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ABSTRACT

In these three studies I attempt to explore reasons behind the differences in receptivity of men and women to dating and sexual offers from perfect strangers and whether responses vary by gender. For Studies 1 and 2, I hypothesized that there would be (1) a main effect for type of request, (2) a main effect for gender, and (3) an interaction between Gender and Type of Request. For Study 3, I additionally hypothesized that responses for both men and women would decline the more sexually explicit the offer becomes and that there would no longer be an interaction effect. My main hypotheses were supported in Study 2, but not in Studies 1 and 3, however while I did not secure main effects I did find significant simple effects for Gender and Type of Request for both studies. The third hypothesis from Study 3 was also supported (p< .05).
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CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

One of the most cited series of experiments in social psychology is a trio of studies conducted by Clark and Hatfield (1989, 2003) and Clark (1990). In these studies, college students conducted a simple field experiment. Confederates approached fellow college students of the opposite sex and asked one of three questions: (a) “Would you go out with me tonight?” (b) “Would you come over to my apartment tonight?” or (c) “Would you go to bed with me tonight?” In the initial study, published in 1989, the authors discovered that men and women differed markedly in their receptivity to casual sexual offers. The two subsequent replication studies in 1990 and 2003 confirmed these initial results. When asked: “Would you go out with me tonight?” men and women were roughly equally receptive. Yet, when confederates asked, “Would you come over to my apartment” or “Would you go to bed with me?” gender differences were striking (see Table 1).

Table 1 shows obvious gender differences in sexual receptivity. As each request increases in sexual explicitness men become more and more receptive to the offer while women become less so. Fifty percent of male participants were willing to go on a date, 69% were willing to go back to the female confederate’s apartment, and 75% of men said yes to sex. While 56% of women agreed to a date only 6% said they would go back to the male confederate’s apartment, and not a single woman was willing to “go to bed” with them.
Table 1. *Clark and Hatfield (1989) Percentage of Compliance to Each Request*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, the authors had a great deal of trouble finding a home for this study. From June 1978 to July, 1988, they worked their way through eight scientific journals which had seemed to be a good fit for this small paper: *Archives of Sexual Behavior, Ethnology and Sociobiology, Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, Psychology of Women Quarterly, Sex Roles, and Representative Research in Social Psychology* (an innovative methodology journal.) The story was always the same: a rejection. Then, in July 1988, the *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality* accepted the study. The long quest was over.

Times have changed. Today, most scholars recognize the importance of scientific knowledge about topics that were once considered taboo—love, the emotions, sexual desire, and sexual behavior. Since its publication, this classic study has attracted a great deal of attention. Some examples: In 2003, *Psychological Inquiry* designated the Clark and Hatfield (1989) study a “classic,” “an experiment that scholars will still be talking about 100 years from now.” For evolutionary psychologists, it has become part of the “canon” (see, for example, Buss, 2003), documenting the importance of gender in love and sexual relationships. Several television science programs have discussed the study and run replications in their own countries: see, for example, the Discovery Channel’s
(“Love”) in Canada: BBC’s Human Instinct series (“Deepest Desires”) in England; ZDF’s science documentary, “Liebe” in Austria; Hald and Olesen (2010) in Denmark, and the like. In recent years, these programs have sparked heated debates in Science, News in Brain and Behavioral Sciences, and Sexnet, the last two being scholarly Web-based discussion groups. In these postings, readers were laudatory and annoyed by the study; some thought the results were obvious, others that they could not possibly be valid; that the study was a landmark experiment or a trivial and frivolous experiment.

Although the popularity of this study was gratifying, Hatfield (2006) argued that what social psychology needs are not more replications of this classic study. She suggests that scholars begin to explore “Who, where, what, when, and why?” of this phenomenon. They might, for example, look at:

(1) **Who is doing the asking?** Social psychologists might, for example, ask how old are the stimulus persons? How good looking are they? What is their social class and race? Their religion? Their ethnicity? Are they gay or straight? Are they drunk or sober? Could they have a STI? AIDS? How many people have they approached previously?

(2) **Who is being asked?** In addition to the questions above, scholars might consider the personality traits or social situation of the respondents. For example, are the targets happy or depressed? Popular or social outcasts? Are they in a loving relationship or on the rebound? How old are they? Are they attractive themselves?

(3) **Where does the “asking” take place?** One might, for example, expect to secure quite different results if the invitation took place in a church or at a revival meeting, on a college campus, in an office, in a gay, lesbian, or straight bar; or perhaps in a Greyhound station, where people are you away from home and lonely.
(4) **What and how is it being asked?** Would men and women be more receptive, for example, if the offer were preceded by flirtation and sexy conversation? How are the participants perceiving the questions they are being asked?

The original research began in 1978 and there have been marked social changes since then that may affect sexual receptivity in the 21st century. Chiefly, the rise of Autoimmune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and other sexually transmitted diseases have had a large effect on sexual behavior. This has created a paradigm shift toward monogamy and away from promiscuity. Scholars, Hatfield contended, would do well to begin to explore the boundary conditions for this phenomenon. Perhaps scholars were too quick to assume that our sexual behavior is based mainly on human evolution. Current research instead suggests it may also be based on social constructs and trends, while evolutionary biological changes may still be providing the underlying basis for these sexual behaviors.

There have been other current prominent studies, one conducted in Denmark by Gert Hald and Henrick Hogh-Olesen, and a series of four small studies conducted by Terri Conley at the University of Michigan, published in 2010 and 2011 respectively. The study published in Denmark by Hald and Olesen had a slightly modified methodology from Clark and Hatfield (1989). Just as in the Clark and Hatfield study, confederates were approached outdoors. Hald and Olesen used 21 confederates, many more than were used in the original series of studies (only four confederates). The possible downfall of the Hald and Olesen (2010) study was that confederates were specifically instructed to only approach subjects who were on their own and whom they could imagine following through with their request, and because of this the participant
pool was far from a random selection. For this reason their procedure was greatly flawed.

Their results were not surprising. They found no significant gender differences in consenting to the date condition. More men were receptive to “coming back to my place” and “going to bed with me” than were women, and women’s receptivity also declined the more sexually explicit the offer became. Confederates’ ratings of attractiveness significantly predicted participants’ receptivity to the offer for female, but not for male subjects. For those not in a relationship, male subjects were more likely to consent to sex than were female subjects. While their results support the results attained in my studies (discussed later) the study had three key drawbacks: the sample was not randomly selected, confederate’s acting ability and body language was not controlled for, and ethically, most IRB boards would be reluctant to approve such a study in the United States.

