sexual consent has been given.

The implication of these findings is that the clients of sex workers appear to have benefitted from their interactions with sex workers in terms communication and perceptions of consent. Further, this indicates that clients of sex workers are not more sexually deviant than men in the general population. However, as mentioned above, sex workers are frequently victims of assault and it might just be that the sample in this study differs from other clients of sex workers. As aforementioned, the most vulnerable group of sex workers in terms of sexual victimisation are street sex workers, and most of the men in this study sought sex workers in brothels or used private escorts.

Despite the positive effect the interaction with the sex worker might have on perceptions of consent, it is not to say that interactions with sex workers only have positive effects. Men who seek sex workers might experience feelings of
guilt, particularly if they are in a relationship or married. Further, it might have negative implications on their partner, e.g., possible transmission of sexual diseases and psychological stress should they find out about their partner’s visits to sex workers.

However, this research indicated that men find it easier to discuss sex with sex workers than with women in the general population, which did appear to have a positive impact on their knowledge of sexual consent. It might be that stereotypical behaviours and attitudes hinder both men and women to openly communicate about sex within relationships and also within casual sexual interaction. Consequently, it would be beneficial to address those stereotypes in sexual education programs.

**Future research**

Future research should examine the causes of why men tend to over-sexualise women’s behaviours and how this affects sexual consent. As mentioned above, sexualised media images of women do appear to contribute to sexual aggressive behaviour, however it is unclear how this affects perceptions of consent. At the moment, it appears to be the woman’s responsibility to make sure the man has understood the verbal and non-verbal signals of consent. However, if the causes for the misinterpretation become clearer, men might become clearer about signals of sexual consent. It would also be important to further examine women’s understanding of their own behaviours and if they realise that their non-sexual behaviours are interpreted as sexual.

In addition, the methodological issues in Study 1 in terms of the categorisation of women could be addressed. It might be beneficial to only
include three categories and use more distinct forms of categories such as a married woman, an acquaintance and a sex worker. It might also be beneficial to include qualitative questions to get an understanding of the thinking processes involved when men try to establish consent within a sexual interaction with a woman in the general population.

Further, future research could expand on the findings of Study 2 by examining clients of street or massage parlour sex workers, particularly as past research suggests street sex workers are the sex workers who are most frequently exposed to violence. In addition future research on clients of sex workers could expand on the relationship between personality measures and perceptions of sexual consent, as Study 2 did not include a large enough sample to possibly generalise all of the results. Further it might be the case that, due the small sample size, some of the effects of personality traits might not have been detected. It might be the case that, depending on where clients seek sex workers, their personality and demographic characteristics may vary.

**Concluding comments**

The aim of this thesis was to get an understanding of men’s perceptions of sexual consent. The outcomes of this thesis were that men do not merely rely on verbal signals of consent to establish if consent has been given, rather there are other factors involved. Men’s perceptions of where they fall on a continuum of consent can be differentiated through personality measures and it was found that those men that rated higher on personality traits associated with sexually aggressive behaviours were more likely to perceive consent had been given in a
rape scenario. Men’s perceptions of consent also change depending on whether a woman is in a relationship or not. A woman in a relationship is seen as more likely to have given consent to a sexual interaction in a rape scenario, has less right to refuse a sexual interaction and was less coerced. These findings indicate that men’s perceptions of consent vary and that sexual consent cannot be conceptualised as either given or not given. Further, the results have implications for both men and women when it comes to interactions with the opposite sex. Women need to be aware or should be made aware of the fact that men tend to over-sexualise their non sexual behaviours and that this might have the potential to put them in situations where men misperceive their sexual intentions and their refusals to sexual interactions. Men, on the other had, should acknowledge that verbal communication of sexual consent should be taken seriously and that there is no room for interpretations. Further, it might be important to educate both sexes about the importance of openly communicating about sex in general and in particular about their sexual intentions. Some men may perceive an invitation to their apartment as an indirect request for sex and, consequently, they might perceive the woman’s acceptance of this invitation as consent. Further, it appeared that a subpopulation of men which were clients of prostitutes have a clearer understanding of what constitutes consent than non-clients. This might have been the case as the establishment of consent within an interaction with a sex worker appears to be a very structured procedure, which includes clear verbal communication. The practice of this procedure appeared to have sensitised these men to cues of sexual consent, which indicates that clear communication has a positive impact on perceptions of sexual consent. This might have a positive
impact when these men interact sexually with women in the general population, as they appear to be more aware of signals of consent.
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Appendix 1

Plain Language Statement (Study 1)
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: PARTICIPANTS

Plain Language Statement

Date: 30/01/2012

Full Project Title: Consent: Male interpretations of sexual interactions

Principal Researcher: Dr Eric Koukounas

Student Researcher: Sabrina Nagiller

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to examine differences in male perceptions of sexual consent and the association to implicit theories, differing attachment styles, hostile masculinity and impersonal sex. This project will be used as a thesis for a Doctorate in Forensic Psychology degree.

A total of 500 men will participate in this project.

Previous research has shown that misperception of sexual consent may be a strong predictor of sexual assault, sexual harassment or acquaintance rape. Most previous research has compared male to female perceptions about consent.
However, men’s views about consent are likely to fall on a continuum. Therefore, it is important to investigate men’s perceptions on sexual consent and the associated correlates of these views.

