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ABSTRACT

Research on the self suggests that one's self views are powerful regulators of both cognitive processing and behavioral responding. Sexual self schemas have been defined as cognitive generalizations about the sexual aspects of the self, that are derived from past experience, manifest in current experience, and that function to guide the processing of sexually-relevant social information. Previously, women's sexual self schemas have been assessed as a unidimensional, bipolar phenomenon. In the current research, the sexual self schema construct has been reconceptualized in terms of a bivariate model, in which positive and negative components of women's sexual self views independently contribute to their schematic representations. Using this bivariate approach, four types of schematic representations have been delineated, including Positive, Negative, Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups.

The current research is composed of two independent studies. In Study 1, 318 female undergraduate students completed anonymous questionnaires, which included the Sexual Self Schema scale as well as converging assessments of sexual behaviors, sexual responses (i.e., desire, arousal, orgasm and resolution) and sexual evaluations, as well as measures of past and current relationship patterns and romantic attachment styles. Obtained results highlight predictable patterns of schema group differences across sexual/romantic behaviors, cognitions and affects. Specifically, results replicated and extended previous Positive-Negative schema group contrasts, and, importantly,
distinguished the response patterns of the newly-differentiated Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. Finally, findings were related to existing theories of attachment style representations within the proposed cognitive hierarchy of the self.

Next, the bivariate model of sexual self schema was tested with an explicitly cognitive, information-processing paradigm. In Study 2, 271 female undergraduates who had been prescreened with the Sexual Self Schema scale participated in a timed self-judgment task. Drawing from previous research, we theorized that women's sexual self views would function to mediate the processing of schema-relevant cues. Moreover, we predicted potential interactive effects between self-schematic person variables and schema-relevant situational cues - which were controlled via a priming manipulation. Results provided preliminary support for these schematic hypotheses, and, in conjunction with Study 1 findings, stimulate theoretical speculations regarding the cognitive-affective response patterns of women with alternative sexual self views.
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CHAPTER 1

SCHEMAS, SEXUALITY AND ROMANTIC ATTACHMENT

INTRODUCTION

Research suggests that our self views act as a lens through which we perceive, organize and interpret self-relevant information (Kelly, 1955; Markus, 1977; Markus & Zajonc, 1985). Well-articulated self views, or self schemas, mediate how we process - and in turn how we respond to - relevant social cues. Following this social cognitive premise, we hypothesize that one's sexual self view functions as an important regulator of one's sexual cognitions, behaviors and responses.

Sexual self schemas are defined as cognitive views about the sexual aspects of the self. These views are derived from past experience, are manifest in current sexual cognitions, and they guide sexual behavior. If well-articulated and accessible, one's sexual self schema may function as a quick referent of one's sexual history - a reference point upon which to base relevant judgments, decisions, inferences, predictions and behaviors (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994).

Self schemas may mediate both cognitive processing and affect regulation in response to domain-relevant information. Hence, one's sexual self schemas will have important consequences for one's cognitive and emotive responses to sexually-relevant cues. In addition to these intrapersonal processes, strong self views may also mediate interpersonal processes, including social perceptions and interactions (e.g., see Markus & Wurf, 1987). It follows, then, that one's sexual self views will influence perceptual and behavioral responses within sexual situations and relationships. Hence, individuals with well-articulated sexual self views will be ready to perceive and process sexually-relevant
cues, to respond to these cues in a schema-dependent positive or negative manner, and to engage in subsequent sexual approach or avoidance behaviors or interactions.

Previous studies (Cyranowski, 1993; Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994) indicate that there are systematic differences among women's views of their sexual selves, and that these sexual self views can be validly and reliably measured. Pursuant of Galton's (1884) lexical hypothesis (that important individual differences in human transactions will come to be encoded as single terms in one's language), the sexual self schema construct has been operationalized by assessing women's normative beliefs about the important personality dispositions of a 'sexual woman.' As tapped by the Sexual Self Schema scale, an unobtrusive trait-adjective rating scale, women's sexual self concepts include two positive aspects: (1) romantic/passionate and (2) open/direct self views; and one negative aspect: embarrassment or conservatism, which appears to be a deterrent to sexual expression. (See Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994, for scale development and validity information.)

**The Bipolar Model: Differentiating Negative versus Positive Self Schema Groups**

Previously, the sexual self schema construct has been studied as a unidimensional phenomenon. Specifically, subject ratings on each of the three factors have been linearly combined to obtain a single, cumulative schema score. Utilizing this model, research has differentiated the response patterns of women who score on the extreme ends of a single bipolar continuum, or those who espouse strong and consistent 'positive' versus 'negative' views of their sexual selves. (See Figure 1.1 for a graphic representation of the bipolar schema model.)

Women who obtain high scores on this bipolar schema continuum espouse consistently positive views of their sexuality; whereas women who obtain low scores hold negative sexual self views. When these groups are contrasted, Positive schema women evaluate sexual behaviors more positively and report higher levels of sexual arousal than their Negative schema counterparts. Behaviorally, Positive schema scorers report experiencing a wider range of lifetime sexual activities, a higher frequency of current
sexual activities, and more sexual partners than Negative schema scorers. Positive schema women are also more willing to engage in uncommitted sexual relations, and report more short term (one-night) sexual encounters. This distinction between Positive and Negative schematic women goes beyond the notion of unrestricted sexuality, however, as Positive schema women also report more extensive histories of romantic involvements than do women with negative schemas. Finally, sexual self schemas provide self-scripts for future behaviors, as high scoring women anticipate having a larger number of sexual partners in the future, as compared to their low scoring counterparts. In fact, schema scores prospectively predict differences in sexual activities across Positive and Negative schema groups over a 2-month time interval (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994).

The Bivariate Model: Aschematic and Co-Schematic Hypotheses

While the bipolar conceptualization has proven powerful in the characterization of schemas of opposing valence, we hypothesized that a bivariate model of sexual self schema, in which positive (i.e., factors 1 and 2) and negative (i.e., factor 3) schema dimensions are assessed as independent constructs, might show both conceptual and methodological advantages. (See Figure 1.2 for a graphic representation of the bivariate schema model.) Conceptually, such a model would allow both positive and negative dimensions to have some functional independence, be opposing in their effects on behavior, and provide for the possibility of effects due to differential levels of activation (see Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994). Methodologically, a bivariate model would allow for the clarification of sexual self schemas for women who fall in the middle of the bipolar schema distribution.

The Positive and Negative schema groups defined within the proposed bivariate model should be similar to those groups defined via extreme scores on the bipolar continuum. That is, Positive schema women endorse positive schema adjectives, and few, if any, negative adjectives. The converse is the case for the Negative schema women. In addition, the bivariate schema model identifies two other schema topologies (see Figure 1.2). We define Asematics as those who hold neither strong positive nor strong
negative views of their sexuality. These individuals lack an articulated, coherent, or accessible schematic framework with which to guide relevant perceptions, cognitions and behaviors. We hypothesize that Aschematics would not experience sexual encounters as negative, difficult or anxiety-provoking, and would not take steps to avoid sexually-relevant cues. Neither, however, would they seek out sexual cues or situations. Hence, the sexual behaviors of these individuals would likely be driven by chance or situational variables, rather than by their personal schematic representations.

The final topology is that of the Co-Schematic group, which includes those individuals with a schematic representation of their sexuality, yet one which includes contrasting positive and negative aspects. These individuals provide simultaneously strong endorsements of both positive and negative schema aspects. We theorize that the sexual self views of these women may be disruptive for them, as manifest in behavioral and affective approach-avoidance responses to sexual cues. As such, Co-Schematic women may evidence the same, moderately restricted levels of sexual behavior as the Aschematic women, yet report larger discrepancies in their sexual affects. Specifically, we hypothesize that Co-Schematic women will endorse both positive sexual affects, such as desire and arousal, as well as such negative affects as sexual anxiety.

**Focus of the Current Study**

The current study has been designed to explicitly compare and contrast the cognitive and behavioral response patterns of the four groups defined by the bivariate sexual self schema model. Specifically, we focus on three levels of schema group comparisons. To begin, we replicate the pattern of Positive versus Negative group contrasts previously obtained with the bipolar schema model. Our second level of analysis differentiates the response patterns of our newly-defined schema groups - the Aschematics and Co-Schematics - from those of the previously-studied Positive and Negative schema groups. Finally, we differentiate the response patterns of the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. Planned comparisons between these latter groups should provide a particularly powerful indicator of the incremental validity of the bivariate schema model.
In line with previous sexual self-schema research, the above group comparisons will be examined across multiple sexuality assessment points. To begin, measures of past and current sexual behaviors will be included. In addition, convergent measures of each stage of the sexual response cycle (i.e., sexual desire, arousal, orgasm and resolution) will be tapped, as well as the women's experience of sexual anxiety. Finally, we include measures of general sexual satisfaction, as well as self-evaluative measures of one's sexuality and sexual skills.

A second goal of the research was to extend the sexual self schema construct to the domain of romantic attachments. Prior research comparing Positive and Negative schema scorers has suggested that Positive schema women exhibit more extensive romantic as well as sexual relationships (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994). Hence, we hypothesize that women's sexual self schemas may include an element conducive to the development of emotional attachments that goes beyond the notion of unrestricted sexuality.

A recent line of research has explored the role of affectual bonds within adult love relationships, and has attempted to map alternative styles with which adults emotionally attach to their romantic partners. Attachment theory suggests that affectual bonds function to maintain our relatedness to others, and hence represent a fundamental survival need. Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) argued that attachment patterns first develop within early infant-caregiver relationships, and that differences in the nature and quality of these early interactions may result in the development of alternative 'internal working models' or schemas regarding the self and self-other interactions. These mental models are believed to organize cognitions, affects and behaviors - i.e., attachment style constellations - in later relationships (Bowlby, 1973; Mikulincer, 1995; Hazan and Shaver, 1987).

In what has become a seminal work, Hazan and Shaver (1987) translated Ainsworth's infant-caregiver attachment styles (as developed from observations of the 'Strange Situation'; Ainsworth et al., 1978) into descriptions of adult romantic attachment patterns. Subsequent factor analytic research, moreover, has delineated two independent dimensions of adult romantic attachment styles, which have been identified as: Avoidant
versus Secure, and Anxious versus Non-anxious attachment dimensions (See Simpson, 1990; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Research has related attachment styles to such variables as: perceptions and experiences within close relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990); affect regulation (Mikulincer, Florian & Tolmacz, 1990; Mikulincer, Florian & Weller, 1993; Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995; Simpson, 1990), and self-esteem (Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Griffia & Bartholomew, 1994), among others [e.g., depression, (Hammen, Burge, Daley, Davila, Paley & Rudolf, 1995; Roberts, Gotlib & Kassel, 1996); social support seeking (e.g., Simpson, Rholes & Nelligen, 1992; Feeney & Kirkpatrick, 1996)].

In the current study, we hope to explore the potential relationship between women's sexual self schemas and their romantic attachment styles. We hypothesize that women's sexual self views may not only influence sexual perceptions and interactions; they may also relate to one's perceptions, experience and pattern of romantic or emotional attachments. Specifically, we hypothesize that Secure and Non-anxiously attached individuals will more likely exhibit positive sexual self schemas. More generally, we predict a moderate relationship between (1) the Secure versus Avoidant and positive sexual self schema dimensions; and (2) the Anxious versus Non-anxious and negative sexual self schema dimensions. The current study has therefore included a series of measures designed to assess past and current romantic relationships, relationship satisfaction, and patterns of emotional attachments exhibited across the four schema groups.

**METHOD**

**Participants, Design and Procedures**

Subjects consisted of 318 female undergraduates at the Ohio State University (OSU) enrolled in Introductory Psychology. Participants were informed of the nature of the study and the anonymity of their responses prior to participation. Subjects received course credit for experiment participation.
Measures

Subject Demographics

Subjects completed a series of demographic questions, including: age, year in school, marital status and racial/ethnic background. In addition, subjects indicated their current sexual orientation, with potential response points being: Exclusively homosexual, Predominantly homosexual, Bisexual, Predominantly heterosexual, Exclusively heterosexual, and Uncertain (see Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin & Gebhard, 1953).

Sexual Self Schema

Developed in a trait-adjective rating format, the Sexual Self Schema Scale represents an unobtrusive measure of sexual cognition, or sexual self views. Factor analyses indicate that women's sexual self views are composed of three factors: two positive aspects (romantic/passionate and open/direct self views) and a negative aspect (embarrassment/ conservatism). Subjects rated 50 trait-adjectives (26 scored and 24 fillers) on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (Not at all descriptive of me) to 6 (Very much descriptive of me). Total sexual self schema scores have been found to correlate with such response patterns as history of sexual experience (r=.30, p<.01), sexual arousability (r=.25, p<.01) and number of prior romantic relationships (r=.32, p<.01), and are generally unhampered by social desirability. Internal consistency (Cronbach alpha=.82) and test-retest reliability (2-week, r=.91) estimates are high. (See Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994, for further validity information.)

Part I -- Sexuality Measures

In line with existing theoretical frameworks of women's sexuality and sexual assessment (see Andersen & Cyranowski, 1995), subsets of measures were selected to tap conceptually-relevant sexual domains. Specifically, converging measures of sexual behaviors, sexual responses, and individual differences were used. (See Appendix A for a copy of the full questionnaire.)
Sexual Behaviors

(1-2) Sexual Experience Scale of the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI; Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1979). The SES was completed by subjects in two formats, for measures of lifetime and current (past 30 day) sexual activities. The 24 SES items include preliminary and intimate foreplay, anal activity, intercourse, and masturbation. Lifetime occurrence of each activity was rated either 0 (never experienced in my life) or 1 (have experienced at least once). Current (past 30 day) frequency was rated on a scale from 0 (this activity did not occur) to 9 (activity occurred two or more times a day). Total scores were obtained by summing responses across the 24 scale items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexual activity. The SES has shown one-month test-retest reliabilities of .72, and internal consistencies (Kuder-Richardson) between 84 and .88. (Andersen, Anderson, & deProse, 1989; Andersen & LeGrand, 1991).

(3) Sexual Avoidance Subscale from the Sexual Aversion Scale (SAS; Katz, Gipson, Kearl & Kriskovich, 1989; Katz, Gipson & Turner, 1992). The Sexual Avoidance subscale of the Sexual Aversion Scale consists of 10 statements regarding avoidance behaviors or attitudes, such as "I am afraid to engage in sexual intercourse with another person" and "I try to avoid situations where I might get involved sexually." Items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (Not at all like me) to 3 (A lot like me). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating more sexual avoidance behaviors. Reliability data include estimates of .85 for internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) and .86-.89 for four-week test-retest reliability (Katz, Gipson, Kearl & Kriskovich, 1989; Katz, Gipson & Turner, 1992).

The Sexual Response Cycle

Current models of sexual responding, drawing from both Masters and Johnson (1966, 1970) and Kaplan (1977, 1979), define the sexual response cycle in terms of (1) sexual desire, (2) sexual arousal, (3) orgasm, and (4) resolution. The Sexual Responsiveness Scale (Andersen, Andersen & deProse, 1989) is a self-report measure
designed to assess each of these four stages. Subject responses to the 24-item scale were submitted to a principle axis factor analysis, with an oblique (Harris-Kaiser) rotation. Three main factors emerged, and have been labeled as: (1) sexual desire, (2) arousal difficulties and (3) orgasm/resolution. For convergent validity, other phase-specific measures of sexual desire and arousal were also included. Finally, measures of sexual anxiety were included, as theoretical models of arousal often implicate anxiety as a key to arousal difficulties and/or sexual dysfunctions (e.g., see Barlow, 1986; Beck, 1986).

A. Sexual Desire

(1) Sexual Desire Subscale from the Sexual Responsiveness Scale (Andersen, Andersen & deProsse, 1989). From the factor analysis, seven items of the Sexual Responsiveness Scale were combined to form the Sexual Desire subscale. Items included "How often do you have a desire for sex?" and "How often do you 'say no' or avoid having sex?" and were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (always). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexual desire. Internal consistency was .66 (Cronbach alpha).

(2) Sexual Preoccupation Scale from the Sexuality Scale (Snell & Papini, 1989). Sexual Preoccupation, or the "persistent tendency to become absorbed in, obsessed with, and engrossed in sexual cognitions and behaviors" (Snell & Papini, 1989, p. 257) was assessed with a 10-item subscale of the Sexuality Scale. Items included "I think about sex all of the time" and "I hardly ever fantasize about having sex," and were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (disagree) to 4 (agree). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating more sexual preoccupation. Reliability data include estimates of .88-.91 for internal consistency (Cronbach alphas obtained with female samples) and .70-.76 for four-week test-retest reliabilities. Moreover, for women, sexual preoccupation scores have been found to correlate positively with erotophilia and sexual assertiveness, and negatively with sex guilt and sex anxiety (Snell & Papini, 1989; Snell, Fisher & Schuh, 1992).
B. Sexual Arousal

(1) Arousal Difficulties Subscale from Sexual Responsiveness Scale (Andersen, Andersen & deProse, 1989). Factor analysis revealed eight items from the Sexual Responsiveness Scale characterizing arousal difficulties. Items included "How often does your vagina feel 'too tight' for penetration?" and "How often do you feel pain or discomfort with penetration or intercourse?", which subjects rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (always). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating more arousal difficulties. Internal consistency was .68 (Cronbach alpha).

(2) Sexual Arousability Index (SAI; Hoon, Hoon & Wincze, 1976). The SAI assesses women's experienced or predicted arousal across 28 sexual activities, including erotica and masturbation, body caressing, seductive activities, oral-genital and genital stimulation, and intercourse (Andersen, Broffit, Karlsson, & Turnquist, 1989). Sexual arousal was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (unpleasant/adverse effect) to 6 (extremely arousing). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher levels of arousability. The SAI has obtained Kuder-Richardson reliability estimates ranging from .92 to .96, and 4-month test-retest reliabilities ranging from .74 to .90 (Andersen, Broffit, Karlsson, & Turnquist, 1989).

C. Sexual Anxiety

(1) The Expanded SAI (SAI-E; Hoon, 1978; Chambless & Lifshitz, 1984). A modified version of the SAI, the SAI-E (Hoon, 1978) was utilized to assess sexual anxiety, defined as "feelings of nervousness, tension, uneasiness, or worry. These feelings are unpleasant." The items (which parallel the 28 sexual activities on the SAI) were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (pleasant/relaxing) to 6 (extremely anxiety-provoking). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexual anxiety. Internal consistency estimates include Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients of .94 for the SAI-E. Moreover, validity
studies have found the SAI arousal and anxiety scales to be uncorrelated, and anxiety scores have been negatively correlated with reported orgasmic frequency (Chambless & Lifshiz, 1984).

