

“He enjoys giving her pleasure.” Diversity and complexity in young men’s sexual scripts

Diane M. Morrison,¹ N. Tatiana Masters,¹ Elizabeth A. Wells,¹
Erin Casey,² Blair Beadnell,¹ and Marilyn J. Hoppe¹

¹ School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle. Seattle, WA

² Social Work Program, University of Washington, Tacoma. Tacoma, WA

Corresponding author:

Diane M. Morrison

University of Washington School of Social Work

4101 15th Ave NE

Seattle Washington, 98105-6299

Phone: 206-543-6813

Fax: 206-543-1228

Email: dmm@uw.edu

This research was supported by a research project grant, R01 HD056952, to this research team (Morrison, PI) and from a research infrastructure grant, R24 HD042828, to the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology at the University of Washington, both from *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

ABSTRACT

Research on heterosexual men's sexual expectations has focused on self-described personal traits and culturally dominant models of masculinity. In a pair of studies, we used a sexual scripts perspective to explore the range and diversity of young men's thoughts about sex and relationships with women and to develop measures for assessing these scripts. In the first study, we conducted semi-structured interviews to elicit young men's accounts of their sexual relationships. We used these narratives to produce brief sexual script scenarios describing typical sexual situations, as well as conventional survey items assessing sexual behavior themes. In the second study, we administered the scenarios and theme items to an ethnically diverse, national sample of 648 heterosexually-active young men in an online survey. Using exploratory factor analysis, we delineated sets of sexual scripts and sexual behavior themes. In the scenarios, we found both a traditional masculine "player" script and a script that emphasized mutual sexual pleasure. Analysis of theme items produced scales of Drinking and Courtship, Monogamy and Emotion, and Sexual Focus and Variety. We discuss the implications of these findings for understanding heterosexual men's thinking about sexuality and how cultural change in sexual thinking may arise. We also discuss the need for measures of sexual thinking that better integrate perceptions and expectations about the partner as well as the self in relation to the partner, rather than solely self-assessed traits.

Key words: young men, heterosexual men, sexuality, sexual scripts, mixed methods

“He enjoys giving her pleasure:” Diversity and complexity in young men’s sexual scripts

INTRODUCTION

Sexual behavior research conducted over the past half-century has been driven in large part by responses to emerging public health issues, including teenage pregnancy (cf., Morrison, 1985; Jaccard, 2009) and HIV/AIDS (Sales, Milhausen, & DiClemente, 2006). Much of what we know about sexuality is therefore focused on how people avoid unwanted consequences of sexual activity. Research on adolescents and emerging adults has typically cast sexual activity as a “problem” or “risk” behavior. This view is based on explicit or implicit assumptions that sexual activity is premature at these ages, and as such presents health risks without any compensating benefits; or that it is a “gateway” behavior that leads to, or reinforces, associations with deviant peers and deviant behavior (Moran, 2000).

This focus on the negative consequences of sexual activity’s has diverted attention from understanding the larger context in which sexual behavior occurs, and the natural development of adolescent and emerging adult sexuality. There is a relative dearth of research on how young people think about sex and relationships and how they make sexual decisions, except insofar as they affect pregnancy and disease outcomes. This literature on sexual risk and safety has focused on particular methods of prevention (e.g., condoms, birth control pills, abstinence): which ones people choose, how they use them (e.g., correct condom practices, methods for negotiating with a partner), why they do or do not, and interventions to increase their use. Context has been included primarily as a moderator of predictors of prevention intentions or behavior, or of intervention effectiveness, as in research that controls for relationship with the sexual partner – casual or non-affectionate vs. steady or relationship-based – to improve prediction of condom use (c.f., Sheeran & Orbell, 1998).

Largely missing from this literature is a focus on the larger contexts in which sexual interactions occur and on goals and outcomes that are unrelated to physical health such as seeking intimacy, enacting gender roles, achieving adult status, securing social validation, and experiencing love. Models of sexual safety and risk-taking have also focused primarily on objective reasoning, overlooking affective and relational factors (e.g., Cole, & Leukefeld, 2002). Examining sexual risk decision making divorced from its emotional context may favor cooler, more deliberate calculations over those that arise in the “heat of the moment,” but those immediate situational factors may be as important in understanding in-the-moment behavior (Gutnik, Hakimzada, Yoskowitz, & Patel, 2006; Lowenstein, 1996).

Sexuality researchers have begun to fill these research gaps. As Tolman and McClelland (2011) describe in their review of emerging research on normative sexual development, the first decade of the 21st century has seen a marked increase in research that addresses positive and developmentally expected aspects of young people’s sexuality. These authors and others (cf., Halpern, Waller, Spriggs & Hallfors, 2006; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006) also call for increased focus on males’ experience of sexuality and relationships across adolescence and into emerging adulthood. Heterosexual boys and men have received relatively sparse attention in research on sexual behavior and sexual risk-taking, due in part to the tendency to place responsibility for reproductive health on women (Campbell, 1995; Tolman & McClelland, 2011). Better understanding of young men’s perspectives could go far to inform research and prevention activities focusing on sexual risk.

Sexual Scripts

The present study begins to address these gaps by investigating men’s sexual self-conceptions using a scripts perspective. Scripts are people’s cognitive representations of events

that guide their expectations for similar events, and thus shape them. They include norms that guide behavior, individuals' interpretations of the implications of cultural norms for interpersonal interactions, and individuals' constructions of their own desires (Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005).

Scripts have been conceptualized in a number of ways. Schank & Ableson (1977) posited a general scripts perspective that emphasized people's expectations about the order in which events unfold. This view sees people as believing that the occurrence of one type of event will increase or decrease the conditional probability that a particular next event will occur. These beliefs then create an anticipated sequence of how certain situations might unfold. Gagnon (1974; 1990) built on the scripts perspective with a particular focus on sexual scripts. He placed less emphasis on sequential order. Rather, he conceptualized scripts as cognitive representations that contain information about a social situation at three levels. Cultural scripts, derived from media and social institutions, shape perceptions of appropriate sexual choices at the societal level. Interpersonal scripts are shared expectations and interpretations of cultural scripts, and responses to immediate others' cues and actions. Intrapsychic scripts combine internalizations of cultural and interpersonal scripts with actors' own desires and preferences; these desires and preferences are shaped largely, but not entirely, by cultural scripts.

Traditional Sexual Scripts and Gender Roles

Early research on sexual scripts among young men and women focused on examination of cultural level scripts: documenting the elements of college students' scripts and identifying differences in expected courtship and sexual behavior between women and men. In general, the findings of these studies were in line with traditional gender role expectations. Men's scripts were more direct, proactive, more highly sexed, with more strategies for obtaining intercourse;

women's were more indirect, reactive, less highly sexed, with more strategies for avoiding intercourse (Byers, 1996; LaPlante, McCormick & Brannigan, 1980; Rose & Frieze, 1989; Rose & Frieze, 1993). Greater sexual experience enhanced men's status and diminished women's (Byers, 1996); emotional ties and commitment were more associated with women's scripts (Byers, 1996; Hynie, Lydon, Cote & Wiener, 1998). Scripts varied by sexual situation: Different behavior is normative during party town spring breaks than "at home" (Maticka-Tyndale, Herold, & Mewhinney, 1998).

