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ABSTRACT

Cognitive scientists have studied how individuals process non-sexual text, and schema/scripting theory appears to be a useful way of conceptualizing their findings. This study applied schema/scripting theory findings to sexual text and predicted that Atypical or unnecessary script actions would initially be remembered better than Typical script actions, but that over time Typical script actions would be remembered better as the generic script becomes increasingly important. The present study also incorporated findings from another line of research relevant to schema/scripting theory and predicted that the perspective taken by the reader while reading a story about a sexual encounter would affect memory in that the reader should remember more script actions that are important or relevant to their own perspective. The above predictions were tested by randomly assigning subjects to one of 3 experimental conditions. Subjects were instructed to read a story about a sexual encounter from one of the following 3 perspectives. (1) same-sex perspective, (2) opposite-sex perspective, or (3) no directed perspective. Subjects were then asked to recall and recognize what they remembered from the story immediately after they read the story and 3 days later. The story consisted of Typical and Atypical (or unnecessary) script actions as well as actions that were to be judged as being important to either a "male" or "female" perspective. Results indicated that the above predictions were not confirmed. However, several significant findings based upon exploratory hypotheses were obtained. It was found, as predicted, that males evidenced more "sexual" recall intrusions than females at both
immediate and delayed recall. Males also revealed more "romantic" recall intrusions than females at immediate recall. Although no sex differences were found on recognition measures, all subjects endorsed more "sexual" than "romantic" distractors at both immediate and delayed recall. Results of this study suggested that males and females differ in the processing of sexual text. Possible explanations for the findings obtained were discussed in the context of schema theory as were directions for future research.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This study addresses, in general, how men and women process sexual text. Sexual arousal has been viewed as an emotion by researchers interested in understanding the sexual response. These researchers believe that sexual arousal, like other emotions, consists of cognitive, physiological, and affective components. Although there has been considerable research on the physiological aspects of the sexual response, the cognitive component of sexual arousal has been relatively neglected as a fruitful area of study. This seems surprising given the crucial role cognition appears to play in all emotions, including sexual arousal. Although investigators have used self-report as an index of sexual arousal, that methodology, while perhaps indexing cognitive functioning, without additional work does little to advance our understanding of the role of cognition in sexual arousal.

It would appear that the methods used by experimental cognitive scientists to study cognitive processes may prove helpful in examining the role of cognition in human sexuality. In particular, it is suggested here that the theories and methods used to study individual differences in text comprehension can be applied to study individual differences in comprehension of sexual material. It is the thesis of this work that research such as this will help us understand the role of cognition in sexuality.
Research from the field of human sexuality will first be reviewed in order to determine the current status on the existence of sex differences in affective, physiological, and behavioral functioning as these channels of responding interact with cognitive factors. Evidence for the role of cognition in sexual arousal will be discussed. Then research from the field of cognitive psychology will be reviewed. In particular, schema theory and the methodologies used to test this theory will be discussed. This study utilized well-established methodologies and findings from cognitive psychology on how individuals process and remember information in order to investigate how they differentially process and remember sexually explicit information. It is hoped that this study provides a unique contribution to both cognitive psychology and human sexuality by advancing our understanding of the role of cognition in human sexuality. In particular, questions regarding the possibility of identifying and studying sex differences in the processing of sexually explicit text are addressed.

*Sex Differences: A Brief Overview*

Much of the research on human sexuality has focuses upon sex differences in sexual response and behavior (e.g., Geer and O'Donohue, 1987; Jakobovits, 1965; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953; Schmidt, Sigusch, & Schäfer, 1973; Sigusch, Schmidt, Reinfeld, & Wiedemann-Sutor, 1970). Sexually explicit stimuli (e.g., photographs, slides, tapes, films, written stories) have been used in an attempt to elicit sex-specific affective, physiological, and/or behavioral responses. Many of these investigations have relied upon small and
often unrepresentative samples of volunteers, making generalization difficult. Further, early measurements of sexual arousal usually relied upon self-report (e.g., Jakobovits, 1965; Schmidt, 1975). More recently, however, instruments have been developed to directly measure physiological (genital) components of sexual arousal in men (e.g., Barlow, Becker, Leitenberg, & Agras, 1970) and women (Sintchak & Geer, 1975). These genital measures have been used in conjunction with self-report.