(2) **Sexual Anxiety and Self-Consciousness Subscale** from the Sexual Aversion Scale (SAS; Katz, Gipson, Kearl & Kriskovich, 1989; Katz, Gipson & Turner, 1992). Sexual Anxiety and Self-Consciousness is a 6-item subscale of the Sexual Aversion Scale, and includes such items as, "I often wonder what other people think of me," "I would like to feel more relaxed in sexual situations," and "I worry a lot about sex." Items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (Not at all like me) to 3 (A lot like me). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexual anxiety and self-consciousness. Reliability data include estimates of .85 for internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) and .86-.89 for four-week test-retest reliability. In addition, the scale has been found to correlate with both state and trait anxiety (r=.36 and .44, respectively) using the STAI (Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory) (Katz, Gipson & Turner, 1992).

D. **Orgasm / Resolution**

(1) **Orgasm / Resolution Subscale** from the Sexual Responsiveness Scale (Andersen, Andersen & deProesse, 1989). Factor analysis revealed eight items from the Sexual Responsiveness Scale representing the combined stages of orgasm and resolution. Items included "How often are you able to reach climax (come)?," "How often are you dissatisfied with your capacity to have orgasm / climax?" and "How often do you feel satisfied after sexual activity?" Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (always). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher orgasmic frequency and satisfaction. Internal consistency was .86 (Cronbach alpha).
Sexual Satisfaction and Self-Evaluation

A. Sexual Satisfaction

(1) Satisfacdon with Sexual Activities. Four items assessing general satisfaction with sexual activities (e.g., "How often are you satisfied with the frequency of sexual activity?" and "How frequently do you enjoy sexual activity?") were summed to represent a single sexual satisfaction score, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (Never) to 4 (Always). Internal consistency was .64. (Cronbach alpha).

(2) Sexual Depression Scale from the Sexuality Scale (Snell & Papini, 1989). Sexual Depression, or the tendency to feel saddened, discouraged or dissatisfied with one's sexual activities, was assessed with this 10-item subscale of the Sexuality Scale. Items included "I feel unhappy about my sexual relationships" and "I am disappointed about the quality of my sex life," and were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (disagree) to 4 (agree). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating greater sexual depression. An internal consistency estimate of .94 (Cronbach alpha) has been obtained for the scale, and 4-week test-retest reliabilities range from .67-.76. Moreover, sexual depression has been shown to correlate positively with sex anxiety and clinical depression, and negatively with sexual assertiveness and self-esteem (Snell & Papini, 1989; Snell, Fisher & Schuh, 1992).

B. Sexual Self-Evaluations

(1) Global Sexuality Ratings. Subjective ratings of women's sexuality were assessed with the question, "Compared to other women about your age, how would you rate yourself as a sexual woman?" Responses were scored on a 9-point Likert scale, with the following anchors: 0 (I am much less sexual than most women my age); 4 (I am about as sexual as most women my age); and 8 (I am much more sexual than most women my age).
(2) Sexual Esteem Scale from the Sexuality Scale (Snell & Papini, 1989). Sexual Esteem, or positive evaluations regarding one's sexual ability or activity, was assessed with this 10-item subscale of the Sexuality Scale. Items included “I am a good sexual partner” and “I would rate my sexual skill quite highly,” and were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (Disagree) to 4 (Agree). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating greater sexual esteem. Reliability estimates include internal consistencies of .92 (Cronbach alpha) and 4-week test-retest reliabilities ranging from .69-.74. Preliminary validity studies indicate sexual esteem to correlate positively with self-esteem and sexual assertiveness, and negatively with sex anxiety and clinical depression (Snell & Papini, 1989; Snell, Fisher & Schuh, 1992).

Part II – Relationship Measures

A number of measures were included to examine potential patterns across subjects' cognitive, behavioral and affective experience of romantic relationships. Relationship measures were selected to tap subjects' past and present relationship history as well as patterns of responding within romantic and/or sexual relationships, including: willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relationships, obsessiveness and satisfaction within love relationships, and differing styles of emotional attachments.

Relationship History Participants completed a series of questions related to past and present involvement in romantic or love relationships. Items included questions regarding (a) number of previous love/romantic relationships; (b) current relationship status; (c) length of current relationship; and (d) type or seriousness of current relationship. Appropriate response scales were provided for each item.

Sexual Relationship Patterns

Willingness to Engage in Uncommitted Sexual Relationships.

The Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). The SOI is designed to measure one's sociosexual orientation, or “willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relations.” The seven-item scale includes both behavioral (e.g., “With
how many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex in the next five years?”) and attitudinal (e.g., “Sex without love is OK.”) indices. Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating a greater willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relations. Reliability estimates include .73 for internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) and reliable patterns of convergent and discriminant validity (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).

**Lifetime Sexual Partners.** Subjects were asked to report, “With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) in your lifetime?,” on a rating scale ranging from 0 (None) to 9 (Over 20 partners).

**Romantic Relationship Patterns**

**Obsessiveness in Romantic Relationships.** *Hatfield Passionate Love Scale (PLS-short form; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).* The PLS is designed to measure one’s tendency to become passionate or obsessive in love relationships. Subjects rate 15 statements regarding someone they love(d) passionately, such as “I would feel despair if ___ left me” or “Sometimes I feel I can’t control my thoughts; they are obsessively on ___.“ Items were rated on a 9-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all true) to 8 (extremely true). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating greater levels of passionate or obsessive love. The PLS is factorially unidimensional, obtains internal consistency estimates of .91 (Cronbach alpha), and is uncorrelated with social desirability (r=.09) (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).

**Romantic Attachment Styles.** (Simpson, 1990; Simpson, Rholes & Nelligan, 1992). Derived from Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) reformulation of early infant-caregiver attachment styles (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978), this 13-item measure assesses adult romantic attachment styles. Factor analyses indicate two attachment dimensions: (1) Avoidant vs. Approach and (2) Anxious vs. Non-Anxious attachment. The avoidant attachment index includes eight items such as "I find it difficult to trust others completely" and "I’m nervous whenever anyone gets too close to me," which are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (I strongly disagree) to 6 (I strongly
agree). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating higher levels of avoidance. The anxious attachment index includes five items, such as "I often worry that my partner(s) don't really love me" and "I often want to merge completely with others, and this desire sometimes scares them away," rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (I strongly disagree) to 6 (I strongly agree). Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating greater levels of anxious attachment. Previous research has obtained Cronbach alphas of .81 and .61 for the avoidant and anxious attachment dimensions, respectively (Simpson et al., 1992).

**Dyadic Satisfaction.** The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976). For subjects currently involved in romantic relationships, relationship satisfaction was assessed with the 10-item Dyadic Satisfaction subscale of the DAS. Items included "In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?" and "Do you ever regret that you are partnered (dating/living together/married)?" Total scores were obtained by summing item responses, with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction. This subscale has obtained internal consistency estimates of .94 (Cronbach alpha), and exhibits both content and criterion-related validity (Spanier, 1976).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Subject Demographics**

The mean age of subjects was 20 years (SD=2.42 years), with a mean education level of 13.28 years (between a college freshman/sophomore). Subjects were predominantly Caucasian (78.6%; 9.4% were African-American, 6.3% Asian, 2.5% Hispanic) and unmarried (96%). Ninety-five percent of subjects reported a predominantly or exclusively heterosexual orientation.

**Sexual Self Schema Categorization**

In previous research, subject scores on the two positive factors (i.e., romantic/passionate and open/direct) and the negative factor (i.e., embarrassed/conservative) of the
Sexual Self Schema Scale have been linearly combined to form a single, 'total' sexual self schema score. Replicating previous studies, the mean total schema score for this sample was 59.54 (SD=13.46).

For the purposes of the current study, however, individual scores on the positive and negative dimensions were considered independently. As with total schema scores, both of these dimensions were normally distributed. The mean for the positive dimension (factors 1 and 2) was 81.79 (SD=11.22), with a median score of 83. This scale included 19 items, and obtained a Cronbach alpha of .82. The mean for the negative dimension (factor 3) was 22.25 (SD=5.59), with a median score of 23. This scale included 7 items, and obtained a Cronbach alpha of .64. Median split procedures were performed on the two dimensions utilizing cut-offs of 82/83 for the positive dimension and 22/23 for the negative dimension. From this, subjects were categorized into one of four possible schema groups, designated as: Positive (high positive, low negative scorers; n=87), Negative (low positive, high negative scorers; n=87), Aschematic (low positive, low negative scorers; n=70) and Co-Schematic (high positive, high negative scorers; n=74).

Analysis Plan

In an effort to control for Type I error across the number of proposed analyses, a MANOVA design was employed. Whenever possible, conceptually-related scales were combined into single MANOVAs. When MANOVA results were significant, follow-up ANOVAs were run for the individual scales. For significant ANOVAs, planned comparisons were run to test hypothesized schema group contrasts.

PART I — Schemas and Sexuality

RESULTS

Sexual Behaviors

A MANOVA including the sexual behavior indicators of lifetime SES, current (past 30 day) SES, and Sexual Avoidance scales was significant, $F(9, 759.48) = 5.96, p < .01$. Follow-up ANOVAs for each of the individual scales also reached significance (all
p's < .01), supporting hypothesized group differences in the breadth of lifetime sexual experiences, frequency of current sexual activities, and tendency to avoid sexual situations. Inspection of the pattern of group means across these behavioral scales present a similar picture, with the middling scores of the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups contrasted by the extreme scores of the Positive and Negative groups (see Table 1.1). Figure 1.3a graphically represents these group differences across lifetime sexual activities.

**The Sexual Response Cycle**

**A. Sexual Desire**

A MANOVA including the Desire Subscale of the Sexual Response Cycle Scale and the Sexual Preoccupation scale was significant, $F(6, 470) = 3.25$, $p < .01$. Follow-up ANOVAs for both of the individual measures were also significant ($p's < .01$), indicating overall group differences in the women’s reported levels of sexual desire and their tendency to become preoccupied with sexual cognitions. As predicted, planned comparisons indicate that the Co-Schematic group, in contrast to the Asomatics, are more likely to be preoccupied with thoughts about sex (with Sexual Preoccupation scores of 21.45 vs. 18.1, $p < .01$), and report marginally higher levels of sexual desire (with Desire Subscale scores of 19.64 and 18.35, $p < .06$). Moreover, both measures result in a similar pattern of scores across the four schema groups, with the Negative and Asomatic groups obtaining similarly low, and the Positive and Co-Somatics obtaining similarly high scores on both Sexual Desire indicators (See Table 1.1b). See Figure 1.3b for a graphic representation of sexual preoccupation scores across the four schema groups.

**B. Sexual Arousal**

A MANOVA for the SAI and Arousal Difficulties subscale of the Sexual Response Cycle scale was significant, $F(6, 470) = 5.24$, $p < .01$. Follow-up ANOVAs for the individual measures indicated significant differences across the four schema groups in levels of perceived sexual arousal across a variety of sexual situations ($p < .01$), and marginally significant differences in their reported occurrence of arousal difficulties ($p < .07$). Planned comparisons indicate that the Co-Somatics, as compared to the Asomatics, report significantly higher levels of sexual arousability across sexual
activities (with SAI scores of 118.55 vs. 105.03, p<.01), but did not significantly differ in their self-reports of specific arousal difficulties (see Table 1.1c). See Figure 1.4a for a graphic representation of SAI scores.

C. Sexual Anxiety

A MANOVA including the SAI-E and the Sexual Anxiety and Self-Consciousness scale was significant, F(6, 626) = 6.40, p < .01. Follow-up ANOVAs for both of the individual measures were also significant (p's<.01), indicating significant group differences in reported feelings of anxiety, nervousness or uneasiness across a variety of sexual activities, and general feelings of anxiety or self-consciousness regarding sexual situations. As predicted, evaluations of group means indicate similarly low levels of reported anxiety across various sexual activities for the Positive and Aschematic groups (with SAI-E means of 31.8 and 36.78, respectively), as compared to the significantly higher levels reported by the Negative and Co-Schematic Groups (with SAI-E scores of 52.86 and 48.93, respectively) (see Table 1.1d). A similar pattern of results was obtained across subjects’ Sexual Anxiety and Self-Consciousness scores, although in this case the planned Aschematic vs. Co-Schematic group comparison failed to reach significance (p < .18). Figure 1.4b provides a graphic representation of SAI-E scores by schema group.

D. Orgasm / Resolution

A one-way ANOVA calculated with the Orgasm/Resolution subscale of the Sexual Response Cycle scale failed to obtain significant group differences in subject reports of their perception and satisfaction with reaching orgasm and their experience of relaxation with resolution F(3, 236) = .79.

Sexual Satisfaction and Self-Evaluation

A. Sexual Satisfaction

A MANOVA calculated with the Satisfaction with Sexual Activities items and the Sexual Depression scale was significant, F(6, 470) = 4.94, p < .01. Follow-up ANOVAs for both of the individual measures were also significant (p's<.01), indicating significant group differences in subject reports of their satisfaction with and enjoyment of sexual
actives, and, alternatively, their tendency to feel saddened, discouraged or dissatisfied about their sexual activities. Inspection of group means indicate similarly low sexual satisfaction scores and high sexual depression scores for Negative and Aschematic subjects, and an opposite pattern of results for Positive and Co-Schematic subjects (see Table 1.1e). Planned comparisons between Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups reached significance on both indicators, with Co-Sematics reporting higher levels of sexual satisfaction (11.93 vs. 10.59, p<.01) and lower levels of sexual depression (9.41 vs. 12.41, p<.05) when compared to their Aschematic counterparts. For a graphic example of schema group satisfaction scores, see Figure 1.5a.

B. Sexual Self-Evaluations

A MANOVA calculated with Global Sexuality Ratings and the Sexual Esteem scale was significant, $F(6, 626) = 11.80, p < .01$. Follow-up ANOVAs for both measures were also significant (p's <.01), indicating differences across the four groups in their tendency to view themselves as sexual women, and to positively evaluate their sexual abilities or interactions (see Table 1.1f). Planned comparisons found no significant differences between the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups on either of these indicators. Both Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups obtained similarly intermediate scores, which differed significantly from the extremely high self-evaluations of the Positive group and low self-evaluations of the Negative group. See Figure 1.5b.

DISCUSSION

Positive versus Negative Schema Groups

As predicted, the Positive and Negative groups defined by the bivariate model exhibit patterns of sexual responses mirroring those obtained with extreme groups on a bipolar schema continuum. Replicating previous research (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994), the Positive schema group reported a greater history of lifetime sexual behaviors, a higher frequency of current sexual behaviors, higher levels of sexual arousal, and a tendency to evaluate their sexuality more positively than Negative schema women.
The current results also extend our understanding of this Positive-Negative contrast to include a broader picture of the sexual response cycle, as well as potential negative sexual affects. As predicted, Positive schema women reported higher levels of sexual desire, were more preoccupied with sexual thoughts, and became more aroused in response to sexual stimuli when compared to their Negative schema counterparts. In contrast, Negative schema women reported inhibited levels of desire and arousal, accompanied by high levels of negative sexual affects. The Negative schema group reported higher levels of sexual anxiety, more arousal difficulties, and more feelings of discouragement regarding their sexual activities. This consistently negative affective pattern, moreover, may account for the Negative schema group's higher level of sexual avoidance behaviors and low levels of sexual activities when compared to their Positive schema counterparts.

Notably, no significant Positive-Negative group difference was obtained on the Orgasm/Resolution subscale. Indeed, no schema group differences on this scale approached significance. This singular lack of a schema effect may, in part, be accounted for by the demographics of the current sample. Specifically, the sample is young (mean age = 20), with relatively few years of previous sexual experience. Hence, one might argue that these young women lack the sexual experience necessary to have achieved - or to reliably differentiate the responses associated with - orgasm. Indeed, other data indicate that schema group differences in orgasmic frequency and satisfaction emerge with samples of older, more sexually-experienced women (e.g., see Andersen, Woods & Copeland, 1996, in press).

*Negative versus Aschematic Schema Groups*

Like Negative schema scorers, Aschematics include those who fall below the mean on the positive schema dimension; these individuals do not view themselves as particularly romantic/passionate nor open/direct. As predicted, this schematic similarity is reflected in the response patterns of these groups across measures of positive sexual affects. Both
Negative and Aschematic groups reported similarly low levels of sexual desire, sexual arousal and sexual satisfaction - as compared to the higher scores of both Positive and Co-Schematic schema groups.

Unlike the Negative schema group, however, Asematics do not report embarrassed or conservative self views. It follows, then, that the Asematics reported significantly lower levels of sexual anxiety and self-consciousness when compared to their sexually-anxious Negative schema counterparts. In fact, the low sexual anxiety level reported by the Asematics approached that reported by the Positive schema group on the SAI-E. (See Figure 1.4b.) The Negative and Aschematic groups also differed behaviorally; the Asematics reported more lifetime sexual experiences and less sexual avoidance than did the Negative schema group. Finally, the Asomatic women were more neutral in their evaluations of themselves as 'sexual women,' and reported higher levels of sexual esteem, as compared to the negative sexual self evaluations of the Negative schema group. As hypothesized, Asomatic individuals lack articulated negative or positive views of their sexuality, which is manifest in their weak sexual self-evaluations and behavioral patterns, and their lack of clear positive or negative responses to sexual stimuli.

Positive versus Co-Schematic Groups

Like the Positive schema group, the Co-Schematic group includes women who report strong romantic/passionate and open/direct self-views. As predicted by this schematic similarity, the Positive and Co-schematic groups reported similar patterns of positive sexual affects. Both groups reported elevated levels of desire and arousal in response to sexual stimuli, a preoccupation with sexual thoughts, and a general satisfaction with their sexual activities.

Deviating from their Positive schema counterparts, however, Co-Schematic women hold simultaneous embarrassed, self-conscious or conservative self views. Hence, the Co-Schematic group includes those with strong but conflicting positive and negative views of the sexual self. This conflict was most clearly reflected in the Co-Sematics' endorsements of sexual anxiety. As predicted, the Co-Schematic group reported
significantly higher levels of sexual anxiety and self-awareness when compared to the Positive schema group. In fact, the sexual anxiety scores of the Co-Schematics approached those reported by the Negative schema group. (See Figure 1.4b.) Given these elevated levels of sexual anxiety, it is not surprising that the Co-Schematics also deviated from the Positive group behaviorally; the Co-Schematics reported restricted sexual behaviors and higher levels of sexual avoidance as compared to their Positive schema counterparts. Finally, the Co-Schematics were significantly more neutral in their sexual self-evaluations, and indicated lower levels of sexual esteem, as compared to Positive schema women.