In parallel, social psychological research on sexual decision-making has focused on what is essentially the intrapsychic level of Gagnon's sexual scripts: on individual, self-assessed behaviors, attitudes, and perceived norms. When comparing men's and women's sexual behavior and expectations, researchers find differences consistent with traditional gender roles. Men report having greater numbers of partners, more casual partners, and more concurrent relationships than do women (Adimora & Schoenbach, 2005; O'Sullivan, Hoffman, Harrison, & Dolezal, 2006). They generally hold more permissive sexual values, are more accepting of premarital sex, view intercourse as a more positive part of the self, and receive more pro-sexual messages from peers (see Smith et al., 2005 for a review). Men, more than women, endorse traditional gender norms (c.f., O'Sullivan et al., 2006), such as those that position men as initiators and pursuers in heterosexual encounters, cast men as having lower control of sexual impulses, and discourage commitment and monogamy (Beadnell et al., 2008; Byers, 1996; Flood & Pease, 2009; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1993; Santana, Raj, Decker, Lamarche & Silverman, 2006; Seal & Ehrhardt, 2003; Tolman, Spencer, Rosen-Reynoso & Porche, 2003).

Disjunctures and Alternatives

Research documenting modal male patterns, and mean differences compared to women, does not fully capture the potential diversity of perspectives among men. We know relatively little about the extent to which men vary – between individuals or within individuals over time – in their adoption of traditional male personas. More recent qualitative research in the scripts tradition has used descriptions of dominant scripts as a platform to begin to explore nuances in, and departures from, these traditional scripts. Dworkin and O’Sullivan (2005) explored differences between enacted vs. preferred patterns of sexual initiation among a sample of community college men. They found that although for most of their respondents, male-dominated sexual initiation was the norm in their relationships, egalitarian and female-dominant patterns were also present, and over half the men stated a desire for egalitarian initiation practices. Maxwell (2007) explored similar ground with a more socio-demographically diverse sample in the United Kingdom; her young men and women were drawn from jails and supported housing as well as educational settings. Her findings echo young men’s desire for more female initiation, as well as desire for romantic attachments, at least within established relationships. She notes hearing young men’s “contradictory voices,” espousing traditional beliefs but also aspiring to a “romantic hero” script. In a diverse US sample of young men and women, Masters, Casey, Wells, and Morrison (2013) found that although most participants’ culture-level gender scripts for behavior in sexual relationships were congruent with descriptions of traditional gendered sexuality, there was heterogeneity in how or whether these scripts were incorporated into their individual-level, intrapsychic scripts. Many participants created exceptions to gender scripts for themselves, or attempted to remake or reinterpret culture-level gender scripts.

Harding (2007) has drawn from this perspective in understanding cultural, and particularly sub-cultural, influences on sexual behavior. In his conceptualization, scripts represent cultural knowledge about a set of behaviors or actions, and an individual may hold several of these templates, and choose among them in different situations. This conceptualization echoes Dworkin and O'Sullivan's (2005) work on disjunctures in, and departures from, traditional male sexual scripts. The scripts perspective offers a way to encompass the complexity of sexual motivation that avoids stripping context and deep meaning.

Additionally, it is not clear what alternatives men who reject a traditional view of masculinity instead adopt. Where this has been examined, there is evidence that many men's preferred patterns of sexual interaction diverge from traditional gender role expectations and culturally dominant expectations (Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005; Masters, Casey et al., 2013). Understanding variation in young men's thinking about sexuality is essential to illuminating mechanisms through which it may change, and for designing interventions related to sexual safety and well-being.

This study's goal is to contribute to explicating the diversity of young heterosexually-active men's sexual scripts and to create corresponding measures for capturing these scripts. This perspective has the potential to contribute to the integration of the emotional and relational aspects of sexual interactions into sexual behavior research (cf., Baumeister, Vohs, DeWall, & Zhang, 2007). It builds on literature on disjunctures in scripts, using a two-sample mixed methods strategy to begin to address the prevalence of a range of scripts among young men.

Study 1: Qualitatively Identifying Sexual Scripts and Developing Measures

METHOD

Recruitment

In this qualitative study, we recruited participants from Washington State, stratifying on race (Creswell, 1998) to enroll roughly equivalent proportions of African American, Asian American/Pacific Islander, European American/white, Latino, and other/multiracial men. Advertisements in online classifieds, on social networking sites, and in printed flyers invited men to “share [their] views for a study of sexual relationships.” Potential participants contacted the research team by telephone and were screened for eligibility and scheduled for in-person interviews. Inclusion criteria were having had intercourse with a woman at least one time, current interest in having sex with women in the future, being age 18-25, and residing in the US at least since the beginning of high school.

Participants

We collected narrative data from 26 men, of whom four identified as African American, five as Asian/Pacific Islander, nine as European American/white, five as Latino, and three as Multiracial. Their ages ranged from 18 to 25. All had completed high school or obtained their general equivalency diplomas, eight had obtained at least a four-year degree, and another 12 reported being enrolled in college currently or at some point in the past. Seventeen men reported being currently involved in a romantic or committed relationship; nine were single and/or casually dating.

Procedures

Participants could choose a male or female interviewer; the few who expressed a preference opted for a woman. We used a semi-structured protocol that asked men to talk freely

about each of three types of sexual connections with women that they had experienced: committed romantic partnerships, on-going casual sexual relationships, and one-time only sexual encounters. The interviewers asked men to tell stories of actual relationships (e.g., “Tell me about the situation, your partner, how things unfolded”) in order to get data on men’s sexual scripts as they enacted them in real life. Interviewers prompted participants to describe a relationship’s initiation, how it moved in a sexual direction, details of one or more sexual encounters, sexual safety strategies, and feelings about and perceptions of the relationship. To elicit content on sexual scripts that participants may have been influenced by but had not experienced, interviewers also asked them to describe an ideal sexual experience. If men’s accounts did not address their feelings about and experiences with condoms, other contraception, STIs, and pregnancy and fatherhood, we used follow up probes to draw them out on these topics. Respondents received a check for \$25 at the end of the interview. The interviews were digitally recorded and professionally transcribed. All procedures were approved by the University’s Human Subjects Review Board.

Analytic approach

Our goals for this analysis were to produce both (1) a way of measuring sexual scripts that preserved some of the qualitative richness of men’s real-life narratives, but was concise enough to use for data gathering in an online survey, and (2) typical survey items assessing sexual scripts. The investigative team topic coded (Saldaña, 2009) each transcript using Atlas.ti software, identifying sexual script elements from “casual,” “girlfriend,” or “one-night stand” relationships. Coding was sequential with a second coder reviewing a first coder’s work. The few instances of disagreement were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached (Carter & Little, 2007; Saldaña, 2009). Based on techniques introduced by Maticka-Tyndale and her

colleagues (cf., Maticka-Tyndale, 1992; Maticka-Tyndale et al., 2005), we assigned codes that presented the “who, what, where, when, why, and how” of each sexual episode. We also coded mentions of norms, gender expectations, and attraction that occurred in other relevant sections of the transcript.

When coding was complete, team members reviewed coded text and summarized themes using across-case analysis (Ayres, Kavanaugh, & Knafel, 2003). For example, one member reviewed all Casual who, what, where, when, why, and how codes and organized them into themes that described men’s scripts for casual sexual encounters. Three team members then used their analyses of, respectively, girlfriend, casual partner, and one-night-stand accounts to produce brief sexual scenarios that encompassed the themes we observed. We presented these as paragraph-long sexual situations, using wording drawn from men’s narratives wherever possible. We also created a set of traditional questionnaire items to assess sexual script themes that were not integrated into the scenarios. Scenarios and questionnaire items were reviewed multiple times by the team for inclusion of all major themes. Scenarios were re-written to improve brevity, readability, and applicability to as wide a segment of the 18-25 year old heterosexually-active male population as possible.