In spite of the improved methodology in measuring sexual arousal, the empirical evidence is unsatisfactory with regard to the question of the nature of sex-specific differences in response to psychosexual stimulation. Although some researchers have reported males as experiencing more sexual arousal to erotica than females (e.g., Mosher, 1971; Schmidt & Sigusch, 1970; Sigusch et al., 1970), other researchers have found no sex differences (e.g. Abramson, Goldberg, Mosher, Abramson, & Gottes-Diener, 1975; Englar & Walker, 1973; Fisher & Byrne, 1978; Griffitt, 1973; Mosher & Abramson, 1977; Schmidt, 1975). It appears that when sex differences in arousal are found, they typically do not reach statistical significance. It can be noted, however, that some evidence exists indicating that women may respond to erotic stimuli with significantly more negative affect than men (e.g., Heiman, 1975; Herrell, 1975; Mosher, 1970; Schmidt et al., 1973).

The role of cognition in sexual arousal can be seen in research that reports low correlations between subjective and genital measures of sexual arousal for both men and women (e.g., Farkas, Sine, & Evans, 1979; Wincze, Hoon, & Hoon, 1977). It seems that cognitive factors
mediate the relationship between physiological response and the perception of arousal. Interestingly, Korff and Geer (1983) found that paying attention to bodily cues results in higher subjective-genital correlations in women. It appears that cognitions focused upon increasing body awareness may have a significant influence on sexual arousal.

Cognitive activity has also been considered an important component of sexual dysfunction. Kaplan (1974) emphasized the role of distracting thoughts in the maintenance of erectile dysfunction. Geer and Fuhr (1976) and Farkas et al. (1979) empirically demonstrated the decremental effect of distraction on male sexual arousal. In addition, Abrahamson, Barlov, Beck, Sakheim, & Kelly (1985) found that partner-focused attention, when the partner is highly responsive, resulted in significantly higher levels of penile responding than did self-focus. Numerous other studies on sexual functioning have demonstrated the role of cognition (e.g., fantasy) in sexual arousal. In general, it can be concluded that cognitive activity has a strong influence on sexual arousal. As Geer (1974) so cogently argues, "to a large extent, sex is in the head." Yet, in spite of the recent increased attention to cognitive factors by researchers studying human sexuality, the methodologies utilized in studying these cognitions have remained largely unsatisfactory and consist primarily of theoretical conjecture. Perhaps we should turn to the field of cognitive psychology (Geer, 1974; Geer, 1988) in order to utilize their theoretical views and well-established methodologies in studying the ways in which people think about sex. Cognitive scientists have studied how individuals process
non-sexual text and schema theory appears to be a useful way of conceptualizing their findings. Perhaps findings from this area of research can be utilized in order to study how individuals comprehend and remember text that is sexual in content.

Schema Theory: A Brief Overview

A "schema" is a cluster of knowledge that represents a particular concept (e.g., Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977). Researchers investigating how people process, comprehend, and remember information in text have used the theoretical concept of schema to explain important aspects of cognitive processing. Bartlett (1932) has been acknowledged as the originator of the use of schemata to describe story recall, as he hypothesized that abstract knowledge structures aid recall of past events. Bartlett suggested that individuals reconstruct the event of a story using a few details and an abstractive schema as an elaboration plan.

Inspired by the work of Bartlett, schemata as theoretical constructs have been researched by those interested in memory for prose. Schemata encode knowledge of how events are structured, how event sequences combine and form episodes, and how entire stories are constructed from sequences of episodes (Thorndyke & Yekovich, 1980).