Aschematic versus Co-Schematic Groups

The sexuality of individuals falling near the center of the bipolar schema distribution has been poorly understood. An apparent advantage of a bivariate model is that if subgroups exist, namely Aschematics and Co-Schematics, than comparisons would clarify these schematic representations.

Behaviorally, the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups do not differ. Both groups report moderate levels of lifetime sexual experiences, current sexual activities and sexual avoidance behaviors - falling between the heightened sexuality of the Positive women and inhibited behaviors of the Negative women. Similarly, both Aschematics and Co-Schematics provide mediocre evaluations of their sexuality, again falling between the high Positive and low Negative schema group means.

We theorize, however, that these moderate levels of sexual behaviors and self-evaluations represent different underlying processes for the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. Because the Aschematics generally lack a coherent, accessible or personally meaningful view of their sexual selves, they evaluate their sexuality in a disinterested fashion and exhibit neither restricted nor elevated levels of sexual behaviors. Being schemaless in their sexual self-views, their sexual behaviors will be driven by external factors rather than internal self-representations. In contrast, the moderate behaviors and evaluations of Co-Schematics may result from dysynchrony between simultaneous positive
and negative self views. Hence, these women's behaviors are the result of internal conflicts resulting in simultaneous approach-avoidance behaviors, rather than a disinterested or situationally-driven response.

A number of these hypothesized distinctions become apparent upon a closer analysis of the positive and negative sexual affects and responses of the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. To begin, the Co-Schematic group reports a higher level of positive, sexual approach-like responses. Specifically, Co-Schematics report significantly higher levels of sexual desire, sexual preoccupation, sexual arousal (assessed on the SAI), and sexual satisfaction, as compared to their Aschematic counterparts. In addition to this pattern of positive, approach-like sexual responses, however, Co-Schematics indicate a simultaneous negative sexual response - in the form of sexual anxiety. As predicted, the Co-Schematic group reported significantly higher levels of sexual anxiety (SAI-E) than did their Aschematic counterparts. The Aschematic group, lacking coherent positive or negative sexual self views, report neither high levels of sexual arousal nor sexual anxiety. The Co-Schematics, in contrast, report both. This pattern of low general arousal within the Aschematic group, as contrasted to the high but conflicting positive and negative arousal experienced by the Co-Schematics is strikingly evident in a comparison of group scores on sexual arousal (SAI) and sexual anxiety (SAI-E) indicators. (See Figures 1.4a and 1.4b.)

**PART II – Schemas and Relationships**

**RESULTS**

**Relationship History**

A series of chi-square and one-way ANOVA analyses indicated significant group differences across a number of the relationship history variables. A significant difference emerged between the Co-Schematics and all other groups in terms of current marital status ($\chi^2 = 13.48, p < .01$). Whereas 98.6% of the Aschematics, 97.7% of the Negative and 95.4% of the Positive groups categorized themselves as 'Single, never married,' only
86.5% of the Co-Schematics fell into this category. The remainder of Co-Schematics labeled themselves as 'Living with partner as married' (9.5%), 'Married' (2.7%), or 'Separated/Divorced' (1.4%)

A one-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference in the number of past love/romantic relationships reported across the four schema groups, $F(3, 311)=9.48$, $p < .01$. This was characterized by a significant difference between the Positive group, who reported a mean of 2.51 previous relationships, and all other schema groups (Negatives reported 1.49 relationships; Aschematics, 1.83; and Co-Schematics 1.81). (See Table 1.2a and Figure 1.6a.) This trend was mirrored in subject reports of current relationship status: 70.93% of the Positive group reported being in a current relationship, as opposed to the Co-Schematic (58.9%), Negative (57.47%), and Aschematic (55.07%) groups ($\chi^2 = 5.17$, $p = .16$). Of those subjects in a current relationship, however, no group differences were obtained in terms of the length of relationship, $F(3, 189)=.34$, $p = .79$. Average relationship length was 9-10 months.

Finally, for subjects in a current relationship, differences were obtained in reports of the seriousness of the relationship, $\chi^2 = 13.91$, $p < .05$. To begin, the Co-Schematic and Positive groups were more likely to describe their current relationship as 'Partnered / Engaged to be married' or 'Married' (27.27% and 21.21%, respectively), in contrast to the Aschematic and Negative groups (7.69% and 14%, respectively).

**Sexual Relationship Patterns**

**Willingness to Engage in Uncommitted Sexual Relationships.**

A MANOVA calculated with the SOI (Sociosexual Orientation Index) and subject reports of lifetime sexual partners was significant, $F(6, 626) = 6.48$, $p < .01$. Follow-up ANOVAs for both of the individual measures were also significant ($p's < .01$), indicating significant group differences in subjects' willingness to engage in casual or uncommitted sexual relationships and their number of lifetime sexual partners. A similar trend across group means emerged with both measures. Specifically, the Positive group obtained the highest scores (reporting an average of 3.23 sexual partners), contrasted by the lowest
scores of the Negative group (reporting an average of 1.46 sexual partners). The Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups obtained moderate scores on both measures, with a (non-significant) trend toward higher scores for the Aschematic group (who reported 2.26 partners, versus the 1.82 partners reported by the Co-Schematics) (see Table 1.2b). Figure 1.6b provides a graphic representation of sociosexuality scores.

**Romantic Relationship Patterns**

**Obsessiveness in Romantic Relationships.** A one-way ANOVA calculated with the Passionate Love Scale (PLS) reached significance, \( F(3, 313) = 6.72, p < .01 \), indicating significant group differences in subjects' tendency to become passionate or obsessive in love relationships. An inspection of group means shows the predicted pattern of high levels of reported obsessiveness in the Positive and Co-Schematic groups (with PLS scores of 97.63 and 95.86, respectively), in contrast to the significantly lower levels reported by the Negative and Aschematic groups (87.97 and 85.21, respectively) (see Table 1.2c). A planned comparison of Aschematic and Co-Schematic group means was significant, \( p < .01 \). See Figure 1.7a for a graphic representation.

**Romantic Attachment Styles.** One-way ANOVAs indicated significant group differences on both the Avoidant vs. Approach \( [F(3, 314) = 5.67, p < .01] \) and Anxious vs. Non-anxious \( [F(3, 314) = 3.77, p < .05] \) dimensions of adult romantic attachment styles. Inspection of group means indicated high levels of avoidant attachment reported by both Negative and Aschematic groups (20.71 and 20.94, respectively), contrasted by the lower levels of avoidance reported by Positive and Co-Schematic groups (16.33 and 18.36, respectively) (see Table 1.2d). A planned comparison of Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups means on this dimension approached significance (\( p = .06 \)). (See Figure 1.8a.) In terms of the anxious attachment dimension, high scores reported by all three non-Positive groups are contrasted by the significantly lower, or non-anxious, scores of the Positive group. (See Table 1.2e, Figure 1.8b.)

**Dyadic Satisfaction.** A one-way ANOVA calculated with Dyadic Satisfaction subscale of the DAS was significant, \( F(3, 190) = 2.65, p < .05 \), indicating group differences
in relationship satisfaction reported by subjects in current romantic relationships. An inspection of group means indicates similarly moderate levels of satisfaction reported by both Positive and Negative groups, contrasted by the lower ratings of Aschematics (mean = 33.05) and the higher ratings of Co-Schematics (mean = 36.93) (see Table 1.2f). As predicted, the planned comparison of Aschematic and Co-Schematic group means was significant (p<.01). See Figure 1.7b for a graphic representation.

**DISCUSSION**

*Positive versus Negative Schema Groups*

Given the opposing schemas of Positive and Negative women, comparisons of these groups should render the clearest illustration of the relationship between women's sexual self-views and their patterns of sexual and romantic relationships - should such a relationship exist. Current results indeed provide preliminary evidence of such relationships, and, as predicted, these are most evident in Positive-Negative schema group comparisons.

Replicating previous findings (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994), Positive schema women report a greater willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relationships and report more lifetime sexual partners than do their Negative schema counterparts. As hypothesized, this schematic contrast represents more than unrestricted sexuality; Positive schema women also report a more extensive history of previous romantic relationships, are more likely to be in current relationships, and are more likely to describe their current relationships as 'partnered or engaged,' as compared Negative schema scorers. In addition, Positive schema women report being more passionate or obsessive about their romantic partners, and report feeling more comfortable with, and hence more likely to seek out emotional closeness in their relationships. This directly contrasts with the low levels of passionate love and avoidant attachment styles endorsed by Negative schema women. In addition, Negative schema women report elevated levels of anxiety about being unloved or abandoned by their romantic partners, in contrast to the non-anxious
attachments of Positive schema women. Hence, it would appear that well-articulated and consistent schematic representations of the sexual self may relate to one's emotional, as well as sexual attachments.

**Negative versus Aschematic Schema Groups**

In many respects, Aschematic women endorse patterns of sexual and romantic relationships that closely mirror those of the above-described Negative schema group. Both groups endorse similarly restricted patterns of previous romantic relationships. Both report low levels of passionate or obsessive feelings about their romantic partners. Moreover, both Negative and Aschematic women report discomfort with emotional closeness, or a relatively avoidant romantic attachment style. This pattern of disinterest or avoidance of close emotional attachments may serve to illustrate the schematic similarities of Negative and Aschematic women: both groups provide weak endorsements on the positive sexual self schema dimension - which has been theoretically linked to the development of emotional attachment or connectedness (see Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994).

In contrast to Asematics, however, Negative schema women hold concomitant negative sexual self views, as they endorse embarrassed or conservative self-representations. This schematic discrepancy is highlighted by the inhibited sexual relations reported by Negative schema women, as compared to their Aschematic counterparts. Negative schema women are significantly less willing to engage in uncommitted sexual relationships, and report fewer lifetime sexual partners. Lacking a well-articulated positive or negative view of the sexual self, the Aschematic's sexual relations may be driven to a large extent by external circumstances; whereas the sexual self views of negative schema women may lead to the out-right avoidance of sexual stimuli and/or interactions.

**Positive versus Co-Schematic Groups**

Positive and Co-Schematic women hold similarly positive sexual self views; these women view themselves as romantic, passionate and open individuals. We have previously speculated that positive sexual self schemas may foster the development of emotional attachment or connection as a context for sex. Supporting this hypothesis, both
Positive and Co-Schematic groups indicated elevated passionate or obsessive feelings about their romantic partners, and reported feeling comfortable with - and a tendency to seek out - emotionally close relationships. These patterns are in contrast to the constellation of avoidant attachments endorsed by Negative and Aschematic groups.

Differences between Positive and Co-Schematic women emerge, however, upon analysis of the women's sexual relationships. Results indicate that Positive schema women are more willing to engage in uncommitted sexual relations, and report more lifetime sexual partners than do Co-Schematics. Such a finding is comprehensible, given the inhibiting effects of the Co-Schematic's negative sexual self views. These negative self representations may, moreover, permeate the romantic attachment patterns of Co-Schematic women. For example, Co-Schematic women report restricted romantic relationship histories, and endorse higher levels of anxious attachment styles when compared to Positive schema scorers.

Aschematic versus Co-Schematic Groups

Our final, and perhaps most difficult set of comparisons are those contrasting the relationship patterns of Aschematic and Co-Schematic scorers. In terms of romantic relationship histories, we find no difference between the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. Again, however, one might speculate as to the different processes that may lead to this seemingly similar relationship history. Specifically, the Aschematics' moderately restricted relationship history may represent a simple phenomenon; given their lack of positive or negative sexual self schemas, this group is unmotivated to either seek out, or actively avoid, emotional attachments in order foster sexual-romantic interactions. Their romantic attachment histories may therefore be driven by alternative self-representations or external circumstances rather than by the mediating effects of sexual self schema. In contrast, the Co-Schematics - like Positive schema scorers - report strong positive responses to romantic attachments and a heightened drive to seek out such relationships. At the same time, however, the Co-Schematics' negative sexual self views may undermine their attachment efforts in one of two ways. To begin, these negative self views may inhibit the Co-Schematic individual's initiation of sexual or romantic contacts, due to a
lack of self-confidence or fears of sexual rejection. Alternatively, this group's conflicting self views may promote an anxious or dependent need for emotional attachments, which may sabotage or strain romantic/sexual relationship efforts.

Current results provide preliminary support for these hypotheses. For example, Co-Schematics report higher levels of passionate or obsessive love for their partners and tend to seek emotionally close attachments. Aschematics, in contrast, report low levels of passionate or obsessive preoccupation with their romantic partners, and report avoidant romantic attachment styles. Additionally, although equal numbers of Aschematic and Co-Schematic women reported being in a current romantic relationship, there were marked differences in the women's descriptions of these relationships; whereas 27% of the Co-Schematics described their current relationships as partnered/engaged to be married or married, only 8% of the Aschematics reported this level of relationship commitment. Finally, the Co-Schematic scorers reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their current relationships, in contrast to their Aschematic counterparts.

Given the Co-Schematic group's endorsement of negative sexual self views, one might also expect to find a concomitant pattern of anxiety or inhibitions regarding their romantic or sexual relationships, when compared to the Aschematic group. This hypothesis received partial empirical support. Co-Schematic women did indeed report an anxious attachment style, or heightened anxieties about being unloved or abandoned by their romantic partners. However, the Aschematic group obtained similarly elevated scores on the anxious attachment scale, as compared to the non-anxious Positive schema group. This latter finding was unexpected. In contrast, the postulated sexual inhibition of the Co-Schematics, in contrast to the Aschematics, did receive some support. Specifically, a trend emerged in which the Aschematics reported an increased willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relations and more lifetime sexual partners, as compared to their Co-Schematic counterparts. Whether such a finding represents a stable and significant response pattern remains to be seen. It would, however, be theoretically tenable, given the lack of inhibiting negative self views, and, perhaps, a lesser need for emotionally close relationships as a context for sex experienced by Aschematic scorers.
GENERAL DISCUSSION

The current study highlights the power of the bivariate model of sexual self schema and, we hope, begins to capture the potential variety and complexity of women's sexual self views. To begin, these results replicate and extend our understanding of the sexual response patterns of women with consistently Positive and Negative sexual self schemas. Moreover, the bivariate model has led to the theoretical description and differentiation of two alternative schematic representations - those of the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups.

The Sexual Self Views of Aschematic and Co-Schematic Women

Notably, Aschematic and Co-Schematic women appear quite similar across a number of general sexual assessment points. Aschematics and Co-Schematics endorse similarly moderate levels of past and current sexual behaviors, falling between the heightened sexual activities of the Positive group and the restricted behavioral patterns of the Negative group. In addition, both Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups provide similarly neutral evaluations of themselves as 'sexual women' and mediocre levels of sexual esteem.

We have hypothesized, however, that these similarities represent the outward result of very different underlying cognitive, affective and behavioral processes. For the Aschematic group, neutral sexual self-evaluations represent a simple phenomenon. These individuals lack a coherent schematic framework to reliably guide their cognitive evaluations; they have neither positive nor negative self-structures to push their evaluations toward either extreme. Subsequently, Aschematics indicate little arousal of either positive or negative affects in response to sexual cues, and respond to these in a disinterested or situationally-dependent fashion. The current findings indicate that Aschematics report few thoughts about sex and a low general desire for sexual interactions. When faced with specific sexual situations, they report little sexual arousal. Yet they do not describe sexual activities as aversive or anxiety-producing. Given these
tepid levels of positive or negative sexual cognitions and affects, the Aschematic individual is driven to neither seek out nor avoid sexual interactions. Rather, we theorize that their moderately-restricted levels of sexual behaviors are driven by external, situational factors rather than internal schematic representations.

In contrast, the neutral sexual self-evaluations of the Co-Schematic group may reflect the co-activation of conflicting positive and negative self-views, rather than the lack of a schematic framework. These individuals possess highly accessible positive and negative self-schemas that may be activated by a variety of domain-relevant cues. Co-Schematics are preoccupied with sexual thoughts, and report high levels of desire for sexual activities. These sexual activities, however, activate strong positive as well as negative affective responses. Co-Schematics report high levels of sexual arousal as well as anxiety in response to sexual interactions. Behaviorally, this cognitive-affective co-activation may lead to a pattern of sexual approach-avoidance behaviors and interactions - the net result being a moderately restricted pattern of sexual behaviors that outwardly resembles that of the Aschematic group.

**Sexual Self Schemas and Relationships**

The current research also provides a preliminary picture of the potential relationships between women's sexual self-views and their sexual and romantic relationship patterns. This pattern is clearest when examined across Positive-Negative schema group contrasts. Not only do Positive schema women report greater comfort with casual sexual relationships, they also report extensive histories of romantic or love relationships. Positive schema women report higher levels of passionate love for their romantic partners than do their Negative counterparts. They also exhibit secure romantic attachment styles: they report feeling comfortable with emotional closeness and intimacy, and are relatively free from anxieties of being unloved or abandoned by their romantic partners. Not surprisingly, Positive schema women are generally more likely to report being in a current romantic relationship, and are also more likely to describe their relationships as committed - in contrast to Negative schema scorers.
Current findings also suggest that the conflicting positive and negative sexual self views of Co-Schematic women may spark conflicts in these women's romantic, as well as sexual, relationships. Indeed, results indicate that whereas Co-Schematic women report feeling extremely passionate or obsessive about their romantic partners and seek emotionally intimate relationships, they also experience fears of being abandoned or unloved by their mates. This conflictual cognitive-affective pattern may be particularly disruptive for these individuals, and may result in a dependent need for committed romantic relationships (which may, unfortunately, sabotage or strain these relationships). As preliminary evidence for this hypothesis, we find that whereas Positive schema women reported the most past and current romantic relationships across the four schema groups, of those respondents in current relationships, the Co-Schematics reported the highest levels of commitment and satisfaction, and were most likely to be living with their relationship partners. Undoubtedly, this pattern remains speculative, and we do not imply that, if valid, it would operate for all Co-Schematic scorers. More research, and particularly research obtaining data from the women's relationship partners, would help to clarify these potential sexual and emotional relationships.

Sexual Self Schemas and Attachment Theory

To date, there have been few empirical leads as to the mechanisms that foster the development of alternative positive and negative sexual self schemas. The current results do suggest one potential developmental mechanism, however, in the relationships obtained between sexual self schemas and adult romantic attachment patterns. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980) proposes that some of our earliest cognitive representations are those regarding the self and self-other relationships that develop from early infant-caregiver interactions. Attachment theorists argue that the quality of these infant-caregiver relationships influence the development of mental models that organize cognitions, affects, and behaviors - i.e., general attachment styles - in later relationships. Hence, if early caretakers are rejecting or inconsistent, the child will develop schemas of attachment relations as unavailable or inconsistent, and concomitantly develop schemas of
the self as unworthy or unlovable. These mental models of self and self-other relations subsequently foster the development and maintenance of insecure (such as avoidant or anxious-ambivalent) attachment styles. In contrast, if early caregivers are appropriately available and responsive to the child's needs, the individual will develop models of attachment relations as available and trustworthy, and of the self as worthy and lovable. Alternatively, these latter schemas should foster the development of secure attachment styles (Bowlby, 1973; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978).