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Briefly, themes included (1) traditional masculine sexuality, (2) contrasting themes of (a) traditional feminine sexuality and (b) women who desire and initiate sex, (3) themes regarding both the relationship and emotional/ affective contexts of sex, and (4) themes relating to meeting sexual partners and the courtship process. The traditional masculine sexuality theme described men as having strong “sex drives,” being “players” who wanted no-strings sex, valuing sex over relationships, and seeking variety in partners and sex acts. Feminine sexuality themes included

both one adhering to the mainstream model (e.g., women as wanting commitment and monogamy, seeking emotional intimacy and trust with sex, and having lower levels of sexual desire or interest than men), and a theme depicting women who enjoy and seek out sex with men. Another theme was the relationships in which sex occurred and the emotions associated with it, including both positives (e.g., a developing committed relationship; feelings of trust, affection, and sexual chemistry) and negatives (e.g., “revenge sex;” feelings of guilt and confusion). A final thematic category was sexual courtship, which included content on meeting new partners and progressing toward sex, particularly the role of alcohol (e.g., meeting in bars, drinking together). Other findings on men’s sexual scripts from these data are reported elsewhere (Masters, Casey et al., 2013; Masters, Beadnell, Morrison, Wells, & Hoppe, 2013).

In order to extend these qualitative findings into a quantitative survey of young men’s sexual scripts, we employed them to create a set of 12 brief sexual script scenarios and 28 questionnaire theme items. Each scenario drew upon multiple accounts and synthesized elements from them to present men’s sexual scripts in a narrative format. The scenario measure of sexual scripts strove to preserve as much qualitative richness as possible while remaining concise enough to administer online (see Table 1).

We also created a set of questionnaire items. The items represented additional concepts that were relevant to young men’s sexual scripts but not thoroughly covered in the scenarios. These theme items appear in Table 2. We administered both the sexual script scenarios and the theme items in Study 2.

Study 2: Measuring Sexual Scripts

METHOD

Survey recruitment

We conducted the entirety of this study (recruitment, screening for eligibility, consent for participation, survey administration) online. We sought participants who were men between the ages of 18 and 25, had been physically intimate with a woman (defined as touching below the waist or having oral, vaginal, or anal sex), were interested in having sex with women in the future (not necessarily exclusively), and had lived in the US during their adolescence. Recruitment was designed to insure inclusion of a full range of levels and types of genital intimacy, to include men who were interested in sex with both women and men, and to exclude men who had engaged in heterosexual sex in the past but then concluded that they were interested only in sex with men in the future. We recruited them with advertisements on Facebook (national scope) and Craigslist (14 different US regions) inviting them to “share [their] views” in a “web survey on relationships with women.” To avoid potential participants falsifying information to gain eligibility, ads provided general information about the study but no specific details about eligibility criteria beyond age and gender. To obtain a sample representing different racial/ethnic categories, we programmed the online eligibility questionnaire with quotas to screen in approximately equal numbers of eligible African American, Asian American, European American/white, Latino, and Multiracial or “other” men. We used 3 different ad photos of male-female couples representing a range of apparent racial/ethnic identities. Men who completed surveys and provided confidential contact information were mailed a \$40 check for participation. Recruitment of the final sample took about 6 months, which suggests that this was not a coercively large incentive. All procedures were approved by the University’s Human Subjects

Review Board.

Survey and data cleaning procedures

Because online surveys provide an opportunity for multiple or careless responding, we took steps to ensure data integrity. A programming feature temporarily captured respondents' internet protocol (IP) addresses and used that information to consider a person ineligible if he tried to enter the survey a second time. To deter participants from clicking through the survey simply to get the incentive, some questions were programmed to require responses. We provided a neutral response category (e.g., "I don't know") for such questions, to avoid coercion. For data cleaning, we used flags (e.g., repeated patterns of identical responses) to identify potential problem cases, then reviewed these cases and dropped them from the dataset when most factors pointed to invalid data.

Participants

A total of 662 individuals began the survey. We excluded a small number ($n = 14$) during data cleaning due to suspicious responding. Of the remaining 648, 20.8% were African American, 18.1% Asian American, 20.5% European American/white, 22.2% Latino, and 18.4% Multiracial or of other racial/ethnic backgrounds. Their average age was 20.6 ($SD\ 2.0$). Eight percent currently had less than a high school education; 27% had completed high school or obtained their general equivalency diplomas; 46% had some college or technical training, but no degree; 6% had a community college or Associate's degree; and 12% had obtained at least a Bachelor's degree. Thirty-six percent were not currently students; the majority of the remaining 64% were enrolled in either community college or a four-year school. The majority (62%) had personal incomes under \$12,000 per year.

Of the 648 participants, 146 exited the survey before completing any of the scenario questions, and an additional 25 before answering any of the theme item questions. We therefore included different numbers of cases in analysis samples for scenario responses ($n = 502$) and theme items ($n = 477$). Since other approaches to handling missing data require people to answer at least some items used in a given analysis, listwise deletion was the only practical method in these cases. Of the 648 cases, the 171 not included in one or both of the analyses described below did not differ significantly from the 477 included in all analyses in terms of age, race/ethnicity, education, or income.

Measures

Sexual script scenario items. Following each scenario (shown in Table 1), we asked “How desirable is this situation for you?” and “How common is this situation for you?” to assess the extent to which the scenario represented the respondent’s individual sexual script. In order to assess how much the participant thought each scenario represented a cultural sexual script, we also asked “How desirable is this situation for guys your age?” and “How common is this situation for guys your age?” Response options for the “desirable” questions were 0 (*very undesirable*), 1 (*undesirable*), 2 (*neither undesirable nor desirable*), 3 (*desirable*), and 4 (*very desirable*); for the “common” questions, they were 0 (*never happens*), 1 (*rarely happens*), 2 (*happens sometimes*), 3 (*happens fairly often*), and 4 (*happens very often*).

Sexual script theme items. The twenty-eight items developed in Study 1 included statements such as “Sex is better if it’s in a relationship that includes love” and “Somewhere out there is a special girl who is just right for every guy.” Participants indicated their level of agreement with each statement with these response options: 0 (*strongly disagree*), 1 (*disagree*), 2

(*neither agree nor disagree*), 3 (*agree*), and 4 (*strongly agree*). We included a large number of items in this item pool in anticipation that not all would be useful (DeVellis, 2003).

Gender and sexual attitudes scales. We used ten established scales to test the conceptual validity of the sexual script scores. Eight items from the *Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS)*; Chu, Porche & Tolman, 2005) and six items from the *Hostility toward Women Scale* (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) assessed traditional male gender role beliefs and animosity towards women, respectively. Response options for both of these scales ranged from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores on these scales represent more traditional gender attitudes and greater suspicion of women. We measured sexual sensation seeking with six questions from Kalichman and Rompa's (1995) *Sexual Sensation Seeking Scale*; higher scores represent more sensation seeking. The belief that men are driven by a desire for sex was reflected in higher scores on a score computed from eight items on the *Men as Sex Driven* scale (Ward, 2002). We measured monogamy attitudes with two scales. First, three items from Simpson and Gangestad's (1991) *Sociosexual Orientation Scale* were used to assess endorsement of non-monogamy, with higher scores reflecting greater comfort with it. Second, three items developed by the research team measured affective components of *monogamy attitudes* (monogamy as pleasant/unpleasant, good/bad, smart/dumb), with higher scores signifying positive attitudes towards monogamous sexual relationships. We assessed alcohol expectancies relevant to sex and courtship with four subscales (*sociability, liquid courage, risk and aggression, and sexuality*) adapted from Fromme, Stroot and Kaplan's *Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol Questionnaire* (1993). To decrease participant burden due to questionnaire length, we used the three highest loading items for each subscale based on Ham et al.'s work with the Fromme scale (Ham, Stewart, Norton, & Hope, 2005). Higher scores on these

subscales represent stronger endorsement of alcohol expectancies, that is that drinking alcohol increases behavior in the subscale's particular arena (e.g., makes a person be more sociable or enjoy sex more). Cronbach's alpha for the hostility toward women scale was .63 in this sample; all others were .70 or greater. Ranges and alphas for the ten scale scores appear in Table 4.