Terri Conley is another sexual researcher who conducted a series of four quasi-experiments, which also produced similar results to my three studies. Her first experiments was close to the original Clark and Hatfield (1989), except for one key difference, instead of using actual confederates, participants were asked to imagine an “attractive”, not average, individual. By the nature of the instructions attractiveness could not be controlled for. In her remaining three experimental conditions participants were, again, asked to imagine “attractive” and “unattractive” famous people, an opposite-sex friend, and a same-gender individual as the requestor.

Her results showed that perceived sexual skill was the most important predictor in participants’ likelihood of agreeing to sex, and, she concluded, women’s lack of
receptivity to sex was reflected in the perception that their risk was higher and that their sexual satisfaction would be lower. Male proposers were perceived as more dangerous and not as sexually satisfying than were female proposers. Her studies had several drawbacks: they lacked anonymity, she did not control for attractiveness because participants either imagined idealized and attractive confederate proposers or selected famous individuals, and her population was mainly European American, and had very little ethnic diversity.

The results in these recent studies partially contradict the widely supported Sexual Strategies Theory (SST), commonly held in the field of evolutionary psychology. The Sexual Strategies Theory asserts that women are supposed to be “choosy” in the selection of their sexual partners (mates) because of their greater parental investment in their offspring, meaning that they have more physical and emotion investment in producing offspring, than their male counterparts, due to the time and energy that is involved in pregnancy and child-rearing (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

If this was the case then, just as in the Clark and Hatfield study in 1989, studies conducted now should also demonstrate that men’s receptivity increases the more sexually explicit the offer becomes, and the opposite would be true for women. Instead, men’s and women’s receptivity now seems to be more reflective of the results procured in the following studies. This may not necessarily mean that these results completely contradict SST or evolutionary theory, but perhaps simply be a reflection of an incorporation of society’s changing social norms into our lives and how that has modified our behaviors.
With the exception of these two studies, only recently published, the reason that there has not been more research designed to delineate the boundary conditions surrounding sexual receptivity may be due to several facts. The Clark-Hatfield study was very difficult and time consuming. Secondly, in this day and age, social scientists are more sensitive to possible ethical pitfalls for researchers conducting such experiments and their participants. Many social psychologists are understandably hesitant to ask their college students to initiate such proposals. Lastly, if scholars attempt to stage a replication, due to its questionable ethicality, the IRB often refuses to sanction such field studies.

In the trio of studies reported in this paper, I recount my three-year effort to develop a paper-and-pencil paradigm designed to mimic the Clark and Hatfield (1989) study, without the drawbacks of the classic study. In the following series of survey studies I also attempt to improve upon the original research by eliminating several possible confounds, which will be discussed under Study 1, and to discover the common reasons for participants’ responses.

For the first study I hypothesized (1) that there would be a main effect for type of request, specifically, there would be higher receptivity to offers to go on a date than for invitations back to an apartment or to have sex, (2) men would be more receptive to offers of casual sex than would women, and (3) there would be an interaction between gender and type of request. These three hypotheses were designed to see if I could replicate the Clark and Hatfield results.
CHAPTER 2.  
STUDY ONE METHOD

In Study 1 participants were presented with a standardized stimulus face of the opposite sex. They were provided with the bare minimum of information about the proposer, giving participants only a few lines of script, before they were asked each of the three questions. The respondents had a limited amount of information, visual and contextual, in order to control for multiple confounding variables to be discussed later (see Procedure.) I thought this new procedure had several key advantages over previous studies (see Results.) As in the Clark and Hatfield study, I hypothesized that males would be more receptive to sexual offers than females, and that receptivity would vary systematically with context.

Procedure

When students reported for the session, they were given a consent form and a two-page packet (see Appendices A and B.) Men and women were given different, but parallel forms of the survey. At the top of the first page appeared a picture of a college-aged man or woman. The images were composed of the average of 40 different male and 40 different female faces from an online database. The results were two faces of equal attractiveness (See Figure 1).

Figure 1. Study 1 Stimulus Faces of a Male and Female

Note: Images were created using a program for facereasearch.org. Images are superimposed using 40 different faces from varying ethnic groups.
The faces were to serve as a prototype: to represent faces-in-general, of no particular ethnic group. These faces were constructed using a program by faceresearch.org. The computer software used was developed by Bernard Tiddeman and David Perrett (2007). A sampling of 40 real faces, taken from a variety of the racial and ethnic groups typical of the UH campus, were selected. Using the computer imaging, the faces were then superimposed one upon one another. The purpose of using the superimposed faces was to control for attractiveness, mainly by eliminating small differences in asymmetry. Using these images also controlled for factors such as differences in clothing worn, hairstyles, body type, and facial expressions.

After glancing at this target face, respondents were asked three questions in the following order:

*Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says: “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following questions?*

*(a) Will you go on a date with me? (b) Will you come to my apartment? and (c) Will you go to bed with me?*

Respondents were asked to indicate their answers on the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked to indicate the reasons for their responses to each question. Finally, they were debriefed.
Participants

Participants were 90 women and 27 men (117 total) from the University of Hawai‘i’s Manoa campus. Respondents’ mean age was 21.7; they ranged from 18 to age 49. As is typical of Hawai‘i’s multicultural population, participants were ethnically varied: 35% were of mixed ethnicity, 35% were Caucasian, 7.7% were Japanese, 6% were Chinese, 5.1% were Hispanic, 3.4% were Korean, 2.6% were Filipino, and all other ethnic groups constituted only 5.2% of the total responses (African-American, American Indian, Hawaiian, Middle Eastern, Other Asian, Indian/Pakistani, Pacific Islander, and Portuguese).

Exactly 50% of participants considered themselves religious, where the other half did not. Participants who said they were religious came from an array of religious groups: Protestantism (29.9%), Catholicism (21.4%), Buddhism (6%), and Judaism (2.6%), Atheism (0.9%, and no religion (39.2%). Most participants fell into either the non-religious (39.2%), Catholic, or Protestant religious affiliations. On the average, students rated themselves as 3.9 in religiosity (on a scale ranging from 0 to 10).

Students were also asked about their sexual orientation. Sexual orientations varied, with 89.7% identifying themselves as heterosexual 5.1% as bisexual, 3.4% as homosexual, and 1.7% as unsure of their sexuality. Fifty-five percent said they were in a committed relationship, 44% were not.
CHAPTER 3.
STUDY ONE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

In Study 1, I was hoping to replicate the results of the classic Clark and Hatfield (1989) study, thus demonstrating that I had crafted a prototype that might prove a useful substitute for the authors’ problematic experimental paradigm. In order to test my hypotheses, I conducted a One-Way ANOVA (with three dependent variables, each a type of request and gender as a factor).