Griffin & Bartholomew (1994) have proposed a 2-dimensional schematic model, which focuses on the positivity of one's model of self as opposed to the positivity of one's model of attachment others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1990; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). According to this theory, internalized self-representations (specifically, positive representations related to evaluations of self-worth) relate to anxious versus non-anxious patterns of attachment. In contrast, representations of attachment figures (i.e., the degree to which others are expected to be available or supportive) relates to the attachment dimension of avoiding, versus seeking out, close relationships (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994, p. 431).

The current results may, in part, map onto Griffin and Bartholomew's (1994) 2-dimensional attachment model. We have previously theorized about the potential for the positive schema dimension to relate not only to sexual expression, but also to one's capacity to develop loving, emotionally-close attachments. According to Griffin and Bartholomew's model, the positive schema dimension may relate to one's cognitive representations of attachment figures (i.e., Is my partner available and supportive?), and in turn to one's proclivity to either seek out or avoid close relationships. In contrast, the negative schema dimension may be inversely related to the positivity of one's model of self (i.e., Am I worthy? Will my partner respond to me positively?), which may relate to the experience of anxiety or dependency in close relationships. In line with these predictions, current results indicate that Positive schema women report both approach-like (i.e., non-avoidant) and non-anxious attachments. Negative schema women, as predicted, report the
converse: highly avoidant and anxious attachments. Also as expected, Co-Schematic women (who view attachment partners as positive/available, but the self as unworthy) report both approach-like and anxious attachment styles.

The one profile that did not completely match the above hypotheses, however, was the Aschematic group. Whereas this group showed the expected avoidant patterns of attachments, they also reported anxious attachment styles— which was unexpected given their lack of specific negative sexual self-schema. Such a finding may become comprehensible, however, upon a closer analysis of the various underpinnings of women's general self-esteem. Research by Josephs, Markus, and Tafarodi (1992), for example, suggests that women's self-esteem is derived, in part, from their sense of interpersonal connectedness or relatedness with others. We have theorized that the romantic, loving and open characteristics of the positive schema dimension should serve to foster such interpersonal connections, and in turn contribute to women's general level of self-esteem. Hence, although Aschematic women do not hold clear negative sexual self views, their concomitant lack of positive representations may inhibit the development of interpersonal connections, thereby undermining their self-esteem. Group comparisons across levels of general self esteem (measured with the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale; Rosenberg, 1965) supports this hypothesis: Asematics, like Co-Sematics, report moderately restricted levels of self esteem that fall between the lowered self esteem of Negative schema scorers, and elevated self esteem of Positive schema women. This moderately low self esteem, accompanied by a deficient sense of interpersonal connectedness, may fuel insecurities and anxieties about being unloved or abandoned by relationship partners and, hence, the obtained elevations in anxious attachment scores for the Aschematic group. Clearly, more research is necessary to clarify these potential sexual self schema and attachment style relationships, and particularly studies using alternate methodologies for assessing adult romantic attachment styles, such as other available self-report measures (see Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Collins & Read, 1990) or the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985).
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We may also speculate about the potential cognitive mechanisms underlying the obtained sexual self schema - attachment associations. Many have argued for the complexity of the self construct, which may be viewed as multiple pieces of self-relevant information, grouped into variously well-integrated or distinct clusters of related aspects. It is often assumed, moreover, that these clusters are organized into a hierarchy of self representations, with alternate levels representing more or less inclusive aspects of the self (e.g., see Kihlstrom & Canter, 1984, Markus & Wurf, 1987, Rogers, 1981; Mikulincer, 1995). Attachment style theory dictates that our early self and self-other relationship representations are the building blocks upon which subsequent personal and interpersonal cognitive representations are based; hence, these would exemplify higher-order representations in the cognitive structure of the self. Later, as the child or adolescent's range of experience and interactions begin to expand, so too may the complexity of the self construct, as he or she develops differentiated, lower-order representations of the self within certain contexts, including, eventually, the sexual realm. The differentiation, integration and hedonic tone of these self structures, however, may remain closely associated with the individual's early attachment representations - particularly throughout childhood, adolescence and early adulthood (see Mikulincer, 1995). This hierarchical model of the cognitive structure of the self would explain relationships between higher-order personal and interpersonal attachment representations, and subordinate representations such as sexual self schemas.

Theoretically, this cognitive model may also shed light on potential patterns in the development of sexual self views. For example, children who show secure attachment styles may be at particular advantage for developing Positive sexual self schema. Cognitively, these children will likely develop positive schemas of self and self-other relations, which may guide subsequent cognitive, affective and interpersonal experiences and development. Moreover, mothers of securely attached offspring are likely to exhibit high levels of self esteem and securely-attached romantic attachment styles. Hence, by the process of identification and observational learning, the female child may incorporate similar behavioral patterns into her own expanding realm of interpersonal relationships,
including eventual romantic and sexual relations. In contrast, children who exhibit insecure attachment styles are likely to have primary female caregivers with lower levels of self esteem and insecure romantic attachment patterns. This early developmental history (and the negative representations of self and self-other relations associated with it), may then guide subsequent interpersonal interactions, including romantic and sexual relations, and cumulate in the development of Negative or Co-Schematic sexual self views. Finally, females who develop in a household with avoidantly attached caregivers, or environments lacking in either positive or negative emotional or romantic interactions, may develop neither positive nor negative sexual self views, placing them into the Aschematic category. Again, these developmental hypothesis are speculative, and require further study for empirical clarification. In addition, we join others in noting the lack of prospective, longitudinal studies necessary to support the consistency of attachment styles beyond the childhood years, and the need for similar longitudinal studies to further clarify the development, stability and consistency of sexual self schemas across time.

Notably, the sample selected for the current study may have served to maximize the relations between the women's sexual self schemas and their romantic attachment styles. The current sample was quite young (mean age = 20 years), with relatively few years of sexual and romantic relationship experience. Given this relatively restricted experiential base, the sexual self schemas of these women may be less differentiated than those of older, more experienced women, and thereby more closely related to their pre-existing, superordinate cognitive structures - such as attachment-based personal and interpersonal schemas. As noted previously, further research is needed to clarify both the cognitive structures and sexual response patterns of women across the developmental spectrum.

CONCLUSIONS

The current research lends empirical evidence to a bivariate model of women's sexual self schemas. Methodologically, the independent analysis of both positive and negative schema dimensions enabled us to map the schematic representations of all
respondents, rather than limiting our study to subgroups of extreme scorers.
Conceptually, we have delineated two additional sexual self-schema topographies, specifically, the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups. Predicted response patterns between these groups, along with the previously defined Positive and Negative schema groups, were obtained across multiple sexual assessment points. Additionally, the current study has expanded our understanding of women's sexual self schemas to the domain of sexual and romantic relationships. Finally, theoretical and empirical relationships between women's sexual self schemas and models of adult romantic attachment styles were explored and discussed.
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### Schema Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexuality Measures</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Aschematic</th>
<th>Co-Schematic</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Sexual Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>14.64 $\text{a}$</td>
<td>17.17 $\text{b}$</td>
<td>17.08 $\text{b}$</td>
<td>19.93 $\text{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>(6.96)</td>
<td>(6.33)</td>
<td>(6.15)</td>
<td>(3.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current (Past 30 Day) SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>51.38 $\text{a}$</td>
<td>57.46 $\text{ab}$</td>
<td>66.14 $\text{bc}$</td>
<td>76.44 $\text{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>(48.72)</td>
<td>(45.89)</td>
<td>(53.62)</td>
<td>(50.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Avoidance Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>11.09 $\text{a}$</td>
<td>9.07 $\text{b}$</td>
<td>8.61 $\text{b}$</td>
<td>5.57 $\text{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>(6.46)</td>
<td>(5.78)</td>
<td>(6.00)</td>
<td>(4.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Sexual Response Cycle

#### B. Desire

| Sexual Desire Subscale *   |          |            |              |          |
| $M$                        | 17.75 $\text{a}$ | 18.35 $\text{a}$ | 19.64 $\text{b}$ | 19.79 $\text{b}$ |
| $SD$                       | (3.11)    | (3.95)     | (4.11)       | (3.07)   |

#### C. Arousal

| Arousal Difficulties Subscale * |          |            |              |          |
| $M$                             | 10.92 $\text{a}$ | 9.73 $\text{ab}$ | 8.96 $\text{b}$ | 9.30 $\text{b}$ |
| $SD$                            | (3.96)    | (3.67)     | (3.93)       | (4.36)   |

#### D. Anxiety

| Sexual Arousalability Index (SAI) |          |            |              |          |
| $M$                              | 101.72 $\text{a}$ | 105.03 $\text{a}$ | 118.55 $\text{b}$ | 117.02 $\text{b}$ |
| $SD$                             | (22.69)   | (23.34)    | (21.79)      | (18.91)  |

#### Expanded SAI (SAI-E)

| $M$                             | 52.86 $\text{a}$ | 36.79 $\text{b}$ | 48.93 $\text{a}$ | 31.80 $\text{b}$ |
| $SD$                            | (33.31)   | (26.33)     | (43.04)       | (30.83)   |

#### Katz Sexual Anxiety and Self-Consciousness Scale

| $M$                             | 7.62 $\text{a}$ | 6.10 $\text{b}$ | 6.93 $\text{ab}$ | 4.86 $\text{c}$ |
| $SD$                            | (3.33)   | (3.54)      | (4.27)        | (3.60)    |

**TABLE 1.1:** Schema Group Comparisons: Sexuality Measures (cont'd on following pg)
TABLE 1.1 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexuality Measures</th>
<th>Schema Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual Satisfaction and Self-Evaluation

E. Sexual Satisfaction

Satisfaction with Sexual Activities

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(2.11)</td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
<td>(3.08)</td>
<td>(2.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual Depression Scale

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(7.12)</td>
<td>(7.07)</td>
<td>(7.57)</td>
<td>(8.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Sexual Self-Evaluations

Global Sexuality Ratings

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(2.21)</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual Esteem Scale

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>20.56</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>30.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(8.39)</td>
<td>(7.84)</td>
<td>(10.04)</td>
<td>(7.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Differing subscripts indicate significant differences across group means, p < .05. For the majority of the above analyses, cell n's are as follows: Negative (87), Aschematic (70), Co-Schematic (74), and Positive (87). As only those subjects who had previously engaged in sexual intercourse were asked to complete the Sexual Response Cycle Scale, cell n's for the Desire Subscale and the Arousal Difficulties Subscale differ as follows: Negative (51), Aschematic (51), Co-Schematic (56), Positive (82).
### Schema Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Measures</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Aschematic</th>
<th>Co-Schematic</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Relationship History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Past Romantic Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>1.49&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.83&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.81&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.51&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Sexual Relationship Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Engage in Uncommitted Sexual Relations (SOI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>19.57&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>30.63&lt;sub&gt;bc&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>26.91&lt;sub&gt;ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>37.43&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(22.03)</td>
<td>(26.74)</td>
<td>(25.20)</td>
<td>(32.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lifetime Sexual Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>1.46&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.26&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.82&lt;sub&gt;ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.23&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(1.91)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romantic Relationship Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Obsessiveness in Romantic Relationships (PLS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>87.97&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>85.21&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>95.86&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>97.63&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(20.41)</td>
<td>(18.84)</td>
<td>(25.71)</td>
<td>(16.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Avoidant versus Secure Attachment Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>20.71&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>20.94&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>18.36&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>16.33&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(7.38)</td>
<td>(8.31)</td>
<td>(8.14)</td>
<td>(9.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Anxious versus Non-Anxious Attachment Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>13.46&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>12.96&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>13.19&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>10.84&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(5.52)</td>
<td>(5.12)</td>
<td>(5.62)</td>
<td>(6.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Relationship Satisfaction (DAS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>34.96&lt;sub&gt;ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>33.05&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>36.93&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>35.28&lt;sub&gt;ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>(5.75)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(5.30)</td>
<td>(7.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Differing subscripts indicate significant differences across group means, \( p < .05 \). (*For Avoidant versus Secure analysis, \( p < .08 \).) For the majority of the above analyses, cell n's are as follows: Negative (87), Aschematic (70), Co-Schematic (74), and Positive (87). Only those subjects in a current romantic relationship were asked to rate their relationship satisfaction, cell n's for the Relationship Satisfaction (from the Dyadic Adjustment scale) differ as follows: Negative (50), Aschematic (39), Co-Schematic (44), Positive (61).

---

**TABLE 1.2:** Schema Group Comparisons: Relationship Measures
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**FIGURE 1.1:** The Bipolar Representation of Sexual Self Schema Groups
FIGURE 1.2: The Bivariate Representation of Sexual Self Schema Groups
FIGURE 1.3:
(A) Sexual Behaviors: Number of Lifetime Sexual Activities by Schema Group
(B) Sexual Desire: Sexual Preoccupation Scores by Schema Group
**FIGURE 1.4:**
(A) *Sexual Arousal:* Sexual Arousalability Ratings (SAI) by Schema Group
(B) *Sexual Anxiety:* Sexual Anxiety Ratings (SAI-E) by Schema Group
FIGURE 1.5:
(A) Sexual Satisfaction: Satisfaction with Sexual Activities by Schema Group
(B) Sexual Self-Evaluation: Sexual Esteem Scores by Schema Group
FIGURE 1.6:
(A) Relationship History: Number of Prior Romantic Relationships by Schema Group
(B) Sexual Relationship Patterns: Sociosexuality (SOI) Scores by Schema Group
FIGURE 1.7:
(A) Romantic Relationship Patterns: Passionate Love (PLS) Scores by Schema Group
(B) Romantic Relationship Patterns: Relationship Satisfaction (DAS) by Schema Group
FIGURE 1.8:
(A) Avoidant vs. Secure Attachment Scores by Schema Group
(B) Anxious vs. Non-Anxious Attachment Scores by Schema Group
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CHAPTER 2

SEXUAL SELF SCHEMA AS A COGNITIVE PHENOMENON

INTRODUCTION

Many argue that the integration of personality and social psychology may be best represented in terms of person-situation relations or person x situation interactions (e.g., Mischel, 1990, Higgins, 1990). Hence, numerous research paradigms have attempted to develop a common theoretical language to explore these person-situation relations. Social cognitive theories, for example, have focused on the mental constructs, or cognitive schemas, that individuals develop to process the vast amounts of information in the social environment. Individual differences in cognitive schemas are believed to mediate differences in how individuals perceive, interpret, and in turn respond to similar situational stimuli. In addition, differing situational cues are believed to 'prime' - or increase the likelihood of an individual to use - one or another of their cognitive schemas at any point in time. Hence, social behavior may be viewed as the result of interactions between the person (i.e., individual differences in available schematic frameworks) and the situation (i.e., differences in schema-relevant cues in the social environment).

Chronic versus Situational Sources of Schematic Accessibility

Schemas are typically viewed as internal knowledge representations, or cognitive frameworks that mediate between external social stimuli and an individual's behavioral reactions. This view is based upon the assumption that social information is most efficiently processed if the perceiver has some type of internal perceptual or cognitive structure with which to receive, organize and interpret it. Markus and Zajonc (1985)
argue that "we can understand social behavior only if we understand the precise nature of these representations" (p. 138). These cognitive structures have alternatively been referred to as schemas, templates, theories, scripts, frames, prototypes, and/or constructs. As Kelly (1955) explained,

construct systems can be considered as a kind of scanning pattern which a person continually projects upon his world. As he sweeps back and forth across his perceptual field he picks up blips of meaning. (p. 145)

Kelly (1955) argued that - based upon one's history of social interactions - individuals develop a limited number of personal constructs that they habitually use to screen and interpret social information. Hence, Kelly's personal construct theory is oriented toward the understanding and measurement of person variables in schematic processing.

In contrast, other theorists have focused their attention on situational influences on schematic processing. Bruner (1957) introduced the notion of schematic 'accessibility,' or "the ease or speed with which a given stimulus input is coded in terms of a given category under varying conditions." As Bruner explained, "Given a sensory input with equally good fit to two nonoverlapping categories, the more accessible of the two categories would 'capture' the input" (1957, p. 132). Specifically, Bruner asserted that contextual or situational variables (such as instructional sets, stimulus-related goals) may temporarily alter the accessibility of - and hence the likelihood of utilizing - certain situationally-relevant constructs.

Higgins' "synapse model" of schematic accessibility integrates the notions of person and situation influences on schematic processing (Higgins, 1990; Higgins, Bargh, & Lombardi, 1985; Higgins, King, & Mavin, 1982). Higgins asserts that mental constructs or schemas that have been recently "excited" - or activated for use in cognitive processing - remain at an elevated level of accessibility for a period of time subsequent to activation. Like neuronal synapses, the level of excitation of a recently "fired" or activated schema decays slowly over time. Moreover, Higgins asserts that this gradual decay in schematic accessibility is a function of not only the recency, but also the
frequency with which a particular schema is excited. According to Higgins, frequent schema activation will increase the amount of time that the construct is accessible, predominant, or available for future activation. Hence, individual differences in the frequency with which specific constructs are activated lead to individual differences in long-lasting, or chronic construct accessibility: over the span of one's development and socialization, frequently activated constructs congeal to form chronically accessible schematic frameworks. In line with Kelly's original theories, one's chronically accessible constructs are those that are frequently activated and readily available to mediate the perceptual, organizational and interpretive processing of ongoing stimuli. Moreover, these chronically accessible schemas are hypothesized to interact with situational primes to determine individual differences in perceptual and cognitive processing at any one point in time. Hence, individual differences in chronically accessible schemas represent a person variable, which may then interact with situational primes to determine which and how social-environmental stimuli are perceived and interpreted.