Analytic Approach

We used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with quantitative responses to the scenarios and theme items described above to identify and describe the scripts' dimensions. We conducted a series of EFAs with Mplus 6.0 software, using weighted least squares estimation (WLSMV) because our variables were measured ordinally. Based on our theoretically-informed assumption that factors would intercorrelate, we used promax rotation (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). This oblique rotation approach allows intercorrelations between factors while maximizing the simplicity of the factor structure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). For the 12 scenarios, we conducted EFA separately for each response item (i.e. "How desirable is this situation for you," "How common is this situation for you," "How desirable is this situation for guys your age," and "How common is this situation for guys your age.") Then we conducted a separate EFA for the 28 theme items.

Two key issues in EFA are choosing the number of factors to retain and establishing which items load highly enough on a factor to justify inclusion in a factor score. We generally chose the correct number of factors based on eigenvalues greater than 1 and on examination of scree plots (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). For each factor score we retained items with loadings greater than .40 as long as no cross-loading (the item loading on two factors with a difference of less than .15) occurred. While strict criteria do not exist, these cutoffs are generally accepted (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001).

To compute a sexual script score, we averaged all items that loaded onto that script's factor. We then computed the internal reliability of scores on sexual script scales using Cronbach's alpha, and calculated their correlations with one another to illuminate areas of conceptual overlap. We tested script scores' concurrent validity by calculating their correlations with conceptually related measures. As measures of men's perceptions of how heterosexual sexual relationships "are" or "should be," we expected sexual script assessments to have some overlap with existing measures of gender beliefs and beliefs about sex and monogamy. Thus, we calculated Pearson correlations between script scores and existing measures of masculinity, attitudes toward women, sexual sensation seeking, sex and monogamy-related attitudes, and alcohol expectancies.

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Sexual script scenarios. The initial EFAs found considerable similarity in factor structure across the four sets of responses to the scenarios (desirable for you, common for you, desirable for guys your age, and common for guys your age). Because in this analysis we were interested in exploring personal, intrapsychic scripts we chose "you" as opposed to "guys your age;" because we were interested in what men thought was appropriate for them (as opposed to what might be seen as controlled by circumstances, such as availability of partners), we saw the "desirable for you" approach as best mapping onto the intrapsychic dimension of sexual scripts, and present detailed results only from this EFA.

Initial eigenvalues suggested that a two-factor model was the best fit to the "desirable for you" scenario data, and Table 1 shows this solution. In this 2-factor solution, one scenario cross-loaded on both factors (#9); we did not include this scenario response in interpreting the factors

or in computing final factor scores. Factor scores were computed as the mean of the items loading on that factor.

We labeled the first factor as the Traditional Masculinity script. This script emphasized perceived differences between men and women. It defined men as having strong “sex drives,” being sexual initiators, preferring recreational sex, and seeking no-strings sex with multiple partners, and endorsed double standards for men’s and women’s sexual behavior. Higher scores on the Traditional Masculinity sexual script represent a greater desire for sexual experiences that follow this viewpoint. Scores based on the eight items had an alpha of .83. The mean score on this factor among the young men in our sample was 1.38 ($SD = .78$).

The second factor represented a sexual script involving women who are interested in sex, initiate it, and enjoy it; we labeled this script Sex Positive Woman. This script emphasized both eroticism and areas of similarity between men’s and women’s sexuality. The three scenario responses that loaded on this factor involved female partners who openly expressed desire toward men, mutual sexual pleasure, and relationships (both friendly and romantic) that included emotionality as well as physicality. Higher scores on the Sex Positive Woman script (alpha = .78) indicate more desire for sexual relationships with this type of woman. The mean score on this factor was 2.75 ($SD = .91$).

Sexual script themes. Initial EFAs of the 28 theme items identified 13 items that had low or cross-loadings. Dropping these low performing items resulted in the three-factor model shown in Table 2. Scale scores were again computed as a mean of items loading onto each script’s factor.

We named the three factors (1) Drinking and Courtship, (2) Monogamy and Emotion, and (3) Sexual Focus and Variety. Higher scores on the Drinking and Courtship sexual script

indicated more belief in alcohol as a facilitator of heterosexual courtship and sexual initiation. Scores for the three items loading on this factor had an alpha of .77. The Monogamy and Emotion factor represented a sexual script that favored sex in committed and loving relationships. Higher scores on the Monogamy and Emotion script (alpha = .63, four items) corresponded to a desire for sex in a relational context and negative judgments of both men and women who sought other types of sex. Higher scores on the Sexual Focus and Variety items represented a preoccupation with sex and an emphasis on novelty in both partners and acts (seven items, alpha = .75). The mean scores on each of these scales was between 2, corresponding to a *neither agree nor disagree* rating on the items and 3, corresponding to *agree*; exact means and *SDs* are presented in Table 3 along with correlations among all 5 sexual scripts factors.

Concurrent validity. Table 4 shows Pearson's correlations between sexual scripts scale scores and established measures of gender and sexual attitudes. The concurrent validity of all five of the sexual scripts was supported. As expected, the Traditional Masculinity sexual script was moderately positively correlated with measures of traditional gender role beliefs, hostility toward women, sexual sensation-seeking, and the endorsement of non-monogamous sexual relationships. Men endorsing the Sex Positive Woman script did not report traditional gender ideologies, but other correlations reflected the sex-positive attitudes for both genders contained in this script. Specifically, Sex Positive Woman scores correlated with sexual sensation-seeking, men as sex driven, and non-monogamy. The Drinking and Courtship sexual script, as expected, was positively correlated with beliefs that alcohol increased sexual enjoyment and made one more sociable, courageous, and aggressive. The Monogamy and Emotion sexual script was moderately negatively correlated with masculinity ideology, sexual sensation-seeking, and

endorsement of non-monogamy. It was positively correlated with positive attitudes toward monogamy. Men who endorsed the Sexual Focus and Variety script scored higher on traditional gender ideologies, sexual sensation-seeking, men as sex driven, and measures of non-monogamy.

DISCUSSION

Our goal was to increase understanding of men's sexual self-perceptions and sexual behavior by identifying and describing key sexual scripts operating among young heterosexually-active men. To this end, we developed measures of young men's scripts that stayed as close as possible to the modal stories we heard from young men in the initial interview phase of the project. We attempted to capture some of the complexity of their experiences in, and expectations about, sexual relationships with women.