In hypothesis 1 I predicted that there would be a main effect for type of request, specifically, there would be higher receptivity to offers to go on a date than for invitations back to an apartment or to have sex. In hypothesis 2, I predicted that men would be more receptive to offers of casual sex than would women. In hypothesis 3, I predicted that there would be an interaction between gender and type of request.

I found that the means of responses were not entirely in the predicted direction. While the male participants were more receptive to all three offers than were women both men and women declined in receptivity the more sexually explicit the offer became (see Table 2 below).

Table 2. Study 1 Mean Responses to Offers by Type of Request and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These are the means of response for men and women for the three types of requests, on a ten-point scale of 0-10.
Because participants were asked all three of the types of requests the analysis used was a One-Way ANOVA (with three dependent variables, each a type of request and gender as a factor, analyzed separately) I was hoping to secure a significant interaction between Sex of Respondent (Male or Female) x Type of Request (Date, Apartment, or Sex) on responses. The analysis confirmed my hypothesis (see Table 3 below).

### Table 3. Study 1 One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Gender, Type of Request, and Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Request</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>68.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.405</td>
<td>9.695</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>811.407</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>879.812</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>266.958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>266.958</td>
<td>80.342</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>382.119</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>649.077</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>224.151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224.151</td>
<td>74.751</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>344.841</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>568.991</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Male and Female represent the two groups of analysis*

Figure 2 shows that male mean responses for all three offers are higher than those of women, but at the same time the more explicit the offer becomes, the less likely men and women are to accept. Female responses, on average, were all below 5 on a ten-point scale. There is a sharp decline in female responses to go back to the confederate’s apartment and to have sex, presumably because participants perceive going back to an apartment as leading to sex.
My first hypothesis was supported. I found a main effect for type of request, although not in the predicted pattern, (as discussed below). This hypothesis was also confirmed. When examining within-subjects contrasts, using a general linear model with repeated measures, all comparisons are significant: Date versus Apartment: $F = 99.02$, 1 and 115 d.f., $p < .001$; Date + Apartment versus Sex: $F = 103.91$, 1 and 115 d.f., $p < .001$.

As is evident from Table 2 and Figure 2, as predicted, in my second hypothesis, men were more sexually receptive than women to all three requests ($F = 9.70$, 1 and 115 d.f., $p < .01$, $F = 80.34$, 1 and 115 d.f., $p < .01$ $F = 74.75$, 1 and 115 d.f., $p < .01$). The first two hypotheses still supported results from the original Clark and Hatfield Studies.

In hypothesis 3 I predicted that there would be an interaction between gender and type of request, meaning that men would be increasingly responsive to offers as they become more sexually explicit while women will be become less so, just as in the Clark and Hatfield study (1989). Here the results were ambiguous. As predicted, when we
consider the Gender x (Dating versus Apartment) interaction, we find that, as predicted, it was significant. Interaction $F = 12.34, 1$ and $115$ d.f., $p = .001$. The Date + Apartment versus Sex interaction did not reach significance ($F = 2.34, 1$ and $115$ d.f., $p = .13$). In Study 1, the pattern of results was different than that secured in the classic study. In this simulation, both men and women declined in receptivity as the offer became more sexually explicit. Men’s interest declined less precipitously than did women’s, but the pattern in this study was very different from that secured in the classic study.

After determining that the interaction between Gender x (Dating versus Apartment) interaction was significant some of the main effects results may statistically be invalid. I then did additional analyses to determine if there would be simple effects for the (Date versus Apartment) condition for each Gender, using a General Linear Model (between-subjects factors). The simple effects for Type of Request (after separating by Gender) were significant for women ($F=136.62, 1$ and $89$ d.f., $p < .001$), but not for men ($F=2.5, 1$ and $26$ d.f., $p = .13$).

In addition to responding to the offer on a ten-point scale participants also gave qualitative data as to their reasons for accepting or declining an offer. More often than not both men and women were giving reasons why they declined an offer.

These were some of the most common male reasons for declining a sexual offer:

“in a relationship,” “she’s not that attractive,” “don’t know her,” “not my type,” and “awkward.”

These were some of the most common female reasons for declining the offer:

“have a boyfriend,” “don’t know him,” “he’s creepy,” “not sleeping with a stranger,” “too forward,” and “stalkerish/dangerous.”
In the classic study, the more blatant the sexual offer, the more likely men were to accept it. The more blatant the offer, the less likely women were to accept it. In this study, as proposed, men and women were almost equally likely to accept a date. Men were much more likely to agree to go to a woman’s apartment and to have sex with her than were women. So far, so good. But, once again, contrary to my predictions, the more sexually explicit the offer becomes, the less likely both men and women were to accept it.

In saying “no,” females were most concerned with the male’s forward behavior and in the fact that he was a stranger. Many women made references to the confederate posing potential danger to them in their responses. The males were most concerned with not finding her that attractive, thinking she was too forward, and therefore too “easy”, and feeling that she was not their “type”. They were much less concerned with the danger factor.

Discussion

Because a survey was used in place of confederates, the Study 1 paradigm possessed several advantages over the classic study: (1) the picture of the college student was standardized, eliminating differences in attractiveness, and controlling for other confounds previously discussed. (2) The confederate’s offer was standardized. In the classic study, college students making the offers naturally varied in appearance and presentation style. By using a script, I controlled for body language, acting ability, and created an atmosphere of anonymity. (3) Respondents were not asked a simple “Yes” or “No” question, but were allowed to indicate how certain they were that they would
accept or reject the various offers on a ten-point scale. Study 1 had the advantage of providing continuous data, while the classic study did not. (4) Respondents were asked why they responded as they did to the various offers.

In the classic study researchers could only speculate as to why men and women chose to respond as they did. This failure to inquire into participants’ motives has led to some of the bitter debates that I described earlier. Yet, in this study I did not precisely replicate the original one. I thought I could do better.

In retrospect, I realized that Study 1 possessed one serious flaw. In the classic study, respondents were only asked one question—did they want to go on a date OR to an apartment OR to bed? In Study 1, respondents were asked all three questions. Worse yet, these questions appeared in a standard order! Naturally, the questions should have been counterbalanced. Thus, in Study 2 I decided to replicate Study 1, only this time this methodological flaw would be remedied.
CHAPTER 4.  
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Procedure

In the main, Study 2 was identical to Study 1. When students reported for the experimental session, they were given a consent form and a two-page packet (see Appendices D and E). As before, the questionnaire began with a picture of the same man or woman I presented in Study 1. Respondents were then asked:

*Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says*  “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.”

*How would you respond to the following question?*

This time, respondents were asked to answer *just one* of three questions:

*“Will you go on a date with me?” “Will you come to my apartment?” or “Will you go to bed with me?”*

Again, respondents were asked to indicate their answers on the following Likert scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, students were asked the reason for their response.