You are invited to participate in this research project because participation will increase our knowledge base concerning male interpretations of sexual consent. The interpretation of sexual consent is a ubiquitous phenomenon in our society and has the potential for emotional damage if misused, for example, in the case of date rape.

The results of this research will be used to help researcher Sabrina Nagiller to obtain a Doctorate degree.

**Methods**

At the beginning of the test session, participants will complete some questionnaires asking a series of personal questions. These questionnaires will include:

- Hostility Toward Women Scale (Check, Malamuth, Elias, & Barton, 1985)
- Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Burt)
- The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: 20 item scale (Russell, Peplau, & Curtona, 1980)
- Interpersonal Violence scale (Burt, 1980)
- Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980)
- Sexual Dominance Scale (Nelson, 1979)
- The Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994)
- Socio-Sexual Effectiveness Scale (Quackenbush, 1989)

**Demands**
The research aims to investigate the different ways in which men perceive a sexual situation as consensual. The research also examines the possible reason that people decide a sexual situation is consensual, such as personality traits, social skills and past experience.

In particular, men are required with various sexual experiences, including men who have ever visited a prostitute.

Participants will be asked to complete a package of questionnaires, which will include questions about one’s personality and sexual experience e.g., I experience difficulty in understanding if a woman/man desires sexual intercourse; Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve. In addition, participants will be asked to read and answer questions about two brief scenarios of two individuals participating in a potential sexual interaction.

The study should take approximately 30 minutes and can be conducted on any computer at a time convenient to the participant.

Risks and potential benefits to participants

Possible benefits include a greater understanding of male perception on sexual consent and its interpretation. Investigation of the underlying factors contributing towards misperception of sexual consent can result in information that can be used to educate others about communication with the opposite sex and improve understanding of a sexual situation. Our research may have implications for reducing the frequency of date rape, sexual assault and sexual harassment. We cannot guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this project.
Possible risks, side effects and discomfort include minimal risk to participants, ie. No more than everyday risk. There may be additional or unknown risks. There are no foreseeable risks should participants choose to withdraw from the study. If you experience distress, you may suspend or end your participation in the study any time. **Participants can contact Care Ring Crisis Line: 13 61 69 in cases of distress or discomfort.** Deakin University students can contact Deakin University Student Life Counselling Services (03 9244 6300) if they feel they may need some advice or help in the relation to any personal concern.

**Any expected benefits to the wider community**

A greater understanding of the misperception of sexual consent is a valuable topic to explore, to expand our understanding of faulty interpretations of sexual interactions. Investigation of the underlying psychological factors contributing towards misinterpretations of sexual interactions can be used to gain an understanding what leads to sexual violence and sexual assault. Therefore our research may have implications for reducing the frequency of date rape, sexual assault and sexual harassment.

**Provision of services to participants adversely affected by the research [if adverse effects are anticipated]**

There are no anticipated adverse effects. If participants find that they are experiencing any anxiety, they will be referred to counseling services.
How privacy and confidentiality will be protected

Data will be collected through a non-identifiable questionnaire.

The likelihood and form of dissemination of the research results, including publication and how research participants can access results of the study if they want to

Due to confidentiality, information collected isn't coded or personally identifiable, thus we don't know what results belong to each participant. All we have is group data and analyses

Communication of results will be through the thesis and subsequent possible publication

How the research will be monitored

Researchers will be adhering to a set timetable for data collection and data analysis.

The principal supervisor who has prior experience with this subject and methodology will be overseeing the entire process.

Any payments to participants;

No payment will be offered for participation.

The amounts and sources of funding for the research;
Funding will be provided for printing and materials by the School of Psychology.

There is no grant. Funding will be provided for printing of materials only.

**Financial or other relevant declarations of interests of researchers, sponsors and institutions**

Not applicable

Any alternatives to participation [generally applies only to health research or where participation in research forms part of a Deakin student’s assessment];

Not applicable

The participant’s right to withdraw from further participation at any stage, along with any implications of withdrawal [implications of withdrawal typically relate to health research only], and whether it will be possible to withdraw their data

Participation in any research project is voluntary. **If you do not wish to take part you are not obliged to.** If you decide to take part and later change your mind, you are free to withdraw from the project at any stage while you are being tested. From this stage, as your results are non-identifiable, we cannot access your data. Any information obtained from you to date will not be used.

Your decision whether to take part or not to take part, or to take part and then withdraw, will not affect your relationship with Deakin University.
Before you make your decision, a member of the research team will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project. You can ask for any information you want. Sign the Consent Form only after you have had a chance to ask your questions and have received satisfactory answers.

If you decide to withdraw from this project, please notify a member of the research team or complete and return the Revocation of Consent Form attached. This notice will allow the research team to inform you if there are any health risks or special requirements linked to withdrawing.

Contact details of the researchers [at least one Deakin researcher’s details should be included, with a local contact provided for overseas research. Work or mobile phone numbers may be used but home phone numbers should not be included]

Principal Researcher: Dr Eric Koukounas

School of Psychology

Deakin University

221 Burwood Hwy

Burwood VIC 3125

PH: (03) 9244 6855

FAX: (03) 9244 6858

The complaints clause listed below:
Complaints

If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Research Integrity, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, Facsimile: 9244 6581;
research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number EC00213.