There is now considerable evidence supporting the effects of both personal sources of construct accessibility (e.g., see Higgins, King & Mavin, 1982; Bargh & Pratto, 1986), as well as situational sources of accessibility, such as the 'priming' of social constructs (e.g., see Higgins, Rholes, & Jones, 1977; Srull & Wyer, 1980; Bargh & Pietromonaco, 1982). In addition, a number of studies have explored the potential interplay between personal and situational sources of schema activation. Supporting the temporal hypotheses of Higgins' synapse model, Bargh, Lombardi and Higgins (1988) obtained a 'cross-over' effect of schema activation across time with alternate chronically-accessible and recently-primed schemas. Specifically, subjects pre-selected for chronic accessibility on one trait construct were primed with a recent exposure to an alternate trait construct - both of which could be used to characterize the behavior of a target person in a subsequent task. As predicted, subjects were more likely to use the recently primed schema to characterize the target's behavior after a short (15 second) delay, but were more likely to revert to their alternate, chronically accessible schemas after a longer (120 second) delay (Bargh, Lombardi & Higgins, 1988; Higgins, 1989). In addition, Bargh,
Bond, Lombardi and Tota (1986) obtained independent and additive effects of both chronic and situationally primed sources of construct accessibility on impression ratings of a target person.

The Role of Sexual Self Schemas

As Bargh (1989) asserts, "As self-relevant information is among the most frequently experienced, it is likely that individuals possess chronically accessible constructs for such domains of social information" (p. 13). One historically-relevant line of research into the influence of chronically accessible self-schemas is Markus' (1977) study of women with independent and dependent self-views (versus aschematic women, or those women for whom the independent-dependent dimension is unavailable or inaccessible). Markus predicted that self schemas should "facilitate the processing of information about the self (judgments and decisions about the self) (p. 63)," and subsequently obtained empirical support for this schematic hypothesis. Specifically, results of a response time task indicated that women with independent self schemas were reliably faster at making self descriptive ("Me") judgments for independent (versus dependent) adjectives, whereas women with dependent self schemas were reliably faster at making "Me" judgments for dependent (versus independent) adjectives. Not surprisingly, women with independent self schemas also endorsed more independent adjectives as self-descriptive; whereas the converse was true for women with dependent self schemas (Markus, 1977). Notably, however, Markus did not attempt to manipulate alternate situational cues or primes as a part of her research design.

In line with Markus' early formulations, the sexual self schema concept has been conceptualized as a similar cognitive phenomenon. Sexual self schemas have been defined as cognitive generalizations about the sexual aspects of the self. Drawing from Higgins' synapse model, we hypothesize that over time individuals experience differing patterns in the frequency with which specific sexual self views (be they positive and/or negative) are activated or excited. These differing patterns of activation then lead to differing levels of residual construct excitation,
or accessibility for further activation. Thus the cycle continues, which, over time, results in individual differences in the chronic accessibility of positive and/or negative sexual self views.

As tapped by the Sexual Self Schema Scale, women's sexual self views include three factors: two positive aspects (i.e., romantic/passionate self views and direct/open self views) and a negative aspect (i.e., embarrassment or conservativism). (See Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994, for scale development and validity information.) Recently, a bivariate model of women's sexual self schema has been proposed, in which positive (i.e., factors 1 and 2) and negative (i.e., factor 3) schema dimensions are assessed as independent constructs (Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994; Study 1, this document). This model has led to the differentiation of four sexual self schema groups: Negative schema (i.e., those who score high on the negative, low on the positive dimension); Aschematic (low on both positive and negative dimensions); Co-Schematic (high on both positive and negative dimensions); and Positive schema (i.e., high on positive, low on negative dimension).

Although recent studies have uncovered systematic differences in the patterns of sexual behaviors, responses, and affects exhibited across the four schema groups (see Study 1, this document), the research literature has yet to test the sexual self schema construct as an explicitly cognitive phenomenon. Specifically, we hypothesize that sexual self views organize and guide the processing of self-relevant information contained in one's social environment, cognitively mediating between sexually-relevant social cues and an individual's responses to such cues. Hence, the current study was designed to test the sexual self schema construct within an explicitly cognitive research paradigm.

Focus of the Current Study

The primary aim of the current study was to replicate and expand upon Markus' (1977) response latency findings with women with independent versus
dependent self schemas. In line with Markus' original hypotheses, we predict that women with non-conflicting, chronically accessible schemas regarding their sexual selves (i.e., women with Negative or Positive sexual self views) should be at an advantage to more efficiently (and hence more quickly) make self-judgments regarding schema-relevant stimulus words. Specifically, we hypothesize that women with Positive sexual self schemas will be reliably faster at making 'Me' self-judgments for positive versus negative sexually-relevant adjectives (i.e., romantic/passionate, open/direct traits versus embarrassed/conservative traits), and that they will endorse more of these positive adjectives than women with either Aschematic or Negative sexual self views. In contrast, we predict a similar pattern in the Negative schema group's endorsements and response latencies for making 'Me' self-judgments for negative (versus positive) adjectives.

The current study was also designed to extend Markus' original paradigm. We wanted to explore the effects of chronic accessibility across individuals - as well as potential priming effects across situational cues - on self schematic accessibility and utilization. Specifically, we predicted interactive effects between these person x situation sources of schematic accessibility. We hypothesize that women with consistently Positive or Negative sexual self schemas will show enhanced cognitive processing (and hence particularly short response latencies) for endorsing schema-consistent adjectives when their sexual self views are primed by situational cues. In contrast, we expect Aschematic individuals - who lack a coherent and accessible cognitive framework from which to base such self judgments - to exhibit moderately long response latencies for both positive and negative schema words, and to show only modest responses to the situational primes. Our hypotheses regarding the responses of Co-Schematic individuals, however, were tentative. Given this group's conflicting pattern of positive and negative sexual self views, we hypothesized that Co-Schematics, like Aschematics, might exhibit significantly longer response latencies to both positive and negative cue words, as their conflicting self information might lead to a pattern of
ambivalence or hesitancy within the decision making process. We did not, however, posit specific hypotheses regarding the Co-Schematic group's responses to schema-relevant situational primes.

Although Markus (1977) did not specifically test her subjects' memory for schema-relevant trait adjectives, von Hippel, Jonides, Hilton and Narayan (1993) found that people show better recall (and, in general, better conceptual memory) for trait adjectives that are relevant to their self-schemas than for schema-irrelevant trait adjectives (see also Carpenter, 1988). In line with these findings, we hypothesize that women with consistently Positive or Negative self schemas will show enhanced recall for schema-relevant trait adjectives. Specifically, we hypothesize that Positive schema women will show better recall for positive (versus negative) schema traits, as compared to women with Aschematic or Negative sexual self views. Moreover, we expected this recall effect to be enhanced with situational cues intended to prime the women's sexual self views. As previously, we hypothesize the converse pattern to emerge for women with Negative sexual self views. Finally, we expected the Co-Schematic women to show enhanced recall for both positive and negative schema words, yet were again uncertain as to the potential effect of situational primes on recall for the Co-Schematic group.

**METHODS**

**Participants**

Participants consisted of 271 female undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology 100 at the Ohio State University. Participants were drawn from a screening pool of right-handed, female undergraduate students who completed the Sexual Self Schema scale during the first week of class during two successive academic quarters. Potential participants were contacted by phone, and were instructed to report to a large experimental room in groups of 5 to 10. All participants were informed of the nature of the study and their participation prior to obtaining consent, and received course credit for experiment participation.
Procedures, Measures and Design

Prescreening: The Sexual Self Schema Scale

The Sexual Self Schema Scale is a 50-item (26 scored and 24 filler items) trait-adjective rating measure designed to tap individual differences in women's sexual self schemas or sexual self views. Factor analyses indicate that women's sexual self views may be represented by three factors, consisting of two positive aspects (romantic/passionate and open/direct self views) and a negative aspect (embarrassment/conservatism). Subjects rated the scale's 50 trait adjectives on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (Not at all descriptive of me) to 6 (Very much descriptive of me). Total sexual self schema scores have been found to correlate with past sexual experiences ($r=0.30$, $p<0.01$), sexual arousability ($r=0.25$, $p<0.01$), and number of prior romantic relationships ($r=0.32$, $p<0.01$). Internal consistency (Cronbach alpha=.82) and test-retest reliability (2-week, $r=0.91$) estimates are high. (See Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994 for further validity information.) For the current purposes, we will utilize the bivariate scoring procedure to categorize subjects into one of the four sexual self schema groups (Positive, Negative, Aschematic and Co-Schematic). Recent research supports the validity of this bivariate model, indicating distinct patterns of sexual behaviors, responses, and positive/negative affects across the four sexual self schema groups (see Study 1, this document).

Experimental Session: Reaction Time Task

Approximately 6-8 weeks following prescreen participation, participants completed a reaction time task on individual 486 DX-33 MHz computers equipped with SVGA color monitors. The reaction task program was developed with a LABVIEW-based application, and run on Microsoft Windows for Workgroups 3.11. Subjects were instructed to rate a series of trait adjectives as to whether or not each of the words was self-descriptive. Stimulus words were presented individually in a clearly delineated yellow rectangle located in the center of the computer monitor. Alternate “Me” and “Not Me” buttons were denoted by green and red markers placed on alternate “i/j” (right hand
side of keyboard) and “z” (left hand side of keyboard) keys. Instructions emphasized that subjects were to maximize both the speed and accuracy of their responses to each item. Hence, subjects were instructed to focus their attention on the yellow box in the center of their computer monitor, and to gently place the index finger their right hand over the “Me” key and the index finger of their left hand over the “Not Me” key throughout the task. In addition, subjects were randomly assigned to one of two imagined situational contexts, and were verbally instructed to use this context for making their self-judgments. The contexts included a general Social situation and a Dating situation, and are described below.

**Condition A: Social Situation**
When you are making these decisions about yourself, try to imagine yourself in a typical social situation, or one that might occur, for example, when you are with a group of male and female friends at a friend's home, at a restaurant or bar, or at a party.

**Condition B: Dating Situation**
When you are making these decisions about yourself, try to imagine yourself in a typical dating situation, or one that might occur, for example, when you are with someone that you are attracted to - either alone at a restaurant, bar, movie, or someone's home, or when you are out with friends.

In order to become comfortable with the task, subjects first completed a practice trial of 25 items (e.g., agreeable, boring), after which questions were answered and instructions were reiterated. Next, subjects completed the experimental trial, which was composed of 24 stimulus items and 26 filler items. Filler items included both positively and negatively valenced adjectives related to the dimensions of intelligence, agreeableness and humor. Stimulus items consisted of eight words chosen to tap each of the three sexual self schema factors, i.e., romantic or passionate traits (factor 1), open or direct traits (factor 2), and embarrassed or conservative traits (factor 3). Each set of eight items consisted of four words taken directly from a factor analysis of the Sexual Self Schema scale, and four words judged by the researchers to be conceptually-relevant to each of the three sexual self schema factors. (See Appendix B for a list of items.) Each word was
presented with a 2-second lapse, and responses were recorded and timed via an internal computer timing device. Item order for the experimental trial was randomized across individual subjects. Approximately half of the subjects (n=164) also engaged in a surprise free recall task immediately following the computer task, in which they were instructed to write down as many of the words encountered during the preceding response time task as they could recall within approximately 2 minutes. Finally, all subjects completed a brief pencil-and-paper questionnaire to obtain general demographic information, were debriefed, and dismissed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Subject Demographics and Schema Categorization

The mean age of subjects was 19.5 years (SD=2.61 years), with a mean education level of 13.32 years (between a college freshman/sophomore). Subjects were predominantly Caucasian (81.9%; 8.5% were African-American, 4.8% Asian, 1.8% Hispanic, 3%, other). Ninety-four percent of subjects reported a predominantly or exclusively heterosexual orientation.

In line with previous research (see Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994; Study 1 of this document), the mean for the positive sexual self schema dimension was 80.69 (SD=11.0), and the mean of the negative schema dimension was 21.39 (SD=5.78). Based on the results of Study 1 (n=318), median cut-off scores of 82/83 and 22/23 were utilized for the positive and negative schema dimensions, respectively. This median split procedure resulted in the following N's for the four schema groups: Negative (low positive, high negative scorers; n=73), Aschematic (low positive, low negative; n=79), Co-schematic (high positive, high negative; n=53), and Positive (high positive, low negative; n=66). Although subjects were initially screened for right-hand dominance (to control for this potential effect on response and latency outcomes), 12 subjects reported being predominantly left-handed on the demographic questionnaire. These left-handed subjects were subsequently removed from the response pattern and latency analyses.
Analysis Plan

For our first level of analysis, we conducted a series of 4x2(x3) analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs), with two between subject factors and one within subject (or repeated) factor. The between subject factors included schema GROUP categorization (i.e., Negative, Aschematic, Co-Schematic or Positive), and situational CONTEXT (i.e., Social versus Dating situation). The within subject factor was the stimulus WORDTYPE (i.e., factor 1: romantic/passionate items; factor 2: direct/open items; and factor 3: embarrassed/conservative items). Following our initial hypotheses, separate ANCOVAs were run for each of three dependent variables, including: (1) response pattern outcomes (i.e., 'Me' versus 'Not me' responses), (2) response latency outcomes [calculated separately for 'Me' and 'Not me' responses], and (3) free recall outcomes. A single covariate was included in each analysis. For response pattern outcomes, the ANCOVA design included an index of subject responses across filler items (i.e., number of 'Me' responses) as a covariate, to eliminate potential confounds due to 'yea-saying' or 'nay-saying' response biases. For response latency outcomes, mean latency scores for filler items were included as a covariate, to control for individual differences in response latencies due to such subject factors as reading speed, motor coordination, and motivational differences (see Fazio, 1990, for a discussion). Finally, for the free recall task, total recall score was used as a covariate, to control for such individual differences as motivational sets, cognitive/memory ability, etc.

Finally, a series of follow-up 4x2 ANCOVAs were performed to test the hypothesized between-subject effects, for each outcome variable for which we obtained the hypothesized SCHEMA x WORDTYPE interaction. Here, potential SCHEMA group and SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects were tested with separate 4x2 (SCHEMA Group x CONTEXT) ANCOVAs, predicting outcomes for each of the three types of stimulus words.
Response Pattern Outcomes

Within Subject Effects

As predicted, the 4x2(x3) ANCOVA predicting 'Me' versus 'Not me' responses indicated a significant WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction, $F(6, 498) = 16.67, p < .01$. No significant effects were obtained for WORDTYPE, WORDTYPE x CONTEXT, or the 3-way interaction. (See Table 2.1 for a complete listing of effects for this 4x2(x3) design.) Figure 2.1 provides a graphic representation of the WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction (collapsed across CONTEXT). Whereas Positive schema women endorsed significantly fewer negative stimulus adjectives than positive stimulus adjectives (i.e., 2.48 embarrassed/conservative traits, as compared to 6.16 romantic/passionate traits and 6.75 open/direct traits), the Negative schema group endorsed nearly as many negative ($\bar{x} = 4.46$) as positive ($\bar{x} = 5.03, 5.21$) stimulus words.

Between Subject Effects

Results of the three 4x2 ANCOVAs predicting 'Me' (versus 'Not me') responses to the three types of stimulus words are presented in Table 2.2 and Figure 2.2. A main effect for SCHEMA was obtained for each of the stimulus wordtypes (all p's < .01). As predicted, when collapsed across situational context, the Positive and Co-Schematic groups rated the highest number of romantic/passionate and open/direct adjectives as self-descriptive, followed by the moderate scores of the Aschematic group, and, finally, the lowest scores of the Negative schema group. In contrast, the Negative schema group endorsed the most negative (i.e., embarrassed/conservative) stimulus items, followed by the Co-Schematics, Aschematics, and, finally the lowest scores of the Positive schema group. Figure 2.2 provides a graphic representation of group response scores across situational contexts, separated by wordtype. In addition, a significant SCHEMA x CONTEXT interaction effect was obtained for subject responses to the passionate/romantic items $F(3, 257) = 2.89, p < .05$. As indicated in Figure 2.2a, this interaction is most clearly evident in the responses of the Positive and Co-Schematic groups.
Discussion

We have hypothesized that individuals in the four schema groups hold differing sexual self views, and that these self views will mediate self-descriptive judgments across various sexually-relevant cue words. The current results lend support to these hypotheses. Results indicate that the four schema groups exhibited systematic differences in their endorsements of sexually-relevant, positive versus negative cue words. As predicted, the Positive schema group endorsed more positive (i.e., romantic/passionate, open/direct) than negative (i.e., embarrassed/conservative) stimulus items (see Figure 2.1). In contrast, the Negative schema group endorsed nearly as many negative as positive traits.

Notably, the Aschematic group showed a pattern similar to, if less extreme than, that of the Positive schema group. This pattern may indicate the effects of a positivity or social desirability bias, i.e., that subjects tend to endorse positive or socially desirable attributes over negative or undesirable ones. If this is the case, the Negative schema group's pattern of endorsements is particularly noteworthy, in that this group's relatively low endorsements of positive stimulus items and high negative item endorsements nearly overrode this social desirability effect. Finally, as predicted, the Co-Schematics exhibited elevated endorsements of both positive and negative stimulus adjectives (see Figure 2.1).

Current results support the effects of both chronic - as well as contextually-primed - sources of schematic accessibility in determining sexually-relevant self-judgments. We have hypothesized that chronic sources of schematic accessibility develop gradually over time, and, hence, the basic content or valence of these self representations should exhibit some degree of temporal stability. This hypothesis was supported, as subject schema scores obtained during the first week of classes were found to predict self-descriptive responses 6-8 weeks later, as evident in the main effects for SCHEMA obtained across each of the three WORDTYPES.

In addition, a SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect was obtained for subject responses to the romantic/passionate stimulus words, where we find a crossed interaction between
the responses of Positive and Co-Schematic groups across contextual conditions (see Figure 2.2a). Notably, this effect is obtained only with romantic/passionate WORDTYPE cues - which include the most sexually-explicit of all the stimulus items (e.g., erotic, seductive, provocative; see Appendix B). Given the nature of these items, it would seem appropriate for more of these traits to be endorsed in sexually-relevant (i.e., Dating) contexts, rather than general Social situations. This in fact describes the pattern of responses for the Positive schema women, and, to a lesser extent, the Aschematic scorers. In contrast, however, are the responses of the Co-Schematic group. While the Co-Sematics exhibited a highly sexualized pattern of self-judgments in the Social context (with an average of 6.5 'Me' responses to the 8 possible romantic/passionate items), they exhibited a more restricted pattern of endorsements in the Dating context (x=5.75). Although this pattern of responses was an unexpected one, it is not theoretically inexplicable. Previous research (see Study 1, this document) has obtained self-reported elevations in sexual/romantic desire, arousal and preoccupation among Co-Schematic scorers - which may, in part, explain their rather high 'baseline' pattern of endorsements in the Social context. At the same time, however, Co-Sematics report elevated levels of anxiety when faced with sexual situations. Hence, the contextual prime of the Dating situation may have triggered the negative sexual self views, and accompanying sexual anxiety, of the Co-Semics - thereby interfering with their sex-specific self judgments in this context.