Traditional Masculinity

As anticipated, we found a factor that featured elements of the traditional masculine script, similar to scripts and gender role expectations found throughout the literature (e.g., Beadnell et al., 2008; Byers, 1996; Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005; Masters, Casey et al., 2013; Seal & Ehrhardt, 2003; Tolman et al., 2003). The fact that this factor emerged, even when using an unusual measure comprised of mini-scenarios, attests to its strength and robustness. A related factor, Sexual Variety and Focus, emerged from the factor analysis of theme items, and these two factors were moderately related ($r = .31$). Both emphasized gender differences in sexual interest and the value of novelty to men's sexual enjoyment, and shared moderate-to-large correlations with the *AMIRS* (Chu et al., 2005), the *Men as Driven by Sex Scale* (Ward, 2002), and the endorsement of non-monogamy items from Simpson and Gangstead's (1991) *Sociosexual Orientation Scale*.

Interestingly, however, although these results all suggest that the young men in the sample recognized the coherence of this traditional masculine script, it was not seen as highly desirable. The mean score on the Traditional Masculinity factor among the young men in our sample was 1.38, corresponding to an average rating between *undesirable* (coded 1) and *neither undesirable nor desirable* (coded 2), leaning toward the undesirable end of the scale. This may stem from the realism of the scenario elements of the measure. The scenarios that loaded on the Traditional Masculinity factor include a good measure of uncertainty and tension. As in the stories men told us in the interviews, there was conflict between wanting to have sex early in the relationship and wanting a worthy partner (whose worth, as men saw it, was enacted by waiting to have sex), and between wanting to be seen as successful at sexual gamesmanship and finding it somewhat empty. There was also general discomfort with sex potentially beginning something whose repercussions cannot be foreseen. From both the interview data and the factor analysis, one might conclude that young men find the Traditional Masculinity script ubiquitous and compelling, but not entirely attractive.

Sex-Positive Woman

The second factor that emerged from the factor analysis of the scenarios was quite different, and it reflects a dimension of young men's sexual scripts that we have not seen reported elsewhere. The common element of the three scenarios that comprise this factor is a female partner who is openly enjoying the sexual aspect of the relationship. The type of relationship varied: a courtship stage in one scenario, a long-term relationship in a second, and a "friends with benefits" relationship in the third. This script garnered a higher average desirability rating than any other script factor; its score was 2.75 ($SD = .91$), corresponding to an average rating between *neither undesirable nor desirable* (coded 2) and *desirable* (coded 3). This factor

is consonant with a theme we heard in some of the young men's stories in which they expressed wanting to be the object of a woman's desire as well as interest in sex that involved both emotional connection and physical pleasure.

As Dworkin and O'Sullivan (2005) and Masters, Casey et al. (2013) have discussed, men may recognize, and feel the pull of, traditional cultural scripts for masculine sexuality but simultaneously desire less conventional interpersonal scripts. This disjuncture is consonant with Gagnon's (1974) contention that scripts operate at multiple levels – here, cultural vs. personal – and with Harding's (2007) propositions about the diversity of cultural scripts. Harding suggests that individuals perceive, and select among, a variety of scripts that they see supported either in the dominant culture or in their own subcultural groups. We know that sexual scripts vary over time and space; the evolution of a cultural sexual script may stem from changes in personal (intrapyschic) and interpersonal variations from the dominant sexual script (Simon & Gagnon, 1986). Following this line of reasoning, then, one important implication of these findings may be that embracing the sex-positive woman script is a route away from the less attractive aspects of the traditional male sexual script. The sex-positive woman script, like the Traditional Masculinity script, is significantly (though slightly less strongly) correlated with the *Men as Driven by Sex Scale*, the *Sexual Sensation-seeking Scale*, and *Endorsement of Non-monogamy*; it differs from the Traditional Masculinity script in being uncorrelated with the *Hostility Toward Women Scale* or the *AMIRS*. The sex-positive woman script can thus be seen as an evolution away from the Traditional Masculinity script's emphasis on hostility toward women and machismo, while retaining the man-as-sexual-adventurer aspects of this script.

Drinking and Courtship

Among the theme items, the first factor was one that captured the centrality of alcohol use in courtship situations. This finding confirmed a striking association we noticed in the interviews: alcohol appeared in most participants' descriptions of partner-seeking situations, either in the setting (a bar or a party with alcohol), as a courtship behavior (offering to buy or fetch an alcoholic beverage), or as a social lubricant or marker of sexual interest (Wells et al., 2013). Somewhat surprisingly, the resulting Drinking and Courtship scale had a moderate correlation ($r = .38$) with the Sex-Positive Woman scenario scale. This may reflect a belief that women enter drinking situations to look for sexual partners. It may also reflect the fact that two of the three items in the Drinking and Courtship scale include a focus on the mutuality of the drinking ("One good way to meet women is at a party where you're both drinking" and "A girl is more likely to respond to a guy when they've been drinking together"). But scores on the Fromme et al. (1993) sex and alcohol expectancy scale were not strongly related to the Sex-Positive Woman script ($r = .11$). This may be due to the interpersonal focus of our items in contrast to those in established alcohol expectancy scales, which focus more on the actor's internal state (e.g., [If I were to drink alcohol] "I would be friendly"). The focus, in our Drinking and Courtship measure, on the interpersonal sexual situation may have invoked sexual scripts for interpersonal situations, rather than only self-attributions. Because of its focus on social situations, as opposed to implicit theories about one's own traits, the script approach may be better suited to uncovering interpersonal and cultural layers of social understanding.

Monogamy and Emotion

The second factor that emerged from the theme items, Monogamy and Emotion, reflects a perspective that diverges from the dominant characterization of young men's traditional gender

roles. However, the mean score of 2.72 on this scale corresponds to a score tending toward the “agree” point on this response scale (coded 3), suggesting that many of the young men’s perspectives were well-reflected by these items that emphasize the appeal of an affectionate relationship and disparage casual sex for both genders. It stands somewhat in opposition to the Traditional Masculinity perspective, and this is evidenced by a significant negative correlation ($r = -.32$) with that script scale. It was not negatively related to Sexual Variety and Focus theme scale, however; in fact, it has a small positive correlation; $r = .13$. It would seem, then, that the idealization of an emotionally satisfying relationship is not entirely antagonistic to an enjoyment of sexual variety. This is entirely consistent with a cultural expectation that young men (and young women, as well) may “play the field” before eventually settling down with a life partner.

Limitations and Strengths

Limitations of the current studies include sample characteristics, issues specific to internet data collection, the limits of cross-sectional data, and measurement issues. Participants were not randomly selected from the population but chose to participate in response to our advertising. Volunteers for sexuality-related research tend to have more liberal sexual attitudes and more sexual experience than non-volunteers (Strassberg & Lowe, 1995). Men were recruited for and took part in study 2 online, so all participants were internet users. While most young adult men use the internet (Pew Research Center, 2013), results may not be generalizable to those who do not. Although our online study employed strong monitoring and data cleaning procedures, we cannot be certain whether some cases of invalid responding occurred without detection. Because the current study was cross-sectional, these data cannot address whether any of the sexual scripts we describe have causal effects upon men’s sexual health behavior. Finally, our measures are still in a formative stage. The internal consistency reliability of the Monogamy

and Emotion theme scale is low ($\alpha = .63$), and it needs further development. The scenario-based measures are long, and the time and amount of reading required is longer than for traditional measures. It may be possible to develop versions that have fewer and shorter scenarios, which would enable them to be used more widely, or even to incorporate the ideas captured in the scenarios with more traditional measures. The nuances captured in the scenario measures are also a strength, however, so researchers should approach adaptation cautiously.