Appendix 2

Questionnaire Used For Study 1
SUBJECT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your gender (i.e. male/female)?

2. What is your age?

3. What is your marital status?
   a. Single – living with parents
   b. Single – living alone or with friends
   c. Single – living with lover/sexual partner
   d. Married
   e. Divorced/ Separated/ Widowed – living without partner
   f. Divorced/ Separated/ Widowed – living with partner
   g. Other – please specify

4. Do you currently have:
   a. No sexual partners?
   b. Casual sexual partners?
   c. A monogamous sexual partner?
5. Do you currently have....

   a. No sexual partners?  
   b. Casual sexual partners?  
   c. A monogamous sexual partner?

6. What is the longest time you have spent in a sexual relationship (including current relationship)?

   a. Never had a sexual relationship  
   b. Less than a month  
   c. 1 to 6 months  
   d. 6 to 12 months  
   e. More than a year

7. What is your highest level of education completed?

   a. Primary school
8. **Do you currently have any religious affiliation?**
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. **Have you ever visited a sex worker?**
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. **When was the last time you visited a sex worker?**
    a. Last Week
    b. Less than a month ago
    c. 1 to 6 months ago
    d. 6 to 12 months ago
    e. More than a year

11. **How regularly do you visit a sex worker?**
a. Once a week

b. More than once a week

c. Once a month

d. More than once a month

e. Once a year

f. More than once a year

12. What are your reasons for visiting a sex worker?

a. Company

b. Uncomplicated sex

c. A high sex urge

d. Sex with a variety of women

e. Relief of stress

f. Only sexual outlet available

g. Sex workers are less likely to have a sexually transmitted disease than non sex workers

h. A particular service

i. Other, please state
13. Where do you usually seek the services of a sex worker, street sex worker, massage parlor...?

a. Street

b. Brothel

c. Escort Agency

d. Massage Parlor

.............e. Other, please state ............
Section Two: Case Scenarios

Scenario 1:

Sally is in her mid twenties and has just started work at a real estate company. At the yearly Christmas party she was introduced to employees from other branches and this is where she met David. David is in his mid thirties and has been working for the company for nearly 12 years. During the party they spent most of the time talking to each other and they discovered some shared interests such as travelling and reading. David invited Sally to contact her in the future if she wanted any tips on how to be successful in the business. At the end of the Christmas party, David asked Sally for her mobile phone number so they could talk about the business, which Sally happily provided.

After a few later phone conversations about business the conversation topics became less about business and David finally asked Sally out on a dinner date. After dinner, David asked Sally to come home with him to have a cup of coffee Sally agreed to this. At the apartment David and Sally were sitting on the couch, listening to some music they both enjoyed, drinking coffee. After a while David and Sally started to kiss. David put his hand on Sally’s breasts caressing them. Sally started to stroke David’s back and kissed him more passionately. After a while David tried to open Sally’s jeans.

Alternative 1a: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David stopped at this point and Sally left his apartment shortly after.
Alternative 1b: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David said that Sally had been chasing him for months and that she played games now. Sally again asked David again to stop and repeated that she did not want to have sex with him. David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, and forced himself onto her and had sex with her.

Scenario 2:

Over a year ago, Sally and David met at a Christmas function at a real estate company. Sally was in her mid twenties and had just started work at a real estate company. At the yearly Christmas party she was introduced to employees from other branches and this is where she met David. David was in his mid thirties and has been working for the company for nearly 12 years. During the party they spent most of the time talking to each other and they discovered some shared interests such as travelling and reading. David invited Sally to contact her in the future if she wanted any tips on how to be successful in the business. At the end of the Christmas party, David asked Sally for her mobile phone number so they could talk about the business, which Sally happily provided. After a few later phone conversations about business the conversation topics became less about business and David finally asked Sally out on a dinner date.

Since then they have been going out for a year. On this particular occasion, on their one year anniversary David invited Sally out for a romantic dinner. After dinner, David asked Sally to come home with him to have a cup of coffee Sally agreed to this. At the apartment David and Sally were sitting on the
couch, listening to some music they both enjoyed, drinking coffee. After a while David and Sally started to kiss. David put his hand on Sally’s breasts caressing them. Sally started to stroke David’s back and kissed him more passionately. After a while David tried to open Sally’s jeans.

**Alternative 2a:** David suggested that given that it was their anniversary, they should have sex. At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she felt tired and wasn’t in the mood to have sex. David stopped at this point and Sally left his apartment shortly after.

**Alternative 2b:** David suggested that given that it was their anniversary, they should have sex. At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she felt tired and wasn’t in the mood to have sex. David dismissed her words and told Sally that it is their anniversary and that they should have sex. He then held both of her hands and started to engage in sex.