Response Latency Outcomes

Within Subject Effects

In keeping with the response latency literature, separate 4x2(x3) ANCOVAs were run to analyze the response latencies of 'Me' responses and 'Not me' responses. The need for independent analyses of differential responses is due to the fact that different responses (i.e., 'yes/no,' 'me/not me') may stem from the use of different judgments or judgment criteria, which may serve as a confound when one finds differential patterns of responses across conditions (as is the current case). (See Fazio, 1990 for a discussion of this issue.)
The restriction of latency analyses to 'Not me' responses, however, led to the disproportionate loss of subjects across schema groups. For example, 54% of Positive schema women could not be included in these analyses, largely because of their lack of 'Not me' responses to the positive schema items. In contrast, the attrition rate for Negative schema women was only 16%. Hence, the following results are restricted to the ANCOVA analyses of 'Me' responses, which did not suffer from this problem of differential attrition.

As predicted, the 4x2(x3) ANCOVA analysis of 'Me' response latencies indicated a significant WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction $F(6, 478) = 4.10, p < .01$. No significant effects were obtained for WORDTYPE or WORDTYPE x CONTEXT. (See Table 2.3 for a complete listing of effects for this 4x2(x3) design.) Figure 2.3 provides a graphic representation of the WORDTYPE x SCHEMA effect (collapsed across CONTEXT). This effect is largely due to the Positive group's response latencies across wordtypes, i.e., this group's significantly elevated latencies for endorsing negative stimulus words (mean latency for embarrassed/conservative items = 1447.21 ms), as opposed to positive stimulus words (996.77 ms for romantic/passionate items; 1036.42 for direct/open items). This contrasts with the less pronounced slopes of the Aschematics / Co-Schematics, and, particularly, the Negative schema group. In addition, we find a significant 3-way (W x S x C) interaction, $F(6, 478) = 2.15, p < .05$. This 3-way interaction is depicted in Figure 2.4, which represents mean latencies across WORDTYPE and CONTEXT for each of the four sexual self schema groups.

### Between Subject Effects

Results of the three 4x2 ANCOVAs predicting latencies for 'Me' responses to the three types of stimulus words are presented in Table 2.4 and Figure 2.5. A main effect for SCHEMA was obtained for the embarrassed/conservative words, $F(3, 247) = 4.96, p < .01$. As predicted, the Negative schema group endorsed negative stimulus items most rapidly ($x = 1167.73$ ms), followed by the Co-Schematic and Aschematic groups (1260.53 and 1295.96 ms, respectively). Finally, the Positive schema women took the longest time
to endorse negative stimulus items (1441.09 ms). In addition, a marginally significant
SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect \(F(3, 247) = 2.34, p < .08\) was obtained for the
embarrassed/conservative items. This interaction is particularly apparent in the latencies of the Positive schema women, who took longer to endorse negative stimulus words when in the Dating context, as opposed to a Social context (see Figure 2.5c).

Results of the 4x2 ANCOVA for open/direct words indicated a significant
SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect, \(F(3, 247) = 2.83, p < .05\). Whereas the Negative and Co-
Schematic groups made 'Me' judgments for open/direct words rather quickly when in the Social context, their latencies for positive endorsements increased when in the Dating context. A contrasting pattern occurred for the Positive and Aschematic women; these groups endorsed the open/direct items more quickly in the Dating (as opposed to Social) context. (See Figure 2.5b.) Although the groups' pattern of latencies for endorsing romantic/passionate traits was similar to that for open/direct traits, the SCHEMA x CONTEXT interaction for this analysis failed to reach significance \(F(3, 247) = 1.35, p = .26\).

Discussion

We have hypothesized that differing sexual self views will selectively facilitate cognitive processing for schema-relevant (versus irrelevant) cue words. The current results provide preliminary support for this hypothesis, as we obtained the predicted WORDTYPE x SCHEMA effect for 'Me' response latencies. We also obtained the predicted main effect for SCHEMA across latencies for the embarrassed/conservative cue words. As predicted, Negative schema women were fastest at making these schema-
consistent self-judgments; whereas the Positive schema group, for whom embarrassed/
conservative self-judgments are counter-schematic, showed significant delays for these personal endorsements. [*And, as predicted, this 'interference effect' was most evident for respondents whose Positive sexual self schemas were primed by the Dating context; see Figure 2.5c.] Finally, both the Asematics (who lack the cognitive structures to either facilitate or delay sexually-relevant self-judgments) and Co-Sematics (whose conflicting
schemas may lead to response ambivalence) showed moderately long latencies, with response times falling between the Positive and Negative groups (see Figure 2.3).

We had also predicted SCHEMA x CONTEXT interactions for each of the stimulus wordtypes, due to hypothesized differences in contextual priming effects across the four schema groups. Results provide preliminary support for this interaction hypothesis as well. Specifically, SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects were obtained for the embarrassed/conservative words ($p < .08$; see above discussion*), and the open/direct words ($p < .04$). Unpredictably, a completely crossed interaction was obtained for the open/direct items (see Figure 2.5b), which resulted in an unexpected ordering of latency means for the schema groups in the Social context. In other words, the Negative / Co-Schematic groups exhibited response latencies for open/direct self-judgments that were faster than the Positive / Aschematics in the Social context - whereas this outcome was reversed in the Dating context.

If valid, such a result may suggest a situational specificity to sexual self-schematic processing. Whereas other self schemas may be situationally broad-band and/or represent self-views that are superordinate in the cognitive hierarchy of the self (such as independence/dependence or introversion/extroversion), one's sexual self views may represent narrow-band, or subordinate structures that are closely tied to specific situational primes (i.e., the presence of a potential sexual/romantic partner). Hence, whereas a women with a extroverted self view may use this self schema to facilitate information processing across a wide variety of social situations or interactions, this may not be the case for women with Positive sexual self schemas. For example, an examination of Figures 2.2a and 2.5a provide evidence for an appropriate pattern of situational specificity in the Positive schema women's endorsements and latencies for making sexually-specific self-judgments (as is evident in this group's responses to the romantic/passionate cues). Specifically, Positive schema women are more likely to see themselves as erotic, passionate, seductive or provocative - and to make these self-judgments more quickly - when in a sexually-relevant context as opposed to a general
social situation. Again, however, we were surprised to find the opposite pattern of responses for Co-Schematic women, i.e., the Co-Schematic group endorsed the most positive, sex-specific traits - and made these self-judgments most rapidly - within the general Social situation. Yet when placed within the Dating context, this group endorsed fewer positive, sex-specific traits, and took longer to make these 'Me' self-judgments. Again, we suggest a conflict for Co-Schematic women, such that high levels of sexual/romantic desire and preoccupation may lead them to inappropriately sexualize or romanticize general social situations; whereas situations with sexually-relevant cues may trigger anxiety (or a general pattern of negative cognitive-affective responses), thereby producing the obtained cognitive interference effects.

Although an examination of the WORDTYPE x SCHEMA and SCHEMA x CONTEXT interactions may be informative, given the obtained 3-way interaction, Figure 2.4 may provide a more accurate representation of the current results. To begin, one may note the mirror-image response latency results obtained from the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups (see Figures 2.4a and b). Here we find that the Aschematic group exhibits a mild facilitation effect when situationally primed (i.e., shorter response latencies in the Dating versus Social situation); whereas the Co-Schematics exhibit the reverse pattern of results, or an interference effect of the situational prime. This finding lends support to our theory that sexually-relevant contexts may prime the conflicting self views of Co-Schematic women, resulting in a pattern of anxiety and/or ambivalence in the subsequent decision-making process. We also obtained the predicted pattern of results for the Positive schema group, i.e., a mild facilitation effect of the contextual prime on schema-consistent (romantic/passionate, open/direct) self-judgments, and a notably strong interference effect of the contextual prime on schema-inconsistent (embarrassed/conservative) self-judgments. A similar, if weaker, pattern of results was obtained for the Negative schema women, who exhibited a moderate contextual interference effect in their latencies for schema-inconsistent (specifically, open/direct) responses; however, they did not show the expected facilitation effect for schema-consistent (embarrassed/conservative) judgments in the Social situation.
Finally, we note the general lack of between subject effects for response latencies to romantic/passionate cue words (see Table 2.4a). One potential explanation for this (non) effect may lie in an examination of the amount of variance explained by the mean filler latency covariate used in this analysis. As was expected given the predictably strong subject effects of reading speed, motivation, motor coordination, etc., the latency covariate predicted large amounts of variance across each of the wordtype outcomes. However, we found that the covariate accounted for significantly more of the variance for romantic/passionate latencies \(F(1, 247) = 167.21\), than for either open/direct \(F(1, 247) = 78.7\) or embarrassed/conservative \(F(1, 247) = 45.17\) latency outcomes (all p's < .01). Indeed, prior to partialling out the variance accounted for by the covariate, a marginally significant (\(p = .07\)) SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect was obtained for the romantic/passionate latency outcomes. One possible explanation for this nuisance effect may lie in the lack of familiarity, word length, or sexual specificity of some of the romantic/passionate items. (See Appendix B for a full list of stimulus and filler items)

**Free Recall Outcomes**

*Within Subject Effects*

As predicted, the 4x2(x3) ANCOVA predicting free recall scores indicated a marginally significant WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction \(F(6, 310) = 2.05, p < .06\). No significant effect was obtained for the WORDTYPE x CONTEXT effect, although a marginally significant WORDTYPE effect did emerge \(F(2,310) = 2.98, p < .06\). (See Table 2.5 for a complete listing of effects for this 4x2(x3) design.) In general, individuals recalled more of the romantic/passionate items than the direct/open or embarrassed/conservative items. The WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction was clearest for subject responses across open/direct and embarrassed/conservative words, represented on the right half of Figure 2.6. Here we find a crossed interaction, with the Positive schema group recalling more open/direct and fewer embarrassed/conservative words, whereas the converse is true for the Negative and Co-Schematic groups - who recalled more embarrassed/conservative than direct/open words. As predicted, the Aschematics recalled
similarly low numbers of both of these positive and negative stimulus words. Finally, a marginally significant 3-way (WxSxC) interaction was obtained, $F(6, 310) = 1.89, p < .09$, which is graphically represented in Figure 2.7.

**Between Subject Effects**

Results of the three 4x2 ANCOVAs predicting free recall scores for the three types of stimulus words are presented in Table 2.6 and Figure 2.8. The 4x2 ANCOVA for the direct/open words indicate a main effect for SCHEMA [$F(3, 163) = 4.05, p < .01$], a main effect for CONTEXT [$F(1, 163) = 5.48, p < .05$], and a marginally significant SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect [$F(3, 163) = 2.27, p < .09$]. Generally speaking, the Positive schema group recalled more open/direct words than the other three groups. Moreover, this recall effect was particularly enhanced for the Positive schema women in the Dating context; i.e., Positive schema women in the Dating context recalled more words than those in the Social context. This facilitation effect for the Dating context was mirrored, to a lesser extent, in the recall scores of the Co-Schematic group. In contrast, the Negative and Aschematic groups obtained similar recall scores across both situational contexts (See Figure 2.8b).

A marginally significant SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect was also obtained for the romantic/passionate items [$F(3, 163) = 2.16, p < .10$]. In this case, a crossover effect was obtained, with the Positive / Negative groups recalling more words in the Dating (versus Social) context, and Aschematic / Co-Schematic groups recalling more words in the Social (versus Dating) context. (See Figure 2.8a.) Finally, a marginally significant CONTEXT effect was obtained with the embarrassed/conservative recall scores [$F(1, 163) = 2.84, p < .10$], with a trend toward enhanced recall in the Dating context. (See Figure 2.8c.) We did not, however, obtain the predicted SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect for recalled embarrassed/conservative items.
Discussion

We have hypothesized that differing sexual self views will selectively enhance conceptual memory for schema-relevant (versus irrelevant) cue words. Given the obtained WORDTYPE x SCHEMA effect for the free recall task, results provide preliminary support for this hypothesis. This WORDTYPE x SCHEMA interaction was most evident in subject recall scores for the open/direct versus embarrassed/conservative stimulus items (see right-hand side of Figure 2.6). As predicted, results indicate that - when collapsed across context - the Positive schema group recalled more schema-consistent (open/direct) cue words than schema-inconsistent (embarrassed/conservative) words. Moreover, the converse pattern of results was obtained for the Negative schema group; these women recalled more embarrassed/conservative than open/direct items. Finally, the Aschematic group, who lack the cognitive frameworks to conceptually 'tag' and retrieve sexually-relevant positive or negative cue words, recalled similarly low numbers of both of these wordtypes.

In addition, we predicted both SCHEMA and SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects for recall scores across the three stimulus wordtypes. These hypotheses also received partial support. To begin, we obtained both a SCHEMA (p < .01) and a marginally significant SCHEMA x CONTEXT (p < .09) effect for open/direct recall scores. Specifically, when collapsed across context, the Positive schema group recalled more open/direct items than the other schema groups. As predicted, moreover, this recall effect was substantially facilitated by the contextual priming of the Dating (as opposed to the Social) situation. (See Figure 2.8b.) In addition, a marginally significant SCHEMA x CONTEXT effect was obtained for the romantic/passionate stimulus words. As predicted, the priming manipulation enhanced the recall of the Positive schema group, for whom romantic/passionate items are schema-consistent. Recall for romantic/passionate items across the remaining schema groups, however, were difficult to explain, as was the general lack of between subject effects for embarrassed/conservative recall scores.

Finally, the marginally significant 3-way (W x S x C) interaction suggests that an analysis of Figure 2.7 might help to clarify the current pattern of results. To begin, it is
noteworthy that all four schema groups showed enhanced recall for the romantic/passionate stimulus words, as is supported by the obtained WORDTYPE effect (p < .06). This result again highlights the fact that the romantic/passionate words may have been less familiar to subjects, and that they are more sex-specific - which may have confounded subsequent recall outcomes. If we temporarily disregard romantic/passionate recall scores, however, Figure 2.7 does provide partial support for our initial hypotheses. For example, the Positive schema group exhibited enhanced recall for schema-consistent (open/direct) items, but not schema-inconsistent (embarrassed/conservative) items subsequent to contextual priming (see Figure 2.7c). In addition, a comparison of priming effects for the Aschematic and Co-Schematic groups is noteworthy. Specifically, the Co-Schematic women - who hold simultaneous positive and negative sexual self views - exhibited enhanced recall with contextual priming for both open/direct and embarrassed/conservative cue words. The Asematics, in contrast, showed no changes in their conceptual memory with the contextual priming manipulation. (See Figures 2.7a and 2.7b.) Finally, we find that although the Negative schema women recalled more embarrassed/conservative than open/direct items, they did not show enhanced recall for schema-consistent words in the Dating context.

A final point of note is the fact that substantially fewer subjects engaged in the free recall task as compared to the response latency task (N's = 164 and 248, respectively). This resulted in cells with as few as 11 or 14 subjects for between subject analyses, which may have resulted in substantially less power, and a less reliable pattern of results, for analyses performed on this outcome variable.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Although group differences in women's sexual self views have previously been shown to predict such outcomes as sexual and/or romantic behaviors, cognitions and affects, the current study represents the first test of the sexual self schema construct
within an explicitly cognitive, information-processing paradigm. To our knowledge, moreover, the current study provides the first test of self-schematic processing based upon a bivariate (rather than bipolar) model of self schemas.

Drawing from existing Social Cognitive research and theory, we predicted both personal and situational sources of schematic accessibility to mediate the cognitive processing of sexually-relevant social information. Specifically, we predicted both a main effect for the women's chronically-accessible sexual self views, as well as interactive effects of sexual self schemas with (a) the type information to be processed (i.e., positive versus negative stimulus cue words), and (b) sexually-relevant situational primes (i.e., the Social versus Dating contexts). As described above, the current research has provided preliminary support for a number of these schematic hypotheses.

As previously suggested, the Positive and Negative schema groups delineated by the bivariate schema model should be similar to the extreme groups distinguished by the bipolar schema model (see Study 1, this document). If this is the case, an examination of the response patterns of the current Positive and Negative schema groups should speak to the consistency of the current results as compared with previous schema research. When compared to Negative schema women, Positive schema scorers endorsed significantly more of the positive stimulus words (i.e., romantic/passionate and open/direct traits) as self-descriptive. Moreover, the contextual prime produced different effects on 'Me' response latencies for the Positive versus Negative schema groups. Whereas imagining oneself in a Dating situation facilitated the processing of these positive (schema-consistent) traits for the Positive schema group, it appeared to interfere with the processing of these (socially-desirable yet schema-inconsistent) traits for the Negative group. As expected, the converse pattern occurred for the negative stimulus items: Negative schema women endorsed more embarrassed/conservative traits, and gave these 'Me' responses more rapidly than the Positive schema women. Positive schema scorers, moreover, took a particularly long time to give 'Me' responses to embarrassed/
conservative traits after their positive sexual self-views had been primed by the contextual manipulation (i.e., imagining oneself in a Dating situation - with someone you are attracted to).

An examination of the response patterns of the Aschematic group, or those who lack articulated positive or negative sexual self-representations, may serve to further clarify these Negative-Positive schema contrasts. Whereas Asomatics should exhibit such general response tendencies as positivity or social desirability biases, they should not exhibit schematically-mediated effects when processing sexually-relevant information. Current results would appear to support this hypothesis. Generally speaking, the Asomatic group did endorse more positive than negative stimulus words, and made these 'Me' self-judgments more quickly. Yet this, we hypothesize, exemplifies a general social desirability effect which, moreover, may represent a more accurate baseline from which to contrast the schematically-mediated patterns of the Positive and Negative schema groups.

Importantly, the current study also provides for a preliminary look at the schematic processing of women who hold simultaneously strong positive and negative sexual self-views. Previous research indicates that Co-Somatics report heightened levels of sexual/romantic desire, preoccupation and arousal, as well as elevated levels of sexual anxiety and self-consciousness (see Study 1, this document). The current findings may serve to clarify this seemingly conflicted cognitive-affective pattern. For example, the Co-Somatics' responses to the romantic/passionate items indicate a surprisingly heightened level of cognitive responsiveness for processing these sex-specific cues within general Social contexts. Specifically, we find that the Co-Somatics endorse more of these items, make 'Me' self-judgments quickly, and show heightened recall for these positive, sex-specific adjectives - *when in a general Social context*. (Whether this response pattern represents a true 'baseline,' or is specific to gender-mixed social/recreational interactions, however, is uncertain.) Yet, when placed within an imaged Dating context, the Co-Somatics present a different pattern of responses, i.e., fewer romantic/passionate endorsements, longer latencies for these 'Me' responses, and significantly poorer recall for
these romantic/passionate words (and, in fact, better recall for embarrassed/conservative words). Drawing from these findings, we suggest that sexually-relevant situational cues may prime the Co-Schematic's conflicted sexual self views and, specifically, stimulate anxiety and/or other negative cognitive-affective responses. This response would account for the cognitive interference exhibited by Co-Schematics in processing positive, sex-specific adjectives subsequent to schematic priming; whereas mood-congruent recall may account for their facilitated recall of embarrassed/conservative traits, and inhibited recall for romantic/passionate traits in the primed (or Dating) context.