It has been hypothesized that readers use previously learned schemata to aid comprehension of simple narrative stories (e.g., Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Rumelhart, 1975; Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Thorndyke, 1977; Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977; Stein & Glenn, 1978). For example, it appears that activating relevant prior knowledge facili-
tates comprehension and memory. Dooling and Lachman (1971) found that when subjects were given a title that allowed them to comprehend the theme of a story, recall was enhanced. Similarly, Bransford and Johnson (1972) found that memory for seemingly nonsensical paragraphs was improved when the paragraphs were preceded by appropriate contexts (pictures or short titles). Further support for the effectiveness of context in making text comprehensible (by activating relevant prior knowledge) can be found in a study conducted by Dooling and Mullet (1973). These researchers showed that knowledge of a theme facilitates retention by aiding comprehension.

Several researchers have demonstrated the importance of prior knowledge or experience (i.e. schemata for domain-related knowledge) in comprehending and remembering new information. For example, Anderson, Reynolds, Schallert, and Goetz (1977) gave their subjects (physical education majors and music education majors) one passage to read that could be given either a prison break or wrestling interpretation, and another passage that could be described as card-playing or as a music rehearsal. They found that most subjects gave each passage one interpretation that was related to their own background. Cheisi, Spilich, and Voss (1979) further demonstrated the effects of previous knowledge on text processing. They presented domain-related (baseball) passages to subjects high or low in baseball knowledge and found that highly knowledgable subjects had superior recognition and recall of the passages. Morris, Gruneberg, Sykes, and Merrick (1981) also demonstrated the effects of domain knowledge on recall. They found that subjects who were more knowledgable about soccer demonstrated better
recall of soccer scores. In a similar study, Allard, Graham, and Paarsalu (1980) found that more experienced basketball players recalled more information about the contents of slides of basketball games. Ley (1979) also studied the effects of prior knowledge on memory, and found better recall for medical information by subjects with more medical knowledge. Lastly, Weldon and Malpass (1981) found better recall of a text about student activism by students with more knowledge of this subject.

Although schemata facilitated accurate comprehension of new information in the above studies, they can also distort memory of new information through the process of abstraction. During the abstraction process the meaning of the message is retained but the syntax or surface structure is usually forgotten. That is, an abstract representation of the message (i.e. the gist) is remembered, whereas the lexical form of the individual word and/or the syntactic form of a sentence is forgotten. Since memory is lost in this process, abstraction can count for memory distortions. It seems that schema-consistent information is less likely to be distorted (or forgotten) during this process than schema-inconsistent information (Sentis & Burnstein, 1979).

Schemata (as structures) are organized into a generalization hierarchy in memory. The hierarchy relates concepts of different degrees of specificity (Thorndyke & Yekovich, 1980). For example, the schema for visiting a doctor consists of both generic cases that are located high in the hierarchy and specific cases (e.g., visiting a dermatologist) that are located low in the hierarchy. It is believed
that the more generic concepts are remembered better. Thus, if one reads a story about someone visiting a doctor, he/she is more likely to remember that the person checked in at the appointment desk (generic case) than that the person washed his/her face in the bathroom (specific case). Similarly, after reading a story about eating in a restaurant, the reader is more likely to remember the person used silverware (generic case) than chopsticks (specific case).

The properties that characterize schemata as they exist in memory are represented as variables, or slots, that can be filled whenever the schemata are activated and used to organize incoming information (Bower, Black, & Turner, 1979). The process of matching input to slots is called "instantiation" of the schema. When the reader interprets a story, he/she fills in story "gaps" with whatever makes the most sense. Thus, schemata permit interpretation from incomplete information. The reader has expectations about information which guide the interpretation of incoming information. Thus, if someone tells us that he/she had a physical examination, we may infer that their blood pressure was checked.