**Scenario 3:**

Sally is in her mid twenties and has just started work at a real estate company. At the yearly Christmas party she was introduced to employees from other branches and this is where she met David. David is in his mid thirties and has been working for the company for nearly 12 years. During the party they spent most of the time talking to each other and they discovered some shared interests such as travelling and reading. David invited Sally to contact her in the future if she wanted any tips on how to be successful in the business. At the end
After a few later phone conversations about business the conversation topics became less about business and David finally asked Sally out on a dinner date. After dinner, David asked Sally to come home with him to have a cup of coffee Sally agreed to this. At the apartment David and Sally were sitting on the couch, listening to some music they both enjoyed, drinking coffee. After a while David and Sally started to kiss. At this point, Sally interrupted David and mentioned that she wants to confide something in him. Sally mentioned that she used to be a stripper up until she got the real estate job. David said that it didn’t matter to him and they continued kissing. David put his hand on Sally’s breasts caressing them. Sally started to stroke David’s back and kissed him more passionately. After a while David tried to open Sally’s jeans.

Alternative 3a: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David stopped at this point and Sally left his apartment shortly after.

Alternative 3b: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David said that Sally had been chasing him for months and that she used to be a stripper and is playing games now. Sally again asked David again to stop and repeated that she did not want to have sex with him. David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, and forced himself onto her and had sex with her.
**Scenario 4:**

Sally is in her mid twenties and has just started work at a real estate company. At the yearly Christmas party she was introduced to employees from other branches and this is where she met David. David is in his mid thirties and has been working for the company for nearly 12 years. During the party they spent most of the time talking to each other and they discovered some shared interests such as travelling and reading. David invited Sally to contact her in the future if she wanted any tips on how to be successful in the business. At the end of the Christmas party, David asked Sally for her mobile phone number so they could talk about the business, which Sally happily provided.

After a few later phone conversations about business the conversation topics became less about business and David finally asked Sally out on a dinner date. After dinner, David asked Sally to come home with him to have a cup of coffee Sally agreed to this. At the apartment David and Sally were sitting on the couch, listening to some music they both enjoyed, drinking coffee. After a while David and Sally started to kiss. At this point, Sally interrupted David and mentioned that she wants to confide something in him. Sally mentioned that she used to be a prostitute up until she got the real estate job. David said that it didn’t matter to him and they continued kissing. David put his hand on Sally’s breasts caressing them. Sally started to stroke David’s back and kissed him more passionately. After a while David tried to open Sally’s jeans.
Alternative 4a: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David stopped at this point and Sally left his apartment shortly after.

Alternative 4b: At that point Sally stopped kissing David and told him that she was not ready to go any further. David said that Sally had been chasing him for months and that she used to be a prostitute and is playing games now. Sally again asked David again to stop and repeated that she did not want to have sex with him. David then pushed Sally on the couch while holding both of her hands, and forced himself onto her and had sex with her.

QUESTIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE SCENARIO

In deciding your reactions to the scenarios, use the scale below (1-7) to answer each question. Please write a number in the box next to each question and please do not leave any question unanswered.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6-----------

-7

Not at all Moderately Extremely

To assist you in answering the questions about the scenarios, the following terms have been defined:
**Flirtatious:** “Behaving as if one is amorously attracted to another person”

**Seductive:** “Behaving in a sexually attractive way in order to persuade another person to have sexual intercourse”

**Promiscuous:** “Behaving as if they have an indiscriminate number of casual sexual relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How flirtatious was Sally in the scenario?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How seductive was Sally in the scenario?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How promiscuous was Sally in the scenario?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How indicative was Sally’s behaviour of wanting to engage in a sexual interaction?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you rate the seriousness of this situation on the continuum below?

*Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided*

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Not Serious  Extremely

Serious

6. Do you agree that Sally consented to the sexual interaction?
7. How would you rate Sally’s behaviour to refuse sexual intercourse?

(Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided)

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

8. How would you rate David’s behaviour?

(Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided)

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Not Justified

Justified

9. How do you think Sally would perceive David’s behaviour?

(Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided)

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Not Violent

Extremely Violent

Violent
10. How do you think David would perceive Sally’s behaviour to stop the sexual interaction?

(Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided)

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Not Threatening                      Extremely Threatening

11. Do you agree that Sally had the right to try and stop the sexual interaction?

(Please place a mark anywhere on the line provided)

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
Section Three

**Social-Sexual Effectiveness Scale**

*In describing your relationships with the opposite sex, use the scale below (1-7) to rate how true of YOU each statement is. Please write a number next to each statement – please do not leave any statement unmarked.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Always or almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>always true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have trouble initiating conversations with women/men
2. I can “read” a woman/man
3. I have difficulty expressing my interest in a woman/man
4. I feel uncomfortable when around women/men
5. I know what to say to a woman/man
6. I have difficulty perceiving interest from women/men
7. I feel anxious when on a date
8. I experience difficulty in understanding if a woman/man desires sexual intercourse
9. I know how to act with women/men
10. Women/men misinterpret the level of level of intimacy I desire
11. I experience difficulty in telling a woman/man that I want sexual intercourse
12. I feel comfortable in my role with women/men
13. In social situations, I’m more comfortable with members of my own sex
14. I am satisfied in my relationships with women/men

**The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale**

*Directions: Indicate how often you feel the way described in each of the following statements. Circle one number each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel in tune with the people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I lack companionship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is no one I can turn to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not feel alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel part of a group of people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a lot in common with people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am no longer close to anyone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am an outgoing person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There are people I feel close to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel left out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My social relationships are superficial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. No one really knows me well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel isolated from others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I can find companionship when I want it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There are people who really understand me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. I am unhappy being so withdrawn 1 2 3 4
18. People are around me but not with me 1 2 3 4
19. There are people I can talk to 1 2 3 4
20. There are people I can turn to 1 2 3 4

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the statements below

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree Strongly disagree

2. Any female can get raped.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
8. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?