Next, they were asked to answer a series of demographic questions (see Appendix F.) Finally, they were allowed to ask any questions or make any comments they wished, about anything that might have been unclear, or areas of improvement.
Participants

Participants were 176 women and 151 men (327 total) from the University of Hawai‘i’s Manoa campus. Respondents’ mean age was 22.69; they ranged in age from 18 to 68. As is typical of Hawai‘i’s multicultural population, respondents came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds: 29.8% were of mixed ethnicity, 23.9% were Caucasian, 16.9% were Japanese, 8.9% were Filipino, 7.7% were Chinese, 3.1% were Korean, 2.1% were Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, and 7.6% came from a variety of other ethnic groups (African-American, American Indian, Hispanic, Middle Eastern, Other Asian, Indian/Pakistani, Pacific Islander, and Portuguese).

Participants also came from an array of religious groups. These were Protestant (35.9%), Catholic (20.1%), Buddhist (5.3%), Agnostic (2.6%), Jewish (1%), Muslim (0.3%), other (3.6%), and none (31.2%). On the average, students rated themselves as 4.14 in religiosity (on a scale ranging from 0 to 10). Forty-six percent considered themselves to be religious, the remainder did not. Students were also asked about their sexual orientation. Sexual orientations varied, 91.1% selected heterosexual, 4.3% were bisexual, 3.4% were homosexual, and 1.2% were unsure of their sexuality. Fifty-three percent of the respondents were in a committed relationship; 46% were not.
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Results

In Study 2, I was, again, hoping to replicate the results of the classic Clark and Hatfield (1989) study, this time asking only one question instead of all three sequentially. Specifically, I predicted that in an ANOVA analysis, I would secure a significant interaction between Sex of Respondent (Male or Female) x Type of Request (Date, Apartment, or Sex.) Once again, in part, my predictions were confirmed.

Table 4. Study 2 Mean Responses to Offers by Gender and Type of Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These are the means of response for men and women for the three types of requests, on a 10-point scale of 0-10.

My hypothesis, that there would be a main effect for type of request, specifically, there would be higher receptivity to offers to go on a date than for invitations back to an apartment or to have sex, was supported (F = 46.82, 1 and 325 d.f., p < .001). My second hypothesis, that men would be more receptive to all three requests was also supported (see Table 5) (F = 63.53, 1 and 325 d.f., p < .001). Both of these findings supported results from the original Clark and Hatfield Studies and my previous Study 1.

Again, contrary to my original third hypothesis that there would be an interaction between gender and type of request, I did not secure an interaction (F = .22, 2 and 325 d.f., p = .81). Instead of the hypothesized interaction effect, I found that the more sexually explicit the offer, the less likely both men and women were to be receptive.
I also ran ANOVA analyses on ethnicity, religion, religiosity, and religious affiliation. There were no significant main effects for ethnicity, religiosity, or religious affiliation, but I did find significant effects for being religious (F=5.41, 1 and 325 d.f., p<.05) and being in a relationship (F=17.87, 1 and 325 d.f., p < .01) on responses.

**Figure 3. Study 2 Graph of Mean Responses to Type of Request by Gender**

![Graph showing mean responses by gender for different types of requests: Date, Apartment, Sex.]

*Note: Responses were averaged (on a scale of 0-10)*
Discussion

With Study 2 it became clear that the difference between the classic study and my paradigm was not a simple methodological failure to counterbalance questions. Thus, I brainstormed about how I might account for the puzzling fact that I did not secure an exact replication of the classical study. I came up with a series of possibilities. I may have crafted a paradigm comparable to the classic study, but Hawai‘i’s predominantly culturally and ethnically Asian population simply responded differently to sexual offers than did the predominantly European-American Florida students who participated in the classic study. (In the classic study, no information was provided as to respondents’ ethnicity. It is assumed that the vast majority of them were European-American.)

In order to test this hypothesis, I conducted an ANOVA analysis of ethnicity and response and I found no effect for subjects of Asian ethnic groups and response to the request or for any other ethnic groups. There is a possibility that this may have been due to the fact that many subjects selected multiple ethnic groups, and therefore had more than one ethnic identity, and also, perhaps because the populations of Asian and Caucasian participants were too small to attain significant effects, mainly because I could only use those who selected one ethnic identity for the analysis.

There were other, more mundane possibilities, however. Namely, that participants would have responded as students did in the classic study, were it not for certain design flaws. I found, from my interviews with participants, that Study 2 had certain serious flaws. As I said, in the classic study, virtually all participants were European-American. Since the 1980s, America has changed drastically, each decade becoming more and more ethnically diverse. This multicultural population of Hawai‘i is also now replicated in much of America. Currently, some students date partners of
various ethnicities, some do not. Thus, ideally, I should have provided stimulus photos appropriate to our diverse population. Secondly, in the classic study, the confederates presented more than just a pretty face.

People form impressions of others very quickly—think of the speed dating research which suggests people know all they need to know after just a few seconds of interaction (Finkel, Eastwick, & Matthews, 2007). Perhaps in the classic study, participants could see that the confederate was a “regular Joe or Jane”—not crazy, not dangerous, not a creep—during the brief period before he/she delivered his/her lines. Thus, perhaps I should have provided a paragraph or two designed to provide these respondents with a bit more information as to the confederates’ nature.

In Study 3 I hoped to more exactly replicate the original Clark and Hatfield study, where I hoped to account for the ethnic variation in Hawai‘i and included three ethnically different images, rather than only one. In addition, because in the original series of studies there was a little more interaction between the confederate and participant in the following study I included a longer interaction scenario, including slightly more information about the proposer.
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Procedure

The procedure was mostly identical to Studies 1 and 2. This was again, a 2 X 3 ANOVA between-subjects design (sex of participant X type of request), with a qualitative section, where subjects explained the reason for their response to accepting or declining an offer to go on a date, back to the confederate’s apartment, or to have sex.

The survey itself was three pages long. The first page had three confederate’s faces, representing multiple ethnic groups. The images used were, again, superimposed images, now from seven different faces, from varying ethnic groups (See Figure 4). Each face is designed to represent Asian ethnic groups, Polynesian groups, and Caucasian ethnic groups. Unfortunately, the database did not have enough face images to accurately depict other ethnic groups, which may have been a possible limitation of Study 3. The three main ethnic groupings used were designed to best represent Hawai‘i’s ethnic breakdown.

The surveys were distributed in lecture courses from a variety of subjects, not limited to psychology classes. Subjects were instructed to select the survey with the faces of the sex they are most attracted to. The surveys were already in a randomized order before they were laid out to be selected by subjects in the front of the classroom. There were separate piles for surveys with male and female faces.