It is also important to note both the conceptual and methodological differences between the current research and previous self schema research paradigms. In terms of measurement issues, schema group categorization in the current study was based upon subject scores across two dimensions of the 26-item Sexual Self Schema scale. This represents a marked deviation from previous techniques employed to measure self-schematic frameworks, such as that used by Markus (1977). Markus defined schematics as those who rated themselves on either of the extreme ends of a bipolar dependent-independent continuum, and who rated this dimension as 'important.' In contrast, we assessed positive and negative sexual self views as independent constructs rather than placing these at opposite ends of a bipolar scale - a strategy that has been shown to possess discriminative power (see Study 1, this document). Moreover, we utilized median split procedures rather than selecting only extreme scorers, which, if anything, may have served to underestimate the obtained effects. Finally, we did not ask subjects to directly rate the 'importance' of their sexual self views. Given the unobtrusive nature of the Sexual Self Schema scale, such a rating would have been difficult to obtain. Moreover, we generally question whether individuals with negative self views will rate these as highly important - regardless of the potential impact such negative self schemas may have on one's cognitive processing.
CONCLUSIONS

Sexual self schemas have been defined as cognitive generalizations regarding the sexual aspects of the self, that function to guide the processing of sexually-relevant social information (see Cyranowski, 1993; Andersen & Cyranowski, 1994). The current research represents the first direct test of the sexual self schema construct within an explicitly cognitive, information processing paradigm. Drawing from existing research, we developed a series of hypotheses regarding the mediating effects of women's sexual self views - as well as potential person x situation interactions - on the cognitive processing of sexually-relevant self-judgments. The current study provides preliminary support for a number of these schematic hypotheses. Current findings suggest that women's sexual self views assessed during the first week of the academic quarter may predict response outcomes to timed self-judgments completed 6-8 weeks later, and that these self-views may, at times, interact with sexually-relevant situational cues to mediate the cognitive processing of schema-relevant information. Finally, based on both current results and previous research on the bivariate sexual self schema model (see Study 1, this document), we speculate as to the cognitive-affective response patterns of the four sexual self schema groups.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** SCHEMA Group (S)</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>3, 249</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT (C)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1, 249</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** S x C</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3, 249</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORDTYPE (W)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2, 498</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>6, 498</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x C</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2, 498</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S x C</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6, 498</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Given the significant SCHEMA x WORDTYPE interaction, the current tests of SCHEMA and SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects are not meaningful.

**TABLE 2.1:** 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results: Response Pattern Outcomes Predicting 'Me' versus 'Not Me' Responses - Filler Responses as Covariate
### Factor 1: Romantic / Passionate Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>(1, 257)</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor 2: Open / Direct Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>(1, 257)</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor 3: Embarrassed / Conservative Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>(1, 257)</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>(3, 257)</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** n's for the between-subject cells are as follows:

- Negative schema / Social context, n=37;  Co-Schematic / Social context, n=25;
- Negative schema / Dating context, n=34;  Co-Schematic / Dating context, n=23;
- Aschematic / Social context, n=39;      Positive / Social context, n=30;
- Aschematic / Dating context, n=38;      Positive / Dating context, n=32.

---

**TABLE 2.2:** 4x2 ANCOVA Results Separated by Wordtype  
Response ('Me' versus 'Not me') Outcomes - Filler Responses as Covariate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** SCHEMA Group (S)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3, 239</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT (C)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1, 239</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** S x C</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3, 239</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORDTYPE (W)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2, 478</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6, 478</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x C</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2, 478</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S x C</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6, 478</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Given the significant SCHEMA x WORDTYPE interaction, the current tests of SCHEMA and SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects are not meaningful.

**TABLE 2.3:** 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results: Response Latency Outcomes
Predicting Latencies for 'Me' Responses - Mean Filler Latency as Covariate
**Factor 1: Romantic / Passionate Adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>(1, 247)</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Open / Direct Adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>(1, 247)</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Embarrassed / Conservative Adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>(1, 247)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>(3, 247)</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n's for the between-subject cells are as follows:*
- Negative schema / Social context, n=37;
- Negative schema / Dating context, n=33;
- Aschematic / Social context, n=36;
- Aschematic / Dating context, n=37;
- Co-Schematic / Social context, n=25;
- Co-Schematic / Dating context, n=23;
- Positive / Social context, n=28;
- Positive / Dating context, n=29.

**TABLE 2.4:** 4x2 ANCOVA Results Separated by Wordtype
Latencies for 'Me' Responses - Mean Filler Latency as a Covariate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** SCHEMA Group (S)**</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3, 155</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT (C)</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1, 155</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** S x C</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3, 155</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subject Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORDTYPE (W)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2, 310</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>6, 310</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x C</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2, 310</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x S x C</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>6, 310</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Given the significant SCHEMA x WORDTYPE interaction, the current tests of SCHEMA and SCHEMA x CONTEXT effects are not meaningful.

**TABLE 2.5:** 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results: Free Recall Outcomes
Predicting Recall Scores - Total Recall Score as Covariate
### Factor 1: *Romantic / Passionate Adjectives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>(1, 163)</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor 2: *Open / Direct Adjectives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>(1, 163)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor 3: *Embarrassed / Conservative Adjectives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema Group</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>(1, 163)</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>(3, 163)</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n's for the between-subject cells are as follows:*
- Negative schema / Social context, n=21;  Co-Schematic / Social context, n=11;
- Negative schema / Dating context, n=23;  Co-Schematic / Dating context, n=14;
- Aschematic / Social context, n=25;  Positive / Social context, n=20;
- Aschematic / Dating context, n=27;  Positive / Dating context, n=23.*

**TABLE 2.6:**  4x2 ANCOVA Results Separated by Wordtype  
Free Recall Scores - Total Recall Score as Covariate
FIGURE 2.1: 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results for ('Me' vs. 'Not me') Response Outcomes - Collapsed across CONTEXT
FIGURE 2.2: 4x2 ANCOVA Results for ('Me' vs. 'Not me') Response Outcomes Separated by Wordtype
FIGURE 2.3: 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results for 'Me' Response Latencies Collapsed across CONTEXT
FIGURE 2.4: 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results for 'Me' Response Latencies Separated by Schema Group
FIGURE 2.5: 4x2 ANCOVA Results for 'Me' Response Latencies Separated by Wordtype
FIGURE 2.6: 4x2(x3) ANCOVA Results for Free Recall Outcomes
Collapsed across CONTEXT
FIGURE 2.7: 4x2x(3) ANCOVA Results for Free Recall Outcomes Separated by Schema Group
FIGURE 2.8: 4x2 ANCOVA Results for Free Recall Outcomes
Separated by Wordtype
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APPENDIX A

STUDY 1 QUESTIONNAIRE
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: Please begin with number 1 on the Answer Sheet #1, and item 1 below. Please be honest and accurate. All information is anonymous.

(1) **Racial / ethnic background:** What is your racial / ethnic background?
   0 = Caucasian
   1 = African-American
   2 = Asian-American
   3 = Hispanic / American
   4 = Native American
   5 = Other

(2) **Sexual orientation:** How do you currently identify yourself in terms of your sexual orientation?
   0 = Exclusively homosexual
   1 = Predominantly homosexual
   2 = Bisexual
   3 = Predominantly heterosexual
   4 = Exclusively heterosexual
   5 = I am uncertain at this time

(3) **Religious attendance:** How frequently do you attend religious services?
   0 = Never
   1 = A couple of times a year
   2 = Several times a year
   3 = 2-3 times a month
   4 = Once a week
   5 = More than once a week

(4) **Religious importance:** How important is religion or spiritual beliefs in your life?
   0 = Not at all important
   1 = Not very important
   2 = Somewhat important
   3 = Moderately important
   4 = Very important
**DESCRIBE YOURSELF**

**Directions:** Below is a listing of 50 trait-adjectives. For each word, consider whether or not the term describes you. Each adjective is to be rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 0 - not at all descriptive of me to 6 - very much descriptive of me. For each item, fill in the appropriate circle on your computer answer sheet. Please be thoughtful and honest.

**QUESTION:** To what extent does the term _________ describe me?

**RATING SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all descriptive of me</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) generous</td>
<td>(30) disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) uninhibited</td>
<td>(31) serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) cautious</td>
<td>(32) prudent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) helpful</td>
<td>(33) humorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) loving</td>
<td>(34) sensible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) open-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) shallow</td>
<td>(35) embarrassed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) timid</td>
<td>(36) outspoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) frank</td>
<td>(37) level-headed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) clean-cut</td>
<td>(38) responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) stimulating</td>
<td>(39) romantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) unpleasant</td>
<td>(40) polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) experienced</td>
<td>(41) sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) short-tempered</td>
<td>(42) conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) irresponsible</td>
<td>(43) passionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) direct</td>
<td>(44) wise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) logical</td>
<td>(45) inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) broad-minded</td>
<td>(46) stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) kind</td>
<td>(47) superficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) arousable</td>
<td>(48) warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) practical</td>
<td>(49) unromantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) self-conscious</td>
<td>(50) good-natured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) dull</td>
<td>(51) rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) straight-forward</td>
<td>(52) revealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) casual</td>
<td>(53) bossy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54) feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEXUAL ACTIVITIES DURING YOUR LIFE

Directions: Below are listed a variety of sexual activities. Read the following list of sexual activities. Think about whether or not you have ever experienced each activity. For each item, use the scale provided below. Think carefully and be honest.

Scoring Key: 0 = Never experienced the activity
1 = Have experienced the activity

(55) Your partner lying on you while you are clothed
(56) Stroking and petting your sexual partner's genitals
(57) Erotic embrace while dressed
(58) Intercourse -- vaginal entry from rear
(59) Having your genitals caressed by your partner
(60) Mutual oral (mouth) stimulation of genitals

(61) Oral stimulation of your partner's genitals
(62) Intercourse -- side by side
(63) Kissing of sensitive (non-genital) areas of the body
(64) Intercourse -- sitting position
(65) Masturbating alone
(66) Your partner kissing your nude breasts
(67) Having your anal area caressed
(68) Breast petting while you are clothed
(69) Caressing your partner's anal area
(70) Intercourse -- female "on top" position

(71) Mutual petting of genitals to orgasm
(72) Having your genitals orally stimulated
(73) Mutual undressing of each other
(74) Deep kissing
(75) Intercourse -- male "on top" position
(76) Anal intercourse
(77) Kissing on the lips
(78) Breast petting while you are clothed
**FREQUENCY OF CURRENT SEXUAL ACTIVITIES**

**Directions:** Think about whether or not you experienced each activity *in the last 30 days (one month)*. If an activity has occurred, try to remember how many times and give the best estimate of how often or how many times. For each item, use the scale provided below. Think carefully and be honest.

**Scoring Key:**
- 0 = This activity did not occur
- 1 = Activity occurred once
- 2 = Activity occurred twice
- 3 = Activity occurred 3 times
- 4 = Activity occurred 4 times
- 5 = Activity occurred 5 times
- 6 = Once a week
- 7 = 2-6 times a week
- 8 = Once a day
- 9 = 2 or more times a day

(79) Your partner lying on you while you are clothed
(80) Stroking and petting your sexual partner’s genitals
(81) Erotic embrace while dressed
(82) Intercourse -- vaginal entry from rear
(83) Having your genitals caressed by your partner
(84) Mutual oral (mouth) stimulation of genitals
(85) Oral stimulation of your partner’s genitals
(86) Intercourse -- side by side
(87) Kissing of sensitive (non-genital) areas of the body
(88) Intercourse -- sitting position
(89) Masturbating alone
(90) Your partner kissing your nude breasts

(91) Having your anal area caressed
(92) Breast petting while you are clothed
(93) Caressing your partner’s anal area
(94) Intercourse -- female “on top” position
(95) Mutual petting of genitals to orgasm
(96) Having your genitals orally stimulated
(97) Mutual undressing of each other
(98) Deep kissing
(99) Intercourse -- male “on top” position
(100) Anal intercourse
(101) Kissing on the lips
(102) Breast petting while you are clothed
SEXUAL AROUSABILITY INDEX

Directions: Listed below are a variety of sexual experiences. Some may be sexually arousing while others are not. Read each item carefully, then indicate how sexually aroused you feel when you have the described experience, or how sexually aroused you think you would feel even if you have never actually experienced it. There are no right or wrong answers. Be sure to answer every item. If you aren’t certain about an item, pick a number that seems about right. The meaning of the numbers is given below.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Unpleasant/Adverse effect on arousal
No effect Arousing
Possibly Arousing
Slightly Arousing
Moderately Arousing
Very Arousing
Extremely Arousing

(103) When a partner stimulates your genitals with mouth and tongue
(104) When a partner fondles your breasts with his/her hands
(105) When you see a partner nude
(106) When a partner caresses you with his/her eyes
(107) When a partner stimulates your genitals with his/her fingers
(108) When you are touched or kissed on the inner thighs by a partner
(109) When you caress a partner’s genitals with your fingers
(110) When you read a sexually explicit or “dirty” story
(111) When a partner undresses you
(112) When you dance with a partner
(113) When you have intercourse with a partner
(114) When a partner touches or kisses your nipples
(115) When you caress a partner (other than genitals)
(116) When you see sexually explicit pictures or magazines
(117) When you lie in bed with a partner
(118) When a partner kisses you passionately
(119) When you hear sounds of pleasure during sex
(120) When a partner kisses you with an exploring tongue

**Begin Answer Sheet #2**

(1) When you read suggestive or sexually explicit material (e.g., books, etc.)
(2) When you see a strip show
(3) When you stimulate your partner’s genitals with your mouth and tongue
(4) When a partner caresses you (other than genitals)
(5) When you see a sexually explicit or x-rated movie/video
(6) When you undress a partner
(7) When a partner fondles your breasts with mouth and tongue
(8) When you make love in a new or unusual place
(9) When you masturbate
(10) When your partner has an orgasm
SEXUAL ANXIETY AND NERVOUSNESS

Directions: Listed below are a variety of sexual experiences. Some may make you feel sexually anxious and some may not. Read each item carefully, and then indicate how sexually anxious you feel when you have the described experience, or how sexually anxious you think you would feel even if you have never actually experienced it. By sexually anxious we mean feelings of nervousness, tension, uneasiness, or worry. These feelings are unpleasant. If you aren’t certain about an item, pick the number that seems about right. The meaning of the numbers is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant / Relaxing</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Possibly Anxious</td>
<td>Slightly Anxious</td>
<td>Moderately Anxious</td>
<td>Very Anxious</td>
<td>Extremely Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) When a partner stimulates your genitals with mouth and tongue
(12) When a partner fondles your breasts with his/her hands
(13) When you see a partner nude
(14) When a partner caresses you with his/her eyes
(15) When a partner stimulates your genitals with his/her fingers
(16) When you are touched or kissed on the inner thighs by a partner
(17) When you caress a partner’s genitals with your fingers
(18) When you read a sexually explicate or “dirty” story
(19) When a partner undresses you
(20) When you dance with a partner
(21) When you have intercourse with a partner
(22) When a partner touches or kisses your nipples
(23) When you caress a partner (other than genitals)
(24) When you see sexually explicit pictures or magazines
(25) When you lie in bed with a partner
(26) When a partner kisses you passionately
(27) When you hear sounds of pleasure during sex
(28) When a partner kisses you with an exploring tongue
(29) When you read suggestive or sexually explicit material (e.g., books, etc.)
(30) When you see a strip show
(31) When you stimulate your partner’s genitals with your mouth and tongue
(32) When a partner caresses you (other than genitals)
(33) When you see a sexually explicit or x-rated movie/video
(34) When you undress a partner
(35) When a partner fondles your breasts with mouth and tongue
(36) When you make love in a new or unusual place
(37) When you masturbate
(38) When your partner has an orgasm
SEXUAL CONCERNS

Directions: Listed below are statements about various aspects of sexuality. Read each statement carefully and rate each statement on how well it expresses your own attitude or experience. There are no right or wrong answers. Be sure to answer every question. If you aren’t certain about an item, pick the number that seems about right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all like me</td>
<td>A little like me</td>
<td>Somewhat like me</td>
<td>A lot like me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39) I worry a lot about sex.
(40) I am afraid to engage in sexual intercourse with another person.
(41) I have avoided sexual relations recently because of my sexual fears.
(42) The AIDS scare has increased my fear about sex.
(43) I believe the risks associated with sex are greater than its rewards.
(44) I worry about being criticized because of my sexual behavior.
(45) I was sexually molested when I was a child.
(46) I try to avoid situations where I might get involved sexually.
(47) I have strong sexual urges that I am unable to express.
(48) I would like to feel more relaxed in sexual situations.
(49) The thought of AIDS really scares me.
(50) I have an abnormal fear of sex.
(51) I have repeatedly avoided all or almost all genital sexual contact with a sexual partner.
(52) I'm not afraid of kissing or petting but intercourse really scares me.
(53) I worry a lot about catching a sexually transmitted disease.
(54) I believe my attitudes about sex are abnormal.
(55) When I was a child I was punished because of my sexual behavior.
(56) The way things are now, I would never engage in sexual intercourse.
(57) The thought of sex makes me nervous.
(58) I believe there is no such thing as "safe sex."
(59) The thought of becoming pregnant scares me.
(60) My sex life has always been a source of dissatisfaction.
(61) I often wonder what other people think of me.
(62) I would become more sexually active if I knew there was no such thing as a sexually transmitted disease.
(63) I am more afraid of sex now than I used to be.
(64) I would like to feel less anxious about my sexual behavior.
(65) I would go out of my way to avoid being alone with a member of the opposite sex.
(66) Sex is a chronic source of frustration for me.
(67) I feel sexually inadequate.
(68) I would like to get help for a sexual problem.
NEGATIVE SEXUAL EXPERIENCES

Directions: Below is a list of situations that many college women have experienced. Read each item carefully. Rate whether or not you have experienced each of the following situations. Be honest; all information is confidential.