(1) ...................(2) ...................(3) ...................(4) ...................(5)

Almost       About ¼       About half       About 1/4       About none
All

13. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?

(1) ...................(2) ...................(3) ...................(4) ...................(5)

Almost       About ¼       About half       About 1/4       About none
All

14. A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you believe their statement if the person were:

your best friend?

an Indian woman?

a neighborhood woman?

a young boy

a black woman?
Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to assess your feelings towards women. Thus, all of the statements on this page refer to women. Please read each statement carefully and circle T (True) if the statement describes your feelings and F (False) if the statement does not describe your feelings or if you disagree with it.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel upset even by slight criticism by a woman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It doesn’t really bother me when women tease me about my faults</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I used to think that most women told the truth, but now I know otherwise</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not believe that women will walk all over you if you aren’t willing to fight</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not often find myself disagreeing with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do very few things to women that make me feel remorseful afterward</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I rarely become suspicious with women who are more friendly than I expected</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are a number of females who seem to dislike me very much</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don’t agree that women always seem to get the breaks</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don’t seem to get what’s coming to me in my relationships with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I generally don’t get really angry when a woman makes fun of me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Women irritate me a great deal more than they are aware of</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If I let women see the way I feel, they would probably consider me a hard person to get along with</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lately, I have been kind of grouchy with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I think that most women would not lie to get ahead</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It is safer not to trust women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I am not easily angered by a woman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I often feel that women probably think I have not lived the right kind of life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I never have hostile feelings that make me feel ashamed of myself later</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Many times a woman appears to care, but just wants to use you</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I don’t usually wonder what hidden reason a woman may have for doing something nice for me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If women had not had it in for me, I would have been more successful in my personal relations with them</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I never have the feeling that women laugh about me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Very few women talk about me behind my back</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>When I look back at what’s happened to me, I don’t feel at all resentful toward the women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I never sulk when a woman makes me angry</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I have been rejected by too many women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale

*Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements listed below*

1. A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree               Strongly disagree

2. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree               Strongly disagree

3. A man is never justified in hitting his wife

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree               Strongly disagree

4. Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women
5. People today should not use “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” as a rule for living

6. Many times a woman will pretend she doesn’t want to have intercourse because she doesn’t want to seem loose, but she is really hoping the man will force her
Adversarial sexual beliefs

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements listed below

1. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

2. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can’t satisfy them.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

3. A man’s got to show a woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked.
4. Women are usually sweet until they have caught a man, but then they let their true self show.

5. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can’t perform well sexually.

6. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.

7. Men are out for only one thing.
8. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to take advantage of a man.

9. A lot of women seem to get pleasure in putting men down.

Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ)

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which you believe each statement best describes your feelings about close relationships. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all like me</td>
<td>...............</td>
<td>Somewhat like me</td>
<td>...............</td>
<td>Very much like me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. I find it difficult to depend on other people.
___ 2. It is very important to me to feel independent.
3. I find it easy to get emotionally close to others.
4. I want to merge completely with another person.
5. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.
6. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships.
7. I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them.
8. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others.
9. I worry about being alone.
10. I am comfortable depending on other people.
11. I often worry that romantic partners don't really love me.
12. I find it difficult to trust others completely.
13. I worry about others getting too close to me.
15. I am comfortable having other people depend on me.
16. I worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.
17. People are never there when you need them.
18. My desire to merge completely sometimes scares people away.
19. It is very important to me to feel self-sufficient.
20. I am nervous when anyone gets too close to me.
21. I often worry that romantic partners won't want to stay with me.
22. I prefer not to have other people depend on me.
23. I worry about being abandoned.
24. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.
25. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
26. I prefer not to depend on others.
27. I know that others will be there when I need them.
28. I worry about having others not accept me.
29. Romantic partners often want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being.
30. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.

**Sexual Dominance Scale**

1. I like the feeling that I really have someone in my grasp.

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

2. I enjoy the feeling of being overwhelmed by my partner.

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

3. Sex allows me to feel vulnerable.

   1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

   Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

4. I enjoy the feeling of giving in to my partner.
5. In the act of sex more than at any other time I get the feeling that I can really influence how someone feels and behaves.

6. I like the feeling of being out of control and dominated by another.

7. I like it when my partner is really open and vulnerable to me.

8. When my partner finally surrenders to me I get this incredibly satisfying feeling.
1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree          Strongly disagree
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Ethics Approval (Study 1)
Memorandum

To  Dr Eric Koukounas
    School of Psychology

From  Secretary – HEAG-H,
      Faculty of Health

Subject  HEAG-H 10_2012: Consent: Male interpretations of sexual interactions

Date  19th March, 2012

Approval has been given for Dr Eric Koukounas, School of Psychology, to undertake this project for a period of 2 years from 19 March 2012. The current end date for this project is 19 March 2014.