The interpretation of incoming information is affected by the process of integration. For example, Sulin and Dooling (1974) had their subjects read a passage that was supposed to be about either a fictitious character or Adolph Hitler. Subjects who read the passage that was supposedly about Hitler were likely to falsely believe later that a fact true about Hitler was in the text when it was not. Loftus and Loftus (1980) suggest that new information introduced after an event has occurred may add or replace a person's knowledge of the
original scene, resulting in one, integrated memory. Once new information has been integrated and old knowledge has been altered, accurate retrieval of the new information becomes unlikely as new information has been integrated with prior information. Thus, schema theory predicts inaccurate retrieval of new information.

Several formulations of schema theory have been developed. Many of these formulations are text comprehension models (e.g., Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978), which describe the propositional structure of text and how the reader's processing strategies interact with text properties. Most of these models assume a hierarchical organization of text, in which the more "central" (Omanson, 1982), generic or "superordinate" (Black, 1978) sentences or propositions are located high and the more specific or "subordinate" (Black, 1978) sentences or propositions are located low. It is believed that the text elements located high in the hierarchy are recalled better than elements located low in the hierarchy. Thus, in order to validate these text comprehension theories, recall protocols are collected and examined in order to determine if high and low text elements are, in fact, differentially recalled as predicted.

In contrast to the text comprehension models of schema theory, Schank and Abelson (1977) proposed a "script theory". They suggest that knowledge is organized around stereotyped sequences or routine activities called scripts. It is believed that through experience one acquires these scripts. A script has a standard set of characters or roles, props, scenes or actions, conditions for entering the activity, and results. A reader's script guides comprehension by providing
knowledge which allows him/her to "instantiate" the generic script by filling in its "slots" according to the details of the story. Once a script is activated (by text), the reader can infer events that are implied but not actually stated. Thus, according to this model, the slots of a pre-existing schema that specify typical actions sequences for a given setting are filled either with text content or inferences (Omanson, 1982). It seems reasonable to assume that since scripts are stereotyped or routine activities (e.g., eating at a restaurant), sexual encounters that are quite often stereotyped should also be considered scripts and should be relevant to this line of research.

Schank and Abelson (1977) have also introduced an hypothesis of a "script pointer plus tag" (SP+T). It is assumed that the reader constructs a specific memory representation for every activity that is read, enacted, or otherwise registered (Graesser, Woll, Kowalski, & Smith, 1980). The memory trace contains a "pointer" to the generic script that best fits the activity, along with a set of "tagged actions." The generic script interrelates the various typical actions as a whole, whereas each inconsistent or atypical action is tagged as a functionally separate organizational unit. For example, after reading a story about eating at a restaurant, the "pointer" would relate to the generic case of eating at a restaurant (e.g., sitting at a table, looking at a menu, etc.), whereas the "tagged actions" would each relate to inconsistent or atypical actions, such as dropping a napkin or asking for more water.

The SP+T hypothesis makes two predictions about memory discrimination for actions in scripted passages (Graesser, Gordon, & Sawyer,
First or all, it is predicted that if a passage contains some, but not all, of the typical script actions, then the reader should be unable to identify which of the typical actions had been mentioned. Graesser et al. (1979) tested this hypothesis by auditorily presenting their subjects a story about a character named Jack who enacted a number of scripted activities. They found, as predicted, that there was zero discriminative accuracy for very typical script actions. A second prediction made by the SP+T hypothesis is that discriminative accuracy should be better for atypical than for typical script actions because each atypical action is "tagged" or processed separately. Graesser et al's (1979) findings also support this prediction as their subjects showed better discriminative accuracy for atypical actions. These researchers further propose that there is much better recall (as opposed to recognition) for typical than for atypical actions since recall involves the additional processes of abstraction and summarization.