Rating Scale: 0 = No
1 = Yes

Have you ever:

(69) Had a man misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?
(70) Been in a situation where a man became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop him even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse?
(71) Had sexual intercourse with a man even though you didn’t really want to because he threatened to end your relationship otherwise?
(72) Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn’t really want to because you felt pressured by his continual arguments?
(73) Found out that a man had obtained sexual intercourse with you by saying things he didn’t really mean?
(74) Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn’t want to?
(75) Been in a situation where a man tried to get sexual intercourse with you when you didn’t want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?
(76) Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?
(77) Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn’t want to because he threatened to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t cooperate?
(78) Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn’t want to because he used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?
(79) Been in a situation where a man obtained sexual acts with you such as anal intercourse or oral intercourse when you didn’t want to by using threats or physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?
PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Directions: Listed below are statements about attitudes or feelings you may have. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false about yourself. If you feel the statement described yourself, say “true”. If you feel the statement does not describe yourself, say “false”. Be honest.

Rating Scale: 0 = False
1 = True

(80) I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
(81) I have never intensely disliked anyone.
(82) I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my own way.
(83) There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
(84) I can remember “playing sick” to get out of something.
(85) When I don’t know something I don’t at all mind admitting it.
(86) I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
(87) I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings.
(88) There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
(89) I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
SEXUAL OPINIONS

Directions: Listed below are a number of sexually-related opinions that people hold. Read each statement, and rate the degree to which you agree or disagree. Please respond to each item as honestly as you can. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) I think it would be very entertaining to look at erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.).
(2) Erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.) is obviously filthy and people should not try to describe it as anything else.
(3) Swimming in the nude with a member of the opposite sex would be an exciting experience.
(4) Masturbation can be an exciting experience.
(5) If I found that a close friend of mine was homosexual, it would annoy me.
(6) If people thought that I was interested in oral sex, I would be embarrassed.
(7) Engaging in group sex is an entertaining idea.
(8) I personally find that thinking about engaging in sexual intercourse is arousing.
(9) Seeing an erotic (sexually explicit) movie would be sexually arousing to me.
(10) Thoughts that I may have homosexual tendencies would not worry me at all.
(11) The idea of my being physically attracted to members of the same sex is not depressing.
(12) Almost all erotic (sexually explicit) material is nauseating.
(13) It would be emotionally upsetting to me to see someone exposing themselves publicly.
(14) Watching a stripper of the opposite sex would not be very exciting.
(15) I would not enjoy seeing an erotic (sexually explicit) movie.
(16) When I think about seeing pictures showing someone of the same sex as myself masturbating, it nauseates me.
(17) The thought of engaging in unusual sex practices is highly arousing.
(18) Manipulating my genitals would probably be an arousing experience.
(19) I do not enjoy daydreaming about sexual matters.
(20) I am not curious about explicit erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.).
(21) The thought of having long-term sexual relations with more than one sex partner is not disgusting to me.
SEXUAL THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS

Directions: Below is a list of some sexual thoughts and feelings that women may experience. Read each item carefully, and rate the extent to which you think or feel this way. Please use the rating scale given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) I am a good sexual partner.
(23) I am depressed about the sexual aspects of my life.
(24) I think about sex all the time.
(25) I would rate my sexual skill quite highly.
(26) I feel good about my sexuality.
(27) I think about sex more than anything else.
(28) I am better at sex than most other people.
(29) I am disappointed about the quality of my sex life.
(30) I don’t daydream about sexual situations.
(31) I sometimes have doubts about my sexual competence.
(32) Thinking about sex makes me happy.
(33) I tend to be preoccupied with sex.
(34) I am not very confident in sexual encounters.
(35) I derive pleasure and enjoyment from sex.
(36) I’m constantly thinking about having sex.
(37) I think of myself as a very good sexual partner.
(38) I feel down about my sex life.
(39) I think about sex a great deal of the time.
(40) I would rate myself low as a sexual partner.
(41) I feel unhappy about my sexual relationships.
(42) I seldom think about sex.
(43) I am confident about myself as a sexual partner.
(44) I feel pleased with my sex life.
(45) I hardly ever fantasize about having sex.
(46) I am not very confident about my sexual skill.
(47) I feel sad when I think about my sexual experiences.
(48) I probably think about sex less often than most people.
(49) I sometimes doubt my sexual competence.
(50) I am not discouraged about sex.
(51) I don’t think about sex very often.
SEXUAL HISTORY AND ATTITUDES

(52) With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) in your lifetime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-6 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7-9 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-12 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13-15 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16-20 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Over 20 partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(53) With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) in the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 or more partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(54) With how many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex with during the next five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 or more partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(55) With how many partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 or more partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(56) How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current dating partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once every two or three months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Once every two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A few times each week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nearly every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At least once a day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(57) Sex without love is OK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(58) I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline
\text{Strongly Disagree} & \text{Moderately Disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Moderately Agree} & \text{Strongly Agree}
\end{array}
\]

(59) I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I would feel comfortable and fully enjoy sex with him/her.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline
\text{Strongly Disagree} & \text{Moderately Disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Moderately Agree} & \text{Strongly Agree}
\end{array}
\]

(60) Compared to other women about your age, how would you rate yourself as a sexual person?

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline
\text{I am much less sexual than most women my age} & \text{I am about as sexual as most women my age} & \text{I am much more sexual than most women my age}
\end{array}
\]

SELF-EVALUATION

**Directions:** Listed below are statements about attitudes and feelings that people may have about themselves. Read each statement carefully, then rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement in reference to yourself.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Disagree} & \text{Agree} & \text{Strongly Agree}
\end{array}
\]

(61) I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
(62) I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
(63) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
(64) I am able to do things as well as most other people.
(65) I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
(66) I take a positive attitude about myself.
(67) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
(68) I wish I could have more respect for myself.
(69) I certainly feel useless at times.
(70) At times I think I am no good at all.
RELATING TO OTHERS

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements regarding various styles of relating to others. Read each statement, and rate the degree to which you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I strongly disagree | I strongly agree

(71) I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
(72) I'm not very comfortable having to depend on other people.
(73) I'm comfortable having others depend on me.
(74) I rarely worry about being abandoned by others.
(75) I don't like people getting too close to me.
(76) I'm somewhat uncomfortable being too close to others.
(77) I find it difficult to trust others completely.
(78) I'm nervous whenever anyone gets too close to me.
(79) Others often want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.
(80) Others often are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
(81) I often worry that my partner(s) don't really love me.
(82) I rarely worry about my partner(s) leaving me.
(83) I often want to merge completely with others, and this desire sometimes scares them away.

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Directions: Listed below are statements about attitudes or feelings you may have. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false about yourself. Be honest.

Rating Scale: 0 = False
1 = True

(84) It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
(85) I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my own way.
(86) On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
(87) There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
(88) No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener.
(89) There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
(90) I’m always willing to admit when I make a mistake.
**Rating Scale:**

\[0 = \text{False} \quad 1 = \text{True}\]


(91) I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
(92) I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
(93) I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
(94) There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
(95) I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
(96) I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings.

---

**PASSIONATE LOVE SCALE**

**Directions:** In this section, you will be asked to describe how you feel when you are passionately in love. Some common terms for this feeling are passionate love, infatuation, love sickness, or obsessive love. Please think of the person whom you love most passionately right now. If you are not in love right now, please think of the last person you loved passionately. Keep this person in mind as you complete this section. Try to tell us how you felt at the time when your feelings were the most intense.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline
\text{Not at all} & \text{True} & \text{Moderately True} & \text{Extremely True}
\end{array}
\]

(97) I would feel despair if _____ left me.
(98) Sometimes I feel I can’t control my thoughts; they are obsessively on _____.
(99) I feel happy when I am doing something to make _____ happy.
(100) I would rather be with _____ than anyone else.
(101) I’d get jealous if I thought _____ was falling in love with someone else.
(102) I yearn to know all about _____.
(103) I want _____ -- physically, emotionally, mentally.
(104) I have an endless appetite for affection from _____.
(105) For me, _____ is the perfect romantic partner.
(106) I sense my body responding when I feel _____ touching me.
(107) _____ always seems to be on my mind.
(108) I want _____ to know me -- my thoughts, my fears, my hopes.
(109) I eagerly look for signs indicating _____’s desire for me.
(110) I possess a powerful attraction for _____.
(111) I get extremely depressed when things don’t go right in my relationship with _____.
**PLEASE NOTE:** Many college-aged and older women have not experienced sexual intercourse (coitus). If you have never experienced sexual intercourse, please skip to Page 9, making sure to also skip #112-120 on answer sheet #1, and #1-19 on answer sheet #2. If you have experienced sexual intercourse, please continue.

**SEXUAL FEELINGS AND RESPONSES**

**Directions:** Listed below are several different feelings or responses that women may experience regarding their sexual activities. For the questions below, try to recall your sexual feelings and responses in general, and your feelings and responses regarding intercourse in particular. Read each item carefully and think about how frequently you may feel or respond in the described manner. For each question, use the scale listed below. All information is anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Desire:*
(112) How often did you have a desire for sex?
(113) How often are you not interested in your partner’s suggestions for sex?
(114) How often does your partner want sex more than you?
(115) How often do you “say no” or avoid having sex?
(116) How often do you want sex more than your partner(s)?
(117) How often are you dissatisfied with your interest in sexual activity?

*Excitement:*
(118) During sexual activity with a partner, how often do you become aroused or excited?
(119) Are you aware of wetness in your vagina as you became sexually excited?
(120) How often does it take a long time for your vagina to become wet or slippery as you became sexually excited?

*Note: BEGIN Answer Sheet #2 here.*
(1) How often does you vagina feel “too tight” for penetration?
(2) How often do you use vaginal lubricant (e.g. Lubriderm, K-Y jelly) for sexual activity?
(3) During sexual relations, how frequently do you notice dryness of your vagina?
(4) How often do you feel pain or discomfort with penetration or intercourse?
(5) How often are you dissatisfied with your capacity to become aroused?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orgasm / Climax**

(6) How often are you able to reach climax (come)?

(7) As sexual activity becomes more intense, how often are you aware of throbbing sensations in your vagina (sensations of orgasm or climax)?

(8) During sexual activity, how often are you aware of feelings of body warmth, sweating, heavy breathing, or a fast heart beat?

(9) How often are you dissatisfied with your capacity to have orgasm / climax?

**Resolution / After sexual activity**

(10) How often do you feel satisfied after sexual activity?

(11) How often do you feel pain after intercourse?

(12) How often does your body feel relaxed after sexual activity with a partner?

(13) How often do you feel a release of sexual tension after sexual activity?

(14) How frequently do you feel tense or nervous after intercourse or an intense sexual experience?

(15) How often do you feel dissatisfied after sexual activity ends?

**General Questions:**

(16) How often are you satisfied with the frequency of sexual activity?

(17) How frequently do you enjoy sexual activity?

(18) How often do you feel like a sexual woman?

(19) All things considered, how often is your sexual desire or functioning a source of concern or difficulty in your relationship with a partner?
RELATIONSHIP HISTORY

[* Note: You should now be filling in the circle for #20 on Answer Sheet #2]*

(20) Have you ever dated?
   0 = No
   1 = Yes

(21) Have you ever been in a romantic / love relationship with someone?
   0 = No
   1 = Yes

(22) How many relationships have there been like this?
   0 = None; Not applicable
   1 = 1
   2 = 2
   3 = 3
   4 = 4
   5 = 5
   6 = 6-10
   7 = 11 or more

(23) Are you currently involved in a romantic / love relationship?
   0 = No
   1 = Yes

** Please Note: If you have answered NO to item #23 above (you are not currently involved in a romantic / love relationship), please skip to Page 11 of this questionnaire for final directions. If you answered YES to item #23 above, please continue. **

(24) What kind of relationship is it?
   0 = Just dating
   1 = Serious / committed relationship
   2 = Partnered / Engaged to be married
   3 = Married

(25) How long have you been in the current relationship?
   0 = Less than 1 month
   1 = 1 - 2 months
   2 = 3 - 4 months
   3 = 5 - 6 months
   4 = 7 - 8 months
   5 = 9 - 10 months
   6 = 11 - 12 months
   7 = 1 - 2 years
   8 = 3 - 5 years
   9 = 6 years or more
RELATIONSHIP EVALUATION

Directions: Use the following scale to rate how often the following events occur between you and your partner.

Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | All of the time

(26) How often do you discuss or have you considered ending your relationship?
(27) How often do you or your partner leave (the house/apartment/dorm) after a fight (and before making up)?
(28) In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?
(29) Do you confide in your partner?
(30) Do you ever regret that you are partnered (dating/living together/married)?
(31) How often do you and your partner argue?
(32) How often do you and your partner “get on each other’s nerves”?

(33) There are different degrees of happiness in relationships. The middle point, “happy”, represents the degree of happiness in most relationships. Choose the number which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship at the present time.

Extremely Unhappy | Fairly Unhappy | A Little Unhappy | Happy | Very Happy | Extremely Happy | Perfect

(34) Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship? Pick one from below.

0 = I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.
1 = I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all that I can to see that it does.
2 = I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.
3 = It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can’t do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.
4 = It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to help it succeed.
5 = My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep it going.
EARLY SEXUAL HISTORY

(35) At what age did a parent or guardian first discuss the basics of sexuality with you (e.g., the mechanics of sexual intercourse and reproduction)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - Parents never discussed sexuality</th>
<th>1 - Before age 6</th>
<th>2 - Age 6 - 7</th>
<th>3 - Age 8 - 9</th>
<th>4 - Age 10 - 11</th>
<th>5 - Age 12 - 13</th>
<th>6 - Age 14 - 15</th>
<th>7 - Age 16 - 17</th>
<th>8 - Age 18 - 19</th>
<th>9 - After age 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>A little information</td>
<td>Some information</td>
<td>Quite a bit of information</td>
<td>A lot of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(36) While you were growing up, how much information did you receive from your parents (or guardians) about sexuality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - Not at all embarrassed</th>
<th>1 - Slightly embarrassed</th>
<th>2 - Moderately embarrassed</th>
<th>3 - Extremely embarrassed</th>
<th>4 - Could not be more embarrassed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not interfere at all</td>
<td>Slightly interfered</td>
<td>Moderately interfered</td>
<td>Extremely interfered</td>
<td>Completely interfered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38) While you were growing up, to what extent did your family's religious values interfere with the frank discussion of sexuality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - Extremely Negative</th>
<th>1 - Moderately Negative</th>
<th>2 - Neutral</th>
<th>3 - Moderately Positive</th>
<th>4 - Extremely Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not interfere at all</td>
<td>Slightly interfered</td>
<td>Moderately interfered</td>
<td>Extremely interfered</td>
<td>Completely interfered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39) How would you describe your mother's (or female guardian's) attitude toward sexuality? [Skip this item if there was no mother / female guardian in household.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - Extremely Negative</th>
<th>1 - Moderately Negative</th>
<th>2 - Neutral</th>
<th>3 - Moderately Positive</th>
<th>4 - Extremely Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Negative</td>
<td>Moderately Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
<td>Extremely Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(40) How would you describe your father's (or male guardian's) attitude toward sexuality? [Skip this item if there was no father / male guardian in household.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Positive</th>
<th>Extremely Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(41) While you were growing up, to what extent did your parents (or guardians) openly express affection to each other physically (e.g., kissing, hugging) in your presence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42) At what age did you first begin to masturbate, or stimulate your own genitals?

0 - I have never masturbated
1 - Before age 6
2 - Age 6 - 7
3 - Age 8 - 9
4 - Age 10 - 11
5 - Age 12 - 13
6 - Age 14 - 15
7 - Age 16 - 17
8 - Age 18 - 19
9 - After age 20

(43) While you were growing up, to what extent were you scolded or punished for masturbating? [For this item, choose the answer or answers that best describe your experience.]

0 - I never engaged in these behaviors
1 - I engaged in these behaviors, but was never "caught" by an adult
2 - I was "caught," and masturbation was discussed as a normal behavior
3 - I was "caught," but the incident was never really discussed
4 - I was mildly scolded
5 - I was moderately scolded
6 - I was severely scolded

(44) While you were growing up, to what extent were you scolded or punished for engaging in "sex play" with other children, such as exhibiting your genitals to another child, or exploring another child's genitals? [For this item, choose the answer or answers that best describe your experience.]

0 - I never engaged in these behaviors
1 - I engaged in these behaviors, but was never "caught" by an adult
2 - I was "caught," and sex play was discussed as a normal behavior
3 - I was "caught," but the incident was never really discussed
4 - I was mildly scolded
5 - I was moderately scolded
6 - I was severely scolded
(45) While you were growing up, how much information did you receive from your friends or siblings about sexuality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>A little information</td>
<td>Some information</td>
<td>Quite a bit of information</td>
<td>A lot of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46) Relatively speaking, where did you receive the most information about sexuality, from your parents or from your friends / siblings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received no info from either source</td>
<td>Almost all info from parents</td>
<td>Majority of info from parents</td>
<td>From both parents &amp; friends equally</td>
<td>Majority of info from friends</td>
<td>Almost all info from friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47) While you were growing up, how much information did you receive from your school system about sexuality? (e.g., health classes, sex education classes)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>A little information</td>
<td>Some information</td>
<td>Quite a bit of information</td>
<td>A lot of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(48) While you were growing up, how much information did you receive from the popular media about sexuality? (e.g., television, books, magazines)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>A little information</td>
<td>Some information</td>
<td>Quite a bit of information</td>
<td>A lot of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE.

Thank you for your participation. Please be sure to return both this booklet and your computer answer sheets to the manila envelop. Envelops should be dropped off at the experimenter's desk on your way out. Please remember:

1) Do NOT put your name or any identifying information on any of these materials
2) Have the experimenter sign your experiment card, so that you may receive credit

Should you have any further questions or comments about today's experiment, please feel free to contact either of the below researchers:

Dr. Barbara L. Andersen ............... 292-4236
Jill Cyranowski, M.A. ................. xxx -xxxx
APPENDIX B

STIMULUS AND FILLER WORDS USED IN REACTION TIME TASK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Factor 1: Romantic / Passionate Items</strong></th>
<th><strong>Filler Items</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>romantic</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passionate</td>
<td>unintelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loving</td>
<td>smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulating</td>
<td>stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erotic</td>
<td>dumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seductive</td>
<td>witty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exciting</td>
<td>quick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provocative</td>
<td>brilliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Factor 2: Open / Direct Items</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>direct</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frank</td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td>unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolerant</td>
<td>thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bold</td>
<td>disagreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgoing</td>
<td>friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obnoxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irritable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Factor: Embarrassed / Conservative Items</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cautious</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timid</td>
<td>sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-conscious</td>
<td>amusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prudish</td>
<td>entertaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhibited</td>
<td>funny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>humorless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>