Subjects were told that we were conducting a survey about sexual behavior and attitudes. Research assistants handed out the consent forms and instructed subjects to read the consent form before deciding on whether they wanted to participate. It was then
reiterated that they (the subjects) could discontinue at any time and participation was completely voluntary. Subjects then came to the front of the class to pick up their survey. It took roughly five minutes to complete. When they were finished participants brought their survey back to the front of the classroom and placed them facedown on a pile of completed surveys, in order to further insure anonymity.

**Figure 4. Study 3 Superimposed Images of Three Male and Three Female Faces**

![Image of superimposed faces](image)

*Note: Images were created using a program for faceresearch.org. Images are superimposed using 40 different faces from varying ethnic groups.*

In addition to adding images to represent multiple ethnic groups, several other key changes were made. This was done, in order to make the research more in line with the original study and to eliminate any of the issues encountered in the first two paper-and-pencil replications. First, subjects selected which person they found most attractive out of the three faces with which they were presented. This time subjects were presented
with three ethnic groups. This was a change from the two former versions where subjects were only given one face. The new introduction for Study 3 read:

“Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says, “Hey, you were in my class last semester and I think you are really cute.” (You recognize them although you never caught their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with, “You seem like you’re a pretty nice person. I wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I was wondering if....”

... “you want to go out sometime?” or

... “you want to come over to my place tonight?” or

... “you would want to have sex with me tonight?”

The main purpose for their conversation was that in a face-to-face interaction there would include a lot of non-verbal body communication that cannot be replicated in survey format, so a short introduction took its place. After subjects responded they gave an explanation for their responses. Using the qualitative data from Studies 1 and 2, a panel of three other research assistants and I developed a coding system to encompass all the categories of responses from participants. Ten codes were created.

Here are the following codes for the reasons for declining one of the three offers presented to participants: (0) No Response, they left the question completely blank; (1) Not Attractive Enough; (2) Not my Type; (3) Creepy/Stalkerish/Dangerous. This code covered responses that have been coined the “creep effect,” where the participant felt like it might be a trap, that the confederate might be a “psycho,” and where a subject voiced
concern for his or her safety; (4) Don’t Know/Need to Know Better. These responses often overlapped with code 3, where participants were concerned for their safety and felt that they needed to know the confederate better, to insure there was no physical threat; (5) Too Forward. This included responses where the participant perceived the confederate to be rude, awkward, or not following accepted social norms; (6) STD/Disease. This included responses where the subject alluded to thinking the confederate might be unclean, might have “gotten around” and be carrying some sort of sexually transmitted infection; (7) Immoral. This covered participants who stated that they declined because it went against their personal moral code or their religion’s morals. (8) In a Committed Relationship. This covered those who did not read the instructions that they were supposed to “imagine themselves not in a committed relationship.” (9) Other Response. These were responses that were not covered in one of the other categories; and (10) the participants gave a reason for accepting the offer. The responses for accepting the offer were not individually coded because I was not interested in the reasons for accepting, only in declining the offer. Some example of typical responses to declining an offer, by male and female participants, will be included in the results section.

Participants also rated the person they selected (of the three confederates presented to them) and then rated him or herself on an attractiveness scale between 0-10. They also were asked to rate their happiness level on a scale of 0-10 from extremely unhappy to ecstatic. Finally, they were asked to indicate their current or intended major and state or country of origin. All other demographic questions remained the same (See Appendix G, H, and I for complete survey).
Participants

Participants were 178 women and 178 men (356 total) from the University of Hawai‘i’s Manoa campus. Respondents’ mean age was 21.98; they ranged in age from 18 to 54. As is typical of Hawai‘i’s multicultural population, respondents came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds: 31.1% were Caucasian, 18.1% were Japanese, 15% were Filipino, 9% were Chinese, 5.9% were Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, 4.8% were Hispanic, 4.2% were Pacific Islander, 3.7% were African American, 3.7% were Korean, and 4.5% came from a variety of other ethnic groups (American Indian, Middle Eastern, Other Asian, Indian/Pakistani, and Portuguese). (In this study, unlike Studies 1 and 2, I asked participants to indicate the ethnic group with which they most identified.)

Participants also came from an array of religious groups: Protestantism (21.7%), Catholicism (14.1%), Buddhism (2.5), Islam (0.8%), and Judaism (0.8%), Atheism (1.1%), Agnosticism (0.6%), and those who had no religious affiliation (58.4%). Sixty two percent did not consider themselves to be religious, 37% did. Students were also asked about their sexual orientation. Sexual orientations varied. Ninety-two percent selected heterosexual, 4.3% bisexual, 2.8% homosexual, and 0.9% were unsure of their sexuality. Bisexual, homosexual respondents, and those unsure of their sexuality, were all included in the analysis. Fifty-five percent of the respondents were not in a committed relationship, 45% were. The majority of participants were raised in Hawai‘i (57.1%), 34.7% in the remaining Continental United States, 1.7% in Pacific Island nations, 1.4% in the Philippines, 1.1% in Japan, and 4.1% from other regions (Africa, Central and South America, Korea, and the Middle East.)
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Results

Results from Study 3 mainly confirmed the results procured in the previous two studies. My hypothesis, that there would be a main effect for type of request, specifically, there would be higher receptivity to offers to go on a date than for invitations back to an apartment or to have sex, was supported (F=65.76, 1 and 324 d.f., p < .01). My second hypothesis, that men would be more receptive to all three requests was also supported (F=73.16, 1 and 324 d.f., p < .01). Both of these findings supported results from the original Clark and Hatfield Studies and my previous Studies 1 and 2.

Additionally for Study 3, I hypothesized that responses for both men and women would decline the more sexually explicit the offer becomes. The general trend of the mean was as predicted, however, statistically the interaction effect was still significant, which may invalidate some of the main effects. For this reason I conducted three additional One-Way ANOVA analyses (for each type of request) to determine if there were simple effects for gender. All three analyses were significant (Date Request: F=6.61, 1 and 108 d.f., p <.05, Apartment Request: F=41.04, 1 and 112 d.f., p <.05, Sex Request: F=29.84, 1 and 102 d.f., p <.05).

I also conducted two separate One-Way ANOVA analyses (within-group analysis, for each Gender) to determine if there were simple effects for Type of Request. There were significant simple effects for all three request types for women (F=66.89, 1 and 162 d.f., p<.01, all pair-wise Tukey Post Hoc tests were significant, (p<.01). However, for men only the (Date vs. Sex) and (Apartment vs. Sex) were significant (p < .01). The (Date vs. Apartment) comparison was not significant (p = .11).
The main difference in the data collection was that for Study 3 participants responded with a “Yes” or “No” and then on a scale of 0-10 with their likelihood of accepting the request. This was a percentage of compliance based on respondents’ sex that could be calculated (see Table 6 below). Females were less receptive to all three requests, just as hypothesized. Eleven percent of females said yes to a date, 2% said yes to going back to the confederate’s apartment, and less than 1% said yes to sex. Thirteen percent of men were receptive to the date, 11% to going back to the confederate’s apartment, and 4% to having sex.