The approval given by the Deakin University HEAG - H is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Secretary immediately should any of the following occur:

- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time
- Any events which might affect the continuing ethical acceptability of the project
- The project is discontinued before the expected date of completion
- Modifications that have been requested by other Human Research Ethics Committees

In addition you will be required to report on the progress of your project at least once every year and at the conclusion of the project. Failure to report as required will result in suspension of your approval to proceed with the project.

HEAG-H may need to audit this project as part of the requirements for monitoring set out in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). An Annual Project Report Form can be found at http://www.deakin.edu.au/hmnhs/research/ethics/ethicssubmissionprocess.php which you will be required to complete in relation to this research. This should be completed and returned to the Administrative Officer to the HEAG-H, Pro-Vice Chancellor’s office, Faculty of Health, Burwood campus by Tuesday 20th November, 2012 and when the project is completed.

Good luck with the project!

Signature Redacted by Library
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Plain Language Statement (Study 2)
TO: PARTICIPANTS

Plain Language Statement

Date: 18/02/2013

Full Project Title: Consent and the clients of sex workers

Principal Researcher: Dr Eric Koukounas

Student Researcher: Sabrina Nagiller

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to examine clients of sex workers perceptions of sexual consent within the client-sex worker interaction. This project will be used as a thesis for a Doctorate in Psychology (Forensic) degree.

A total of 200 men will participate in this project.

Sexual consent is an important concept that defines if a sexual interaction between two people is mutually agreed upon. Past research has focused on how consent is communicated and gender differences in perception and
communication of sexual consent. However, sexual consent has not been
investigated in such a specific area. Therefore, it is important to investigate
clients of sex workers perceptions on sexual consent and the associated correlates
of these views.

You are invited to participate in this research project because participation
will increase our knowledge base concerning male interpretations of sexual
consent. The interpretation of sexual consent is a ubiquitous phenomenon in our
society and has the potential for emotional damage if misused, for example, in the
case of date rape.

The results of this research will be used to help researcher Sabrina
Nagiller to obtain a Doctorate degree.

**Methods**

Participants will be asked to fill in an online questionnaire regarding their
experiences with sex workers.

**Demands**

The research aims to investigate the different ways in which clients of sex
workers perceive a sexual situation as consensual within the client sex worker
interaction. The research also examines the possible reason that men decide a
sexual situation is consensual, such as attitudes towards sex workers.
Participants will be asked to provide some demographic information e.g., What is your age? How frequently do you visit? Then participants will be asked about their experiences with sex workers e.g., How important are specific physical features, such as breast size, of the sex worker? Is it common to bargain with the sex worker? Is it important to you that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction with you?

**Participant tasks**

Participants are required to follow an online link to access the questionnaire. The participation in this project is voluntary. By completing the questionnaire the participant implies consent. Participants are completely anonymous.

The questionnaire takes about 30 minutes to be filled out.

**Risks and potential benefits to participants**

Possible benefits may include a greater understanding of your own perception on sexual consent and your interaction with sex workers. Our research may have implications for reducing the frequency of sexual assault and sexual harassment. We cannot guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this project.
Possible risks, side effects and discomfort include minimal risk to participants, ie. No more than everyday risk. As this is an interview you will be able to indicate during the interview if you wish not to answer a question or if you experience discomfort. Should this be the case the interview can be suspended and you are able at any time during the interview to withdraw consent. There may be additional or unknown risks. There are no foreseeable risks should participants choose to withdraw from the study. Participants can contact Care Ring Crisis Line: 13 61 69 in cases of distress or discomfort.

Any expected benefits to the wider community

A greater understanding of the misperception of sexual consent is a valuable topic to explore, to expand our understanding of faulty interpretations of sexual interactions. Investigation of the underlying psychological factors contributing towards misinterpretations of sexual interactions can be used to gain an understanding what leads to sexual violence and sexual assault. Therefore our research may have implications for reducing the frequency of sexual assault and sexual harassment.

Provision of services to participants adversely affected by the research

There are no anticipated adverse effects. If participants find that they are experiencing any anxiety, they will be referred to counseling services.
How privacy and confidentiality will be protected

Data will be collected through an online questionnaire that does not require participants to reveal their identity.

The likelihood and form of dissemination of the research results, including publication and how research participants can access results of the study if they want to

Due to confidentiality, information collected isn't coded or personally identifiable, thus we don't know what results belong to each participant. All we have is group data and analyses

Communication of results will be through the thesis and subsequent possible publication

How the research will be monitored

Researchers will be adhering to a set timetable for data collection and data analysis.

The principal supervisor who has prior experience with this subject and methodology will be overseeing the entire process.

Any payments to participants;

Participants will go into a draw to win one of two $50 gift vouchers.

The amounts and sources of funding for the research;
Funding will be provided for the voucher, printing and materials by the School of Psychology

Financial or other relevant declarations of interests of researchers, sponsors and institutions

Not applicable

Any alternatives to participation

Not applicable

The participant’s right to withdraw from further participation at any stage, along with any implications of withdrawal, and whether it will be possible to withdraw their data

Participation in any research project is voluntary. **If you do not wish to take part you are not obliged to.** If you decide to take part and later change your mind, you are free to withdraw from the project at any stage while you are being tested. From this stage, as your results are non-identifiable, we cannot access your data. Any information obtained from you to date will not be used.