Strengths of these studies are their racially and socioeconomically diverse samples and their bringing together of qualitative and quantitative methods. We used focused recruitment to gather a participant group including African American, Asian American, Latino, Multiracial/“other,” and white/ European American men in roughly equal proportions. Carrying out the survey online allowed us access to a national sample, and recruiting from the general public rather than from a college student pool resulted in a more socioeconomically diverse sample. Because we began the study qualitatively with men’s descriptions of their sexual encounters, and stayed close to the scenarios they described, we were able to incorporate the interpersonal aspects of men’s sexual scripts that are missing from many measures of men’s sexual motives and expectations. We then used our qualitatively-grounded survey measures to move our examination of men’s sexual scripts forward with rigorous quantitative analytic techniques rarely applied to scripts.

CONCLUSIONS

Together, these studies captured the multidimensionality of men’s scripts and the invocation of different scripts with different partners. This more nuanced perspective is necessary to better understand young men’s romantic and sexual intentions and behaviors, an understanding that is essential for the development of effective interventions to reduce sexual

risk taking and intimate partner aggression. Important individual social cognitive predictors of these problem behaviors (attitudes, norms, intentions) have already been well described in the literature, and it is time to turn our attention to the interpersonal complexities and dyadic perspectives that incorporate areas of ambiguity and conflicting goals.

These data provide evidence for complexity and heterogeneity among young heterosexually-active men's thinking about sexual relationships. There is heterogeneity among the sexual scripts they endorse, and heterogeneity in how notions of masculinity are translated to performance of "appropriate" sexual behavior. Thus, we see the same "masculine" norm of sexual variety enacted in two ways: through a Traditional Masculinity script that focuses on men's presumed greater sexual interest, and in a sex-positive woman script that focuses on mutual enjoyment. This underscores the importance of exploring nuanced and multi-faceted ways of measuring both gender and sexuality-related norms and the way these intersect. Men's scripts incorporate their ideas about women and appropriate female sexuality, as well as men and male sexuality. These ideas were apparent in the both the Monogamy and Emotion (e.g., "It's hard to trust a girl who is willing to have sex right away") and the Sexual Variety and Focus theme scales (e.g., "When a girl starts talking to a guy, it usually means she's sexually interested in him"). To fully understand heterosexual men's thinking about how sexual and romantic relationships unfold, we need to understand not only how men view appropriate behavior for their own sex, but how they view and interpret the behavior of women.

An important next step for this research is to explore the predictive power of these sexual script constructs for sexual well-being and risk-taking, and to test their predictive power independent of that attributable to social cognitive predictors. To what extent do young men's desired sexual scenarios affect their behavior, including choices of sexual safety strategies? A

full understanding of the factors that affect these decisions requires that researchers better integrate perceptions and expectations about the partner, and the self in relation to the partner, mirroring the context in which dyadic sexual behaviors occur. Incorporating the complexities uncovered in this study is essential to developing a more complete picture of young men's thinking about sex and relationships.

REFERENCES

- Adimora, A. A., & Schoenbach, V. J. (2005). Social context, sexual networks, and racial disparities in rates of sexually transmitted infections. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *191* (Supplement 1), S115- S122.
- Ayres, L., Kavanaugh, K., & Knafl, K. A. (2003). Within-case and across-case approaches to qualitative data analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *13*, 871-883.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., DeWall, C. N., & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*, 167-203.
- Beadnell, B., Baker, S. A., Gillmore, M. R., Morrison, D. M., Huang, B., & Stielstra, S. (2008). The theory of reasoned action and the role of external factors on heterosexual men's monogamy and condom use. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*, 97-134.
- Byers, E. S. (1996). How well does the traditional sexual script explain sexual coercion? Review of a program of research. In E. S. Byers & L F. O'Sullivan (Eds.) *Sexual coercion in dating relationships* (pp. 7- 25). New York: Haworth.
- Campbell, C. A. (1995). Male gender roles and sexuality: Implications for women's AIDS risk and prevention. *Social Science and Medicine*, *41*, 197-210.
- Carter S. M. & Little, M. (2007). Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies, and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *17*, 1316-28.
- Chu, J. Y., Porche, M. V., & Tolman, D. L. (2005). The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale: Development and validation of a new measure for boys. *Men and*

Masculinities, 8, 93-115.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10, 1-9.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dworkin, S. L., & O'Sullivan, L. (2005). Actual versus desired initiation patterns among a sample of college men: Tapping disjunctures within traditional male scripts. *Journal of Sex Research*, 42, 150- 158.

Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 10, 125-142.

Fromme, K., Stroot, E., & Kaplan, D. (1993). Comprehensive effects of alcohol: Development and psychometric assessment of a new expectancy questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 19-26.

Gagnon, J. H. (1974). Scripts and the coordination of sexual conduct. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 21, 27-54.

Gagnon, J. H. (1990). The explicit and implicit use of the scripting perspective in sex research. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 1, 1- 43.

Gutnik, L. A., Hakimzada, A. F., Yoskowitz, N. A., & Patel, V. L. (2006, in press). The role of emotion in decision-making: A cognitive neuroeconomic approach towards understanding sexual risk behavior. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 39, 720-736.

Halpern, C. T., Waller, M. W., Spriggs, A., & Hallfors, D. D. (2006). Adolescent predictors of emerging adult sexual patterns. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*, 926.e1–926.e10.

Ham, L. S., Stewart, S. H., Norton, P. J., & Hope, D. A. (2005). Psychometric assessment of the Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol Questionnaire: Comparing a brief version to the original full scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 27*, 141-158.

Harding, D. J. (2007). Cultural context, sexual behavior, and romantic relationships in disadvantaged neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review, 72*, 341-364.

Hynie, M., Lydon, J. E., Cote, S., & Wiener, S. (1998). Relational scripts and women's condom use: The importance of internalized norms. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*, 370-380.

Jaccard, J. J. (2009). *Unlocking the contraceptive conundrum: Reducing unintended pregnancies in emerging adulthood*. Washington, D.C.: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.

Kalichman, S. C., & Rompa, D. (1995). Sexual sensation seeking and sexual compulsivity scales: Reliability, validity, and predicting HIV risk behavior. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 65*, 586-601.

LaPlante, M. N., McCormick, N., & Brannigan, G. G. (1980). Living the sexual script: College students' views of influence in sexual encounters. *Journal of Sex Research, 16*, 338-355.

Lefkowitz, E. S., & Gillen, M. M. (2006). "Sex is just a normal part of life:" Sexuality in emerging adulthood. In J. J. Arnett and J. L. Tanner (Eds.) *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Logan, T., Cole, J., & Leukefeld, C. (2002). Women, sex, and HIV: Social and contextual factors, meta-analysis of published interventions, and implications for practice and research.

Psychological Bulletin, 128, 851–885.

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: a theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 704- 711.

Lowenstein, G. (1996). Out of control: Visceral influences on behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making*, 65, 272-393.

Masters, N. T., Beadnell, B., Morrison, D. M., Wells, E. A. & Hoppe, M. J. (2013, in press). Multidimensional characterization of sexual minority adolescents' sexual safety strategies. *Journal of Adolescence*.

Masters, N. T., Casey, E., Wells, E.A., & Morrison, D. M. (2013). Sexual scripts among young heterosexually active men and women: Conformity and change. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50, 409-420.

Maticka-Tyndale, E. (1992). Social construction of HIV transmission and prevention among heterosexual young adults. *Social Problems*, 39, 238-252.

Maticka-Tyndale, E., Gallant, M., Brouillard-Coyle, C., Holland, D., Metcalfe, K., Wildish, J., & Gichuru, M. (2005). The sexual scripts of Kenyan young people and HIV Prevention. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 7, 27-41.