Table 6. Study 3 Percentages of Compliance to Each Type Request by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date (Type of Request)</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These are separate results from the mean responses based on gender. The higher the number, the greater the percentage of people agreeing with the request.

Figure 5 below displays the mean graph of responses to each request by gender. Males are more receptive both percentage-wise and in their mean responses than were women for an offer to go on a date, go back to the confederate’s apartment, and to have sex. Both males’ and females’ mean responses decline with each request becoming more sexually explicit. All mean responses fell between 1 and 7 on a scale of 0-10.
Table 7 illustrates the relationship between gender and type of request on responses. Data were analyzed using mean responses, not the percentage of compliance by gender. As shown in the table there is a significant effect of gender and type of request on response, as well as for gender and type of request on response. Mean response data was analyzed using ANOVA between-subjects design.

**Table 7. Study 3 ANOVA Analysis of Gender, Type of Request, and Response (Between-Subjects Effects)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>373.705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>373.705</td>
<td>73.168</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>671.742</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>335.871</td>
<td>65.761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request * Gender</td>
<td>58.215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.107</td>
<td>5.699</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1629.285</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2796.197</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R Squared = .417 (Adjusted R Squared = .408)
For the Yes/No data on receptivity to each of the three questions (Response 1) using a Generalized Linear Model I secured a main effects for Type of Request (Wald Chi-Square = 64.15, 2 and 324 d.f., p < .001) and for Gender (Wald Chi-Square = 29.65, 2 and 324 d.f., p < .001). However, the interaction between Gender and Type of Request was not significant (Wald Chi-Square = 5.84, 2 and 324 d.f., p = .054).

In a Univariate Analysis of Variance test of Between Subjects Effects there was a significant two-way interaction between a participant’s rating of their own attractiveness and what they rated the confederate’s attractiveness on their responses to the question asked (F=11.737, 1 and 324 d.f., p < .05). There was also a significant two-way interaction between how participants thought their peers would respond and their gender on their response to the main question (F=4.931, 1 and 324 d.f., p < .05). There was no significant effect of where the participant was raised on their responses to have sex, go on a date, or go back to the confederates apartment, even when taking into account gender.

In Study 3, I posed an additional question. I asked: “If this person were interested in being your significant other, how would you respond?” Buss (2003) argued that women often accept offers of casual sex because they are secretly hoping for a long-term relationship. Would there be gender differences, we wondered, if the target asked directly about the possibilities of a serious relationship? In response to this question, participants were asked to indicate both a Yes or No answer and a rating on the same 11-point scale I had used previously.

I also did secure significant main effects for our Yes/No data (see Table 8). Again, using a Generalized Linear Model I found a Main effect for Gender (Wald Chi-Square = 15.94 1 and 247, p< .001), main effect Type of Request (Wald Chi-Square =
7.04 2 and 247, p< .05), but not an interaction (Wald Chi-Square = 5.84, 1 and 2 d.f., p = .05).

Table 8  *Study 3 Percentage of Compliance by Gender and Type of Request to being in a Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Apartment (Type of Request)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The higher the number, the more certain people are that they would agree with the request.*

When I examined the Fs for the continuous data, I found that once again, I did secure a significant main effect for Gender (F = 14.32, 1 and 344 d.f., p < .001) (see Table 9). Using Univariate Analysis of Variance (Between-Subjects Effects) I found a main effect Gender, main effect Type of Request (F = 4.49, 1 and 344 d.f., p < .001), but did not secure an interaction (see Table 9).

Table 9  *Study 3 Mean Responses by Gender and Type of Request to Being in a Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Apartment (Type of Request)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The higher the number, the more certain people are that they would agree with the request. These are the means of responses for men and women (to the relationship request) separated by conditions. Responses are, on a ten-point scale of 0-10.*

These results were a bit of a surprise. Men were more eager than women to participate in both a casual and a serious relationship. We had expected that while men were interested in casual affairs, women would be more interested in serious relationships. This was not the case. Men were more eager for any kind of relationship—casual or serious. To figure out exactly what this means, more research will have to be conducted.
Study 3 took an additional look at ethnicity. In order to look at which ethnicities had a preference for what other ethnicity, I first created three categories of grouped ethnicities. The first group (1) Asians included Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Other Asians (these were the categories they self-selected as their ethnicity). The second group (2) Caucasians included only those who selected Caucasian as the identity that they most identify with. The third, and final, group (3) Filipinos included only Filipinos. The participants who selected these ethnicities made up the majority of participants. None of the other ethnic categories had enough participants to include in the cross-tabulation.

After creating those three categories I then conducted a cross-tabulation to see which of the three faces which ethnic group had a preference for, if any. The three confederates faces were either a mixed Polynesian with darker skin than the other two categories, an Asian, and a Caucasian. Results of the crosstabulation were fascinating.

In general, Asian females preferred the Caucasian confederate (54%) over the Asian (40%) and Polynesian stimulus face, and their preference for the Polynesian confederate (6%) was the lowest. Caucasian women tended to stick within their own race, also preferring the Caucasian stimulus face (61%), second was Polynesian (23%), and their preference for the Asian stimulus face (16%) was the lowest. Most Filipino women also preferred the Caucasian (68%) over the Asian confederate (28%), their least preferable the Polynesian-looking male (4%).

Male preferences were much more varied. Asian men, by far preferred the Asian woman (70%), secondly the Caucasian (21%), and lastly the Polynesian (9%). The majority of Caucasian participants preferred the Caucasian woman (61%), Asians came in second (23%), and the Polynesian woman last (16%). Lastly, Filipino participants
preferred Asian women (50%), but only slightly more than they preferred Caucasian women (39%), but least again was the darker-skinned, Polynesian-looking stimulus face (11%).

In general the results seemed to show that there was an overall preference for Caucasian and Asian’s over the Polynesian-looking stimulus person. Why this is the case, we can only speculate. Evolutionary theorist may jump to conclusions after seeing these results, but we must be careful before drawing conclusions, before looking at all the factors. At first, I was concerned that perhaps the confederates’ mean attractiveness ratings were too different from each other, but discovered that this was not the case.