Your decision whether to take part or not to take part, or to take part and then withdraw, will not affect your relationship with Deakin University.

Before you make your decision, a member of the research team will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project. You can
ask for any information you want. Consent will be implied if you attend the
online interview. However, you are able to withdraw consent anytime during and
after the interview. Your data will not be used if you withdraw consent.

Contact details of the researchers

Principal Researcher: Dr Eric Koukounas

School of Psychology
Deakin University
221 Burwood Hwy
Burwood VIC 3125

PH: (03) 9244 6855

FAX: (03) 9244 6858

Associate Researcher: Sabrina Nagiller

School of Psychology
Deakin University
221 Burwood Hwy
Burwood VIC 3125
senag@deakin.edu.au

The complaints clause listed below:
Complaints

If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Research Integrity, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, Facsimile: 9244 6581; research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number 2013-14.
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Questionnaire Used For Study 2
SUBJECT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Have you ever visited a sex worker?
   a. If yes please answer the questions below
   b. If no, thank you for your time

2. What is your gender (i.e. male/female)?

3. What is your age?

4. Are you a) heterosexual, b) homosexual, c) bisexual

5. What is your marital status?
   a. Single – living with parents
   b. Single – living alone or with friends
   c. Single – living with lover/sexual partner
   d. Married
   e. Divorced/ Separated/ Widowed – living without partner
   f. Divorced/ Separated/ Widowed – living with partner
   g. Other – please specify

6. Do you currently have….
a. No sexual partners?

b. Casual sexual partners?

c. A monogamous sexual partner?

7. What is the longest time you have spent in a sexual relationship (including current relationship)?

a. Never had a sexual relationship

b. Less than a month

c. 1 to 6 months

d. 6 to 12 months

e. More than a year

8. What is your highest level of education completed?

a. Primary school

b. Secondary school

c. University
9. Do you have any particular religious affiliation?

If yes, please state………………………………………………

10. When was the last time you visited a sex worker?

   a. Last Week

   b. Less than a month ago

   c. 1 to 6 months ago

   d. 6 to 12 months ago

   e. More than a year

11. How regularly do you visit a sex worker?

   a. Once a week

   b. More than once a week

   c. Once a month

   d. More than once a month

   e. Once a year

   .............f. More than once a year
12. What are your reasons for visiting a sex worker?

   a. Company
   b. Uncomplicated sex
   c. A high sex urge
   d. Sex with a variety of women
   e. Relief of stress
   f. Only sexual outlet available
   g. Sex workers are less likely to have a sexually transmitted disease than non sex workers
   h. A particular service
   i. Other, please state

13. Where do you usually seek the services of a sex worker, street sex worker, massage parlor...?

   a. Street
   b. Brothel
   c. Escort Agency
   d. Massage Parlor
14. Do you usually go to the same sex worker? Please explain why or why not?

........................................................................................................

15. How do you negotiate what sexual service you would like from the sex worker?

Please explain...

16. Is it common to bargain with the sex worker for the price of the service?

If yes, please explain why........................................................................

If no, please explain why not......................................................................

17. Is it important to you that the sex worker enjoys the sexual interaction with you?

If yes, please explain why........................................................................

If no, please explain why not......................................................................

18. Have you ever changed your mind about the sexual service you would like to receive, which was not part of what was agreed upon at the outset of the sexual interaction?
If yes, how did you communicate this?

If no, please move on to the next question

19. In your opinion, when you interact with a sex worker what is it that you are buying? Is it time, the service, the sex worker’s emotion, the body, the whole person?

   a. Time
   b. A particular service
   c. An emotional connection
   d. The sex worker’s body
   e. The whole person
   i. Other, please state

20. Do you think it is easier to communicate and interact with a sex worker than other women?

   If yes, why

   If no, why not

21. Sexual consent refers to a freely given verbal or nonverbal communication of a feeling of willingness to engage in sexual activity. **When you pay for the services** of a sex worker, does this signify sexual consent?

   If yes please explain
If no please explain

22. What does consent within a sexual interaction mean to you? Please Explain

23. Does communication of sexual consent differ when you interact with a sex worker compared to a woman in the general population?

If yes please explain why and how

If no, please explain why not
### Social-Sexual Effectiveness Scale

*In describing your relationships with the opposite sex, use the scale below (1-7) to rate how true of YOU each statement is. Please write a number next to each statement – please do not leave any statement unmarked.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Always or almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>always true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have trouble initiating conversations with women/men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can “read” a woman/man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have difficulty expressing my interest in a woman/man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel uncomfortable when around women/men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I know what to say to a woman/man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have difficulty perceiving interest from women/men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel anxious when on a date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I experience difficulty in understanding if a woman/man desires sexual intercourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know how to act with women/men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Women/men misinterpret the level of level of intimacy I desire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I experience difficulty in telling a woman/man that I want sexual intercourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel comfortable in my role with women/men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In social situations, I’m more comfortable with members of my own sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I am satisfied in my relationships with women/men

**The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale**

*Directions: Indicate how often you feel the way described in each of the following statements. Circle one number each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel in tune with the people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I lack companionship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There is no one I can turn to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I do not feel alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel part of a group of people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I have a lot in common with people around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am no longer close to anyone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am an outgoing person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. There are people I feel close to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I feel left out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My social relationships are superficial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. No one really knows me well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I feel isolated from others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I can find companionship when I want it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. There are people who really understand me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. I am unhappy being so withdrawn 1 2 3 4
38. People are around me but not with me 1 2 3 4
39. There are people I can talk to 1 2 3 4
40. There are people I can turn to 1 2 3 4

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the statements below

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

16. Any female can get raped.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
18. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
22. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

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

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
26. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?