Maticka-Tyndale, E., Herold, E. S., & Mewhinney, D. (1998). Casual sex on spring break: Intentions and behaviors of Canadian students. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35, 254-264.

Maxwell, C. (2007). “Alternative” narratives of young people’s heterosexual experiences in the UK. *Sexualities*, 10, 539-558.

Mertler, C. A. & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and Multivariate Statistical Methods: Practical Application and Interpretation* (third edition). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.

Moran, J. P. (2000). *Teaching sex: The shaping of adolescence in the twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Morrison, D. M. (1985). Adolescent contraceptive behavior: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 538-568.

O'Sullivan, L.F. & Byers, E.S. (1993). Eroding stereotypes: College women's attempts to influence reluctant male sexual partners. *Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 270-282.

O'Sullivan, L. F., Hoffman, S., Harrison, A., & Dolezal, C. (2006). Men, multiple sexual partners and young adults' sexual relationships: Understanding the role of gender in the study of risk. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83, 695-708.

Pew Research Center. (2013). *Demographics of Internet Users*. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from: [http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data-\(Adults\)/Whos-Online.aspx](http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data-(Adults)/Whos-Online.aspx)

Preacher, K. J. & MacCallum, R. C. (2003). Repairing Tom Swift's electric factor analysis machine. *Understanding Statistics*, 2, 13-43.

Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1989). Young singles' scripts for a first date. *Gender & Society*, 3, 258-268.

Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1993). Young singles' contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles*, 28, 499-509.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sales, J. M., Milhausen, R. R., & DiClemente, R. J. (2006). A decade in review: building on the experiences of past adolescent STI/HIV interventions to optimise future prevention efforts. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 82, 431-436.

Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., LaMarche, A., & Silverman, J. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*, 575-585.

Schank, R. C., & Ableson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Oxford, England: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Seal, D. W., & Ehrhardt, A. A. (2003). Masculinity and urban men: Perceived scripts for courtship, romantic, and sexual interactions with women. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality, 5*, 295-319.

Sheeran, P., & Orbell, S. (1998). Do intentions predict condom use? Metaanalysis and examination of six moderator variables. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 231-250.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97-120.

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 870-883.

Smith, L. H., Guthrie, B. J., & Oakley, D. J. (2005). Studying adolescent male sexuality: Where are we? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34*, 361-377.

Strassberg, D. S., & Lowe, K. (1995). Volunteer bias in sexuality research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24*, 369-382.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (4th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tolman D. L., & McClelland, S. I. (2011). Normative sexuality development in adolescence: A decade in review, 2000 – 2009. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*, 242-

255.

Tolman, D. L., Spencer, R., Rosen-Reynoso, M., & Porche, M. V. (2003). Sowing the seeds of violence in heterosexual relationships: Early adolescents narrate compulsory heterosexuality. *Journal of Social Issues, 59*, 159-178.

Ward, L. M. (2002). Does television exposure affect emerging adults' attitudes and assumptions about sexual relationships? Correlational and experimental confirmation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*, 1-15.

Wells, E. A., Masters, N. T., Morrison, D. M., Beadnell, B., & Kristman-Valente, A. (2013). "Alcohol is the eraser:" A qualitative analysis of drinking's role in courtship and sex among young, heterosexually active women and men. Unpublished manuscript.

Table 1. *Sexual scripts scenarios (Study 1 qualitative results) and loadings from Exploratory Factor Analysis (Study 2) with quantitative scenario responses, n = 502*

How desirable is this situation for you? (0 <i>very undesirable</i> to 4 <i>very desirable</i>)	Traditional Masculinity	Sex Positive Woman
<p>Charles knew Kayla in school, but she never seemed that into him. Recently, at a reunion, they were both drinking, and he decided to make a move. She returned a kiss, and they left the party together. Although she didn't want to have sex that night, they did hook up and have sex a couple of nights later. The next time they had a date, Kayla brought her boyfriend. Charles knew she had a boyfriend, but she had told him it was breaking up. Kayla spent the whole time talking to her boyfriend. Charles was confused by the mixed messages he was getting from Kayla, but they got together again. They went to his place, where she headed straight for his bedroom and took off her clothes.</p> <p>Charles wanted her, but it bothered him that she might be cheating on her boyfriend.</p>	.77	-.05
<p>Matt has been dating his girlfriend for 18 months. They see each other often and have sex several times a week. He recently found out that she cheated on him with one of his friends.</p> <p>He decided to have sex with someone else to get back at her. He called up a girl in their circle of friends, Megan, who has a reputation as a 'slut'. He invited her to his place to watch a movie. While they were lying on the couch, Megan started to feel his crotch and then gave him a blow job. Later, they had sex.</p> <p>He felt kind of bad afterward, like getting back at his girlfriend that way was a cheap shot. He worried about the risks from having sex with someone who has sex with other guys.</p>	.72	-.14
<p>Marco stopped at a mini-mart on the way home from a late party. He was kind of drunk and wishing he had someone to hook up with. A girl said 'hi' to him and seemed like she was kind of drunk, too. Thinking he wanted to have sex with her, he asked her if she wanted to hang out.</p> <p>Back at her place, he and the girl, Danielle, were drinking some more and started kissing. That led straight to the bedroom where they had sex. Marco liked the sex and started seeing Danielle every day.</p> <p>He likes spending time with her, but he doesn't see this as a long-term thing. While he's young, he wants to keep being a player. Also, he thinks that if Danielle was willing to hook up with him so fast, she might do that with anybody. In his mind, she's not exactly girlfriend material.</p>	.69	.17

Jerome and some friends went to a club. They drank and danced with women. They had a contest to see who would end up with the most phone numbers, and Jerome was ahead. However, he was really interested in one particular woman, Christine.

Christine was all over him, and he was into her, partly because he hadn't been with an older woman before. He asked for her number and got it. He called her that night, pretending it was to be sure she got home OK, but really hoping they'd end up having sex.

He called again a couple of weeks later. Christine picked him up and took him to her place. They watched movies and drank. Later that evening, they had sex. He spent the night and they had sex again in the morning, and then she took him to the bus stop.

Later, he debated about seeing her again, but she was clingy and wanted him to be her boyfriend. He thought she was moving too fast, and he did not want to answer to anyone right now.

.68 -.02

Alan likes to chill on the weekends with his friends. They frequently go to parties with plenty of music and alcohol and women. The last time, Alan got pretty drunk. He left with a woman he met and went to her place. They were both pretty drunk and had sex several times that night.

In the morning, he left quickly because he had to go to work. He just told her he'd see her around and didn't get her phone number. He wasn't really sure he wanted to see her again. He realized she really wasn't that good looking. Also, it seemed too easy to get her to have sex with him.

.66 -.02

Sean and Melissa have dated for about a year. They still have feelings for each other but broke up because they kept getting on each others' nerves and they wanted different things.

She calls him, and he goes to her place to pick up some stuff he left there. They talk about their relationship and if they can maybe work things out. They end up having sex. It's good, actually more intense than Sean remembers, and it has been a dry spell for him since they split up. Melissa keeps calling Sean, and they keep having sex, but she doesn't want to get back together.

He starts to wonder what's going on. He's known guys who wanted a 'friends-with-benefits' situation. But he also thought girls mostly liked things to be 'official'.

.63 .15

James was out one night with some friends. At a bar, they ran into some girls that one of his friends knew. They sat together and James was looking at one thinking, 'She's cute.' When she started talking to him, James figured she must want to hook up with him.

After a while the group went back to James' place and watched TV. He was sitting next to the same

.61 .16

girl, Crystal, on the couch, and their hands made contact. There was some chemistry there. He asked her for her phone number before she left, and they went out again a couple of times. One night, after drinking at a bar, they headed to his place and had sex.