After analyzing their ratings I found the three male faces ranged in attractiveness from 5.31-5.95 on a scale of 1-10 (Polynesian male-5.31, Asian male- 5.70, Caucasian male- 5.95). The female faces ranged in attractiveness from 6.13-7.15 on a scale of 1-10 (Asian female- 6.13, Caucasian female 6.34, Polynesian female- 7.15). While these results are very informative further studies and additional questions would be required to further investigate and understand why this was happening, especially before any conclusions are drawn.

Correlation data also presented some interesting results. There were several highly significant positive correlations to participants’ likelihood of accepting an offer to have sex. Participants’ ratings of their own attractiveness were positively correlated with their likelihood of saying “yes” to sex (r = .36, p<.01, N=108). Participant’s ratings of the confederate’s attractiveness (r = .29, p< .01, N=103) as well as their happiness level (r= .2, p<.05, N=109) also were positively correlated with a greater likelihood of saying “yes” to sex. The strongest correlation was for how participants thought one of their
same-sex friends would respond. That had the greatest impact on their likelihood of being receptive to sex ($r=.65, p<.01, N=103$).

Participants’ ratings of their happiness level had no significant affect on their likelihood to accept an offer to go on a date or to return to the confederate’s apartment. The participants’ self-attractiveness rating ($r=.24, p<.01, N=112$) as well as their rating of the confederate’s attractiveness ($r=.35, p<.01, N=112$) both were highly significantly and positively correlated with saying yes to return to the confederate’s apartment. Again, just as with a request to have sex, participants’ rating of how one of their same-sex friends would respond had a strong positive correlation with their own likelihood of accepting the offer to go back to the confederate’s place ($r=.58, p<.01, N=111$).

Lastly, there were no significant correlations between participant’s rating of their own attractiveness and their likelihood of accepting an offer to go out on a date with the confederate, but on the other hand their ratings of the confederate’s attractiveness level was a highly significant strong positive correlation ($r=.67, p<.01, N=109$). Just as with a request to have sex or return to the confederate’s apartment there was a highly significant positive correlation between participant’s ratings of how one of their friends would respond to the date request and their own likelihood of accepting the offer ($r=.37, p<.01, N=106$). These results tell us a lot about what plays a role in the decision making process of young people when deciding whether or not to accept certain offers, but more research needs to take place to further explore these correlations.

Another feature that separates these studies from other research into sexual behavior, and helps us better understand what factors go into a decision to be receptive to certain offers, is this qualitative component of the survey which gave a section where
participants would give a written response for their reasons for declining a given offer. When females were asked, specifically to go back to a confederate’s apartment or to have sex, there were three common categories of responses explaining their reason to say no to the offer: (1) Creepy/"Stalkerish"/Dangerous, (2) Don’t Know Them/Need to Know Them Better, and (3) Immoral/Goes Against Religious or Personal Values. The responses from Study 1 were used to develop the 10-code system. While attempting to categorize responses the coders and I found it difficult to distinguish between the “Creepy/ Stalkerish” code and the “Don’t Know Them Well Enough” one. Many responses overlapped, which may mean that when women say they refuse because they need to know them better what they are really saying is, “No, because I think they may be a danger to me and I need to establish, through getting to know them better, that they are not.”

Typical responses for women included the following:

“I don’t know him that well. I’d feel awkward / unsafe”

“Don’t know them well. Maybe if it was in a more open place...coffee shop, dinner, or if it was a party and I could go with a few friends.”

“The guy is technically a complete stranger, and sex is something special shared with someone extremely special to you.”

“I’m not a slut.”

“I don’t like to give it up to a stranger. They could be a stalker and he didn’t even tell anything about himself. He seems creepy.”
Male responses varied a bit, but were not as different from female responses as might be expected. While men were still concerned with not knowing the confederate well enough, they disliked the fact that their pursuer was too forward, and not attractive enough. Some participants specifically pointed out that they wanted to see the entire body of their pursuer before deciding. Some typical male responses for their rejecting the offer included:

“I don’t like it when girls ask guys out.”

“I got [have] to see the rest of the package.”

“Too forward, kind of weird, give me the sense that they have a screw loose. How many other people has she tried this with?”

“No idea if it’s safe, plus sex should be about intimacy, not blind lust.”

“It takes more than one conversation to get in my pants.”

Surprisingly, while there was concern about how many men other women had been with few actually voiced a fear, overtly, about STD’s. This may have been a concern voiced through the “not knowing them well enough,” but perhaps it was a non-issue altogether. In the future, when a study like this is conducted again the researcher would do well to include a few questions further exploring participants’ concerns for STD’s and the Danger Factor and “Creep Effect” for both men and women.
Discussion

Since this research deals directly with Evolutionary theories it is important for all of psychology and, specifically for the field of social psychology. All social psychologists and nearly all psychology textbooks recite the results that were found in the original studies without giving a thought to possible social changes since the study was originally conducted. The series of Clark and Hatfield studies demonstrate that while men are more receptive than are women, they become more so with the increasing sexual explicitness of the offer. Thus far it looks as if this may no longer be the case. The only way to really know would be to do an exact replication of the original studies on the same campus. Since, this has not been done, one can only speculate as to what the results of that exact replication would be. Using the results from these three studies and other similar research one can extrapolate that sexual behavior may have indeed changed significantly since the time of the original data collection.

Admittedly, there were limitations to these studies that were not ideal. The sample’s age ground was relatively limited to subjects in their 20’s and University of Hawai‘i students. Future studies should have multiple testing sites, and across multiple different age groups. Additionally, the survey or experiment could have been more extensive, and included a socio-sexuality measure, as well as more questions requiring qualitative responses.

Unless more qualitative data collection is done we may not be able to pinpoint the exact reasons for these socio-behavioral changes, but what we can gleam is that men are still more receptive to offers of a date, going back to someone’s apartment, and to sex, than are women, both genders have become increasingly less receptive to each offer the
more sexually explicit it is. Just looking at the qualitative data from Study 3 measuring the frequency of certain types of responses will only give us the conscious reasons that men and women have for declining an offer. We cannot get at their underlying subconscious reasons, we can only speculate. Therefore, while these three studies contribute to our overall understanding of sexual receptivity, behavior, and attitudes, they require further research, with greater sample group variety, with more qualitative components, and across different testing locations.

This new data might contribute to the reform of the field of sexual research because it demonstrates that while gender differences do exist, meaning men are more receptive to offers of sex than are women, both men and women are less sexually receptive than previously believed, and men and women have become more similar in their responses, signifying the decrease in overall gender differences. Hopefully these studies will be used as a taking off point for more future research in this area, as well as to amend the currently, and widely accepted, ideas about sexual receptivity and behavior.
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APPENDIX A
Consent Form

Agreement to Participate

Sexual Receptivity

Social psychologists have long been interested in the way that men and women from a variety of social backgrounds respond to social, romantic, and sexual invitations of various types. This survey consists of a three-page questionnaire, designed to help us better understand the social attitudes, feelings, and behavior of college students. You are being asked to participate because you are a college student aged 18 or older.