(1)..........................(2)......................(3)......................(4)......................(5)

Almost    About ¼    About half    About 1/4    About
All        none

27. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?

(1)..........................(2)......................(3)......................(4)......................(5)

Almost    About ¼    About half    About 1/4    About
All        none

28. A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you believe their statement if the person were:

  your best friend?
  an Indian woman?
  a neighborhood woman?
  a young boy
  a black woman?
Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to assess your feelings towards women. Thus, all of the statements on this page refer to women. Please read each statement carefully and circle T (True) if the statement describes your feelings and F (False) if the statement does not describe your feelings or if you disagree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel upset even by slight criticism by a woman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It doesn’t really bother me when women tease me about my faults</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I used to think that most women told the truth, but now I know otherwise</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not believe that women will walk all over you if you aren’t willing to fight</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not often find myself disagreeing with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do very few things to women that make me feel remorseful afterward</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I rarely become suspicious with women who are more friendly than I expected</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are a number of females who seem to dislike me very much</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don’t agree that women always seem to get the breaks</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don’t seem to get what’s coming to me in my relationships with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I generally don’t get really angry when a woman makes fun of me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Women irritate me a great deal more than they are aware of</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If I let women see the way I feel, they would probably consider me a hard person to get along with</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lately, I have been kind of grouchy with women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I think that most women would not lie to get ahead</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It is safer not to trust women</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I am not easily angered by a woman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I often feel that women probably think I have not lived the right kind of life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I never have hostile feelings that make me feel ashamed of myself later</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Many times a woman appears to care, but just wants to use you</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I don’t usually wonder what hidden reason a woman may have for doing something nice for me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If women had not had it in for me, I would have been more successful in my personal relations with them</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I never have the feeling that women laugh about me</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Very few women talk about me behind my back</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>When I look back at what’s happened to me, I don’t feel at all resentful toward the women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I never sulk when a woman makes me angry</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I have been rejected by too many women in my life</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale

*Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements listed below*

10. A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

11. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

12. A man is never justified in hitting his wife

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

13. Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women
14. People today should not use “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” as a rule for living

15. Many times a woman will pretend she doesn’t want to have intercourse because she doesn’t want to seem loose, but she is really hoping the man will force her
Adversarial sexual beliefs

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements listed below

10. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

11. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can’t satisfy them.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
Strongly agree              Strongly disagree

12. A man’s got to show a woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7
Strongly agree              Strongly disagree
13. Women are usually sweet until they have caught a man, but then they let their true self show.

1 - Strongly agree 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - Strongly disagree

14. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can’t perform well sexually.

1 - Strongly agree 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - Strongly disagree

15. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.

1 - Strongly agree 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - Strongly disagree

16. Men are out for only one thing.

1 - Strongly agree 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - Strongly disagree
17. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to take advantage of a man.

1-2-3-4-5-6-7

Strongly agree

18. A lot of women seem to get pleasure in putting men down.

1-2-3-4-5-6-7

Strongly agree

**Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ)**

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which you believe each statement best describes your feelings about close relationships. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. I find it difficult to depend on other people.
___ 2. It is very important to me to feel independent.
___ 3. I find it easy to get emotionally close to others.
___ 4. I want to merge completely with another person.
___ 5. I worry that I will be hurt if I allows myself to become too close to others.
___ 6. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships.
7. I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them.

8. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others.

9. I worry about being alone.

10. I am comfortable depending on other people.

11. I often worry that romantic partners don't really love me.

12. I find it difficult to trust others completely.

13. I worry about others getting too close to me.


15. I am comfortable having other people depend on me.

16. I worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

17. People are never there when you need them.

18. My desire to merge completely sometimes scares people away.

19. It is very important to me to feel self-sufficient.

20. I am nervous when anyone gets too close to me.

21. I often worry that romantic partners won't want to stay with me.

22. I prefer not to have other people depend on me.

23. I worry about being abandoned.

24. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.

25. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.

26. I prefer not to depend on others.

27. I know that others will be there when I need them.

28. I worry about having others not accept me.

29. Romantic partners often want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being.

30. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
**Sexual Dominance Scale**

16. I like the feeling that I really have someone in my grasp.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

17. I enjoy the feeling of being overwhelmed by my partner.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

18. Sex allows me to feel vulnerable.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree

19. I enjoy the feeling of giving in to my partner.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree  Strongly disagree
20. In the act of sex more than at any other time I get the feeling that I can really influence how someone feels and behaves.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree
Strongly disagree

21. I like the feeling of being out of control and dominated by another.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree
Strongly disagree

22. I like it when my partner is really open and vulnerable to me.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree
Strongly disagree

23. When my partner finally surrenders to me I get this incredibly satisfying feeling.

1------------2------------3------------4------------5------------6------------7

Strongly agree
Strongly disagree
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