Now that they've had sex, James isn't sure what he's doing or where this is going.

David and his girlfriend Jessica have been dating 8 months after meeting through mutual friends. Things are OK between them. Even though they disagree about some stuff, she's attractive, and they want a lot of the same things out of life.

One night at Jessica's place, they're on the couch watching TV. David puts his arm around her and starts kissing and touching her. She moves his hands away and says she's tired, but David knows if he keeps going, she'll get into it. Lately, if he didn't start things, they'd never do it. He keeps going and she starts to respond a little. They have sex.

It feels good, but it's kind of routine. He wonders how he could get her to try some new things or just be more into it.

.57 -14

Curtis goes to a friend of a friend's housewarming. There are not many people there by the time he arrives. He first flirts with a group of several girls. Then he drinks and smokes cigarettes outside with one girl in particular, Jasmine.

They start kissing and touching. Then they move to quiet room where no one is. They start having sex on the floor when one of the other girls in the group comes into the room. She seems to want to join in – she starts touching herself while she watches them have sex.

The whole thing really turns him on, but he wonders if he can handle sex with two girls at the same time.

.45 .47

Josh and Emily have always been a little attracted to each other and recently started talking more. Emily is beautiful, sweet, fun, and easy-going.

After a few weeks of flirtation, texting, and calls, they get together to hang out. Emily cuddles up to Josh on the sofa and kisses him. They end up having great sex. He tries hard to read her cues and make it good for her, and she seems totally into it. Over the next few weeks, they have a really good time together, sexually and otherwise.

Josh thinks she might be 'the one', and he's pretty much done with being a player. Josh tells Emily that he wants to make things official, and they become boyfriend and girlfriend.

-17 .73

Michael and his girlfriend Ashley have been dating about a year after meeting through mutual friends. They love each other and things are going great, in bed and out. He can really be himself with her. She knows what he likes, and they trust each other enough to do some wild stuff.

One morning in bed at her place, Ashley cuddles up to Michael and starts kissing his neck and rubbing on him. He responds, reaching back and touching her the way he knows she likes. Pretty soon they're having sex and really getting into it, even though they both need to get to work.

-05 **.65**

Tyler and Nicole consider themselves to be friends. They spend time with a group that has hung out together for more than a year. Everyone thinks that Nicole is really hot. Tyler thinks she's got a great sense of humor.

One night they ended up alone at his place. They were watching TV, and she put her head in his lap. He decided to see if she was interested in doing more, so he moved his hand down her body. Getting no resistance from Nicole, he ended up fingering her. Both of them enjoyed this. They've kept seeing each other from time to time, spending the night and having oral sex or giving each other hand jobs.

Tyler likes that Nicole is really into what they do together. Plus, he enjoys giving her pleasure. They don't let on to their friends that they are spending this kind of time together.

.26 **.64**

Eigenvalues

4.88 1.88

Correlation between factors

.30

Note. Scenarios are one element of Study 1's qualitative results; quantitative responses to scenarios were factor analyzed in Study 2 to produce the loadings shown here. Exploratory factor analysis with WLSMV estimation and promax rotation. Bold loadings were high (>.40) on one factor and had substantial differences (>.15) across factors; they were averaged to create factor scores for each sexual script. Italicized loadings were split across factors and were not included in calculation of script scores.

Table 2. *Sexual script theme items (Study 1 qualitative results) and loadings from Exploratory Factor Analysis of quantitative responses (Study 2), n = 477*

Sexual script theme item	Drinking and Courtship	Monogamy and Emotion	Sexual Focus and Variety
One good way to meet women is at a party where you're both drinking.	.89	.16	-.08
A girl is more likely to respond to a guy if he makes his first move when they've been drinking together.	.71	.14	.10
A guy is more likely to make a move on a girl if he's been drinking.	.66	-.27	.20
It's hard to have much respect for guys who try to have sex with as many women as they can.	-.02	.64	-.11
Sex is better if it is in a relationship that includes love.	.25	.63	-.18
Somewhere out there is a special girl who is just right for every guy.	.03	.55	.03
It's hard to trust a girl who is willing to have sex right away.	-.22	.52	.22
When a girl starts talking to a guy, it usually means she's sexually interested in him.	-.18	-.08	.74
When a guy starts talking to a girl, it usually means he is sexually interested in her.	-.01	-.03	.69
Sex without a committed boyfriend-girlfriend relationship is usually hotter sex.	-.02	-.31	.63
Sex often gets routine after a guy and a girl have been together for a while.	.06	.09	.50
Guys are more willing to try new things with a sex partner than girls are.	.15	.24	.50
It is important for a guy to have a lot of different kinds of sexual experiences.	.23	-.03	.50
Guys want sex more often than most girls.	.09	.32	.47
Eigenvalues	4.09	2.31	1.45

Note. Theme items are one element of Study 1's qualitative results; quantitative responses to these items were factor analyzed in Study 2 to produce the loadings shown here Exploratory factor analysis with WLSMV estimation and promax rotation. Bold loadings were high (>.40) on one factor and had substantial differences (>.15) across factors; they were averaged to create factor scores for each sexual script. Drinking and Courtship correlated .20 with Monogamy and Emotion and .45 with Sexual Variety. Monogamy and Emotion correlated .11 with Sexual Focus and Variety.

Table 3. *Bivariate correlations, means, and standard deviations among sexual script scores*

Sexual script score	1	2	3	4	5
1. Traditional Masculinity	—				
2. Sex Positive Woman	.27**	—			
3. Drinking and Courtship	.15**	.38**	—		
4. Monogamy and Emotion	-.32**	.05	.17**	—	
5. Sexual Focus and Variety	.31**	.21**	.45**	.13**	—
Mean (0 to 4 range)	1.38	2.75	2.47	2.72	2.28
<i>SD</i>	.78	.91	.85	.78	.71

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4. *Correlations between sexual script scores and measures of gender role and sexual attitudes*

Variable (range)	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Alpha	Sexual script score				
			Traditional Masculinity	Sex Positive Woman	Drinking and Courtship	Monogamy and Emotion	Sexual Focus and Variety
Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (0 – 4)	1.47 (.62)	.70	.40***	-.09*	.07	-.23***	.28***
Hostility Toward Women (0 – 4)	1.94 (.62)	.63	.27***	.03	.06	-.08	.26***
Men as Driven by Sex Scale (0 – 4)	2.25 (.77)	.83	.43***	.25***	.35***	-.04	.48***
Sexual Sensation Seeking (0 – 3)	1.46 (.74)	.81	.34***	.25***	.33***	-.14**	.37***
Endorsement of non-monogamy (0 – 4)	2.14 (1.04)	.76	.46***	.24***	.23***	-.37***	.35***
Positive monogamy attitudes (0 – 4)	2.90 (.94)	.87	-.26***	.15**	.02	.34***	-.07
Alcohol expectancies: Sociability subscale (0 – 3)	2.02 (.91)	.84	-.01	.24**	.41**	.09	.20**
Alcohol expectancies: Sexuality subscale (0 – 3)	1.21 (.91)	.80	.26**	.11*	.32**	-.05	.26**
Alcohol expectancies: Liquid courage subscale (0 – 3)	1.65 (.93)	.82	.08	.20**	.39**	.04	.23**
Alcohol expectancies: Risk & aggression subscale (0 – 3)	1.34 (.95)	.84	.18**	.12**	.30**	.04	.24**

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.