If you participate, you will write or select answers on a short survey. First, you will answer one question and write a reason for your answer. Then you will answer several demographic questions. The survey should take 5-7 minutes to complete. To maintain your anonymity, please refrain from writing information such as your name or address on the survey.

There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this research project. We believe there little or no risks either. However, if you are uncomfortable with the survey questions, you may stop participating.

Your participation is voluntary. In addition, you may choose to discontinue at anytime without any penalty or prejudice.

If you have any questions regarding this research please contact:

Principal Investigator:
Mercedes Tappé
mtappe@hawaii.edu
(808) 291-5778

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the UH Committee on Human Studies, 956-5007 or uhirb@hawaii.edu
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following questions?

For the following Items please specify on the scale

1. Will you go on a date with me?

   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10
   No never   to   yes definitely

2. Will you come back to my apartment?

   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10
   No never   to   yes definitely

3. Will you go to bed with me tonight?

   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10
   No never   to   yes definitely
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following questions?

For the following Items please specify on the scale

1. Will you go on a date with me?
   
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   No never to yes definitely

2. Will you come back to my apartment?
   
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   No never to yes definitely

3. Will you go to bed with me tonight?
   
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   No never to yes definitely
APPENDIX C
Study One Demographics

Reasons for your response to question 1:

Reasons for your response to question 2:

Reasons for your response to question 3:

What is your sex? Male______ Female______

What is your age? __________

What is your Sexual Orientation?

Bisexual____ Heterosexual____ Homosexual____ Unsure____

What is your ethnic background? (Check all that apply)

___ African, African-American
___ American Indian or Alaskan Native
___ Caucasian
___ Chinese
___ Filipino
___ Hawaiian, Part-Hawaiian
___ Hispanic/Latino/Mexican-American
___ Japanese
___ Korean
___ Middle Eastern
___ Other Asian
___ Pacific Islander
___ Indian, Pakistani, and other South Asians
___ Portuguese

Do you consider yourself religious? Yes____ No ____

How religious are you? Please circle one.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all to Very Religious

What is your religious affiliation? (if applicable) ____________

Are you in a committed relationship? Yes____ No ____

Additional questions or comments:
APPENDIX D
Study Two (Three Male Forms)

Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you go on a date with me?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
No never to yes definitely

Reasons for your response:
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you come back to my apartment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for your response to question 1:
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you go to bed with me tonight?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
No never to yes definitely

Reasons for your response to question 1:
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you go on a date with me?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
No never to yes definitely

Reasons for your response to question 1:
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you come back to my apartment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for your response to question:
Please answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine this person comes up to you while you are walking to class and says “I have noticed you around campus. I find you very attractive.” How would you respond to the following question?

For the following item please specify on the scale

Will you go to bed with me tonight?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
No never to yes definitely

Reasons for your response to question:
What is your sex?  Male______ Female______

What is your age?  __________

What is your Sexual Orientation?

Bisexual___  Heterosexual___  Homosexual___  Unsure___

What is your ethnic background? (Check all that apply)

___  African, African-American
___  American Indian or Alaskan Native
___  Caucasian
___  Chinese
___  Filipino
___  Hawaiian, Part-Hawaiian
___  Hispanic/Latino/Mexican-American
___  Japanese
___  Korean
___  Middle Eastern
___  Other Asian
___  Pacific Islander
___  Indian, Pakistani, and other South Asians
___  Portuguese

Do you consider yourself religious?  Yes____  No ____

How religious are you? Please circle one.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all to Very Religious

What is your religious affiliation? (if applicable)__________

Are you in a committed relationship? Yes____  No ____

Additional questions or comments:
Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize him although you don’t remember his name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) He proceeds with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to go out sometime?”

Please Circle One:

YES NO
Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize them although you don’t remember their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to come over to my place tonight?”

Please Circle One:

YES  NO
Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize them although you don’t remember their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to have sex with me tonight?”

Please Circle One:

YES          NO
APPENDIX H.
Study Three (Three Female Forms)
Please circle the person most sexually attractive to you

Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize them although you don’t remember their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to go out sometime?”

Please Circle One:

YES  NO
Please circle the person most sexually attractive to you

Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize them although you don’t remember their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to come over to my place tonight?”

Please Circle One:

YES  NO
Please circle the person most sexually attractive to you

Answer every question honestly. All answers are completely confidential.

Imagine you are not currently in a relationship. This person (you selected) approaches you while you are walking to meet some of your friends for lunch and says,

“Hey, you were in my class last semester.” (You recognize them although you don’t remember their name. You have a short conversation about the class you took together.) They proceed with,

“You seem like a pretty nice person. I really wish I had a chance to talk with you before. I don’t mean to be forward and this is unusual for me, but I think you’re really cute and was wondering if you want to have sex with me tonight?”

Please Circle One:

YES

NO
APPENDIX I
Study Three Questionnaire and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please specify on the scale)

Reasons for your response:

If this person were interested in being your significant other how would you respond?

YES   NO (CIRCLE ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please specify on the scale)

Rate your own attractiveness in relation to your peers on the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all attractive</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Very attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the attractiveness of the person who approached you on the scale: (person you selected/circled on the previous page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all attractive</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>very attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select how one of your same-sex friends would respond to the question on the first page?

YES   NO (CIRCLE ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No never</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please specify on the scale)

What is your current happiness/satisfaction level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely unhappy</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Ecstatic (very happy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your sex?  Male______ Female______

What is your age? ________

What is your Sexual Orientation?

Bisexual___  Heterosexual___  Homosexual___  Unsure___

What is your ethnic background? (Please select ONE ONLY – the one you most ethnically/culturally identify with)

___ African, African-American
___ American Indian or Alaskan Native
___ Caucasian
___ Chinese
___ Filipino
___ Hawaiian, Part-Hawaiian
___ Hispanic/Latino/Mexican-American
___ Japanese
___ Korean
___ Middle Eastern
___ Other Asian
___ Pacific Islander
___ Indian, Pakistani, and other South Asians
___ Portuguese

Do you consider yourself religious?  Yes____   No ____

What is your religious affiliation? (if applicable)_____________

Are you in a committed relationship? Yes____  No ____

What is your major? __________________

Where were you raised? (Please Select ONE ONLY)

___ Hawaii
___ Continental United States (Mainland)
___ Africa
___ China
___ Philippines
___ Central or South America
___ Japan
___ Korea
___ Middle East
___ Other Asian Countries
___ Pacific Island Nations
___ India and other South Asian Countries

Additional questions or comments:

60