Graesser et al. (1980) tested the above hypothesis concerning recall versus recognition memory for atypical and typical actions. In an experiment comparing recall and recognition memory, it was predicted that typical actions show better recall than atypical actions (due to summarization and abstraction), but atypical actions show more accurate recognition than do typical actions (SP+T hypothesis). Results indicated that both recognition and recall memory is initially better for atypical actions but the rate of forgetting is greater for these atypical actions. Thus, both the memory measure used (recall or recognition) and the retention interval are crucially important. It
was suggested by Graesser et al. (1980) that generic scripts play an increasingly critical role in directing retrieval processes as the retention interval increases. Other researchers (e.g., Bartlett, 1932; Kintsch, 1977) have also noted that generic schemata become increasingly important over time and that memory for unimportant story elements declines over time. Dooling and Christiaansen (1977) propose that abstract memory codes (i.e., generic memories) are remembered longer than specific ones because, by giving abstract memories highest priority, we are making very efficient use of our coding capacity. It can be noted that although these researchers differ in their emphasis on immediate versus delayed memory, their theories are not inconsistent. That is, although the SP + T hypothesis (Graesser et al., 1979) predicts better immediate memory for atypical actions, it is consistent with the theories proposed by Kintsch (1977) and Dooling and Christiaansen (1977) in its prediction that the typical or generic actions will be remembered better over time.

Another interesting line of research relates to scripting theory which has investigated the importance of perspective in encoding and retrieving text. Various encoding hypotheses have been suggested to explain how schema-relevant information is processed. For example, it has been proposed that more attention is devoted to important or relevant-to-schema information, which facilitates comprehension of this information (e.g., Mandler & Johnson, 1977). Several retrieval hypotheses have also been formulated to account for schema-relevant processing. Some researchers (e.g., Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Pichert & Anderson, 1977) have suggested that schemata provide a retrieval plan
by guiding a top (generic knowledge)-down (specific information) schema-based search. Britton, Meyer, Hodge, and Glynn (1980) found that providing subjects with both semantic (content words) and contextual (color of page) retrieval cues improved recall of unimportant information. Thus, these researchers found retrieval processes (as opposed to encoding processes) to be the most crucial to recall.

Pichert and Anderson (1977) predicted that memory for text will depend, in part, upon perspective. In their study, they first had subjects take one of two directed perspectives and rate the importance of "idea units" in passages to their respective perspective. They found that there was a low correlation among ratings across perspectives. Then they used their findings on importance to perspective in another study. In their second study, they had subjects read stories from either of two directed perspectives or from no directed perspective. Results indicated that the importance (to perspective) of the "idea unit" was strongly related to immediate recall. That is, subjects recalled significantly more "idea units" that were important to their perspective than those important to another perspective. Further, importance was demonstrated to have independent effects on delayed recall. However, rated importance had a much stronger effect on the proportion of idea units recalled shortly after reading than on the proportion recalled a week later given recall the first time.

Expanding on their earlier findings, in another experiment, Anderson and Pichert (1978) instructed their subjects to shift perspectives after they read a story once and then to recall the story again. Using the importance ratings established from their previous research,
they found on the second recall, that subjects recalled significantly more information important to the second perspective that had been unimportant to the first. In addition, subjects recalled less information important to the first perspective but unimportant to the second. These researchers suggested a retrieval process to account for their findings. They proposed that some information irrelevant to a given perspective must have been encoded, but was retrieved only when the appropriate schema activated this information by providing a retrieval plan. This interpretation also fits the data reported by Britton et al. (1980) previously discussed on retrieval cues.

In light of the research on scripting theory, memory for typical and atypical script actions (i.e., SP + T hypothesis), and perspective, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that readers will process sexual material by utilizing their schema for sexual encounters. In addition, recall for atypical (or unimportant/unnecessary) and typical actions should basically conform to the findings reported by Graesser et al. (1980). That is, both immediate recall and recognition memory should be better for atypical than for typical actions (as they are "tagged" memories), but the rate of forgetting should also be greater for these atypical actions as the generic script or schema becomes increasingly important over time. We examined these hypotheses in the present study. The perspective taken by the reader should also be important as the reader should remember more script actions that are important or relevant to their own perspective (Anderson & Pichert, 1978). This idea was also tested in this work.
This study addresses, in general, how men and women process and remember sexual text. Sexual text differs from text commonly used in testing schema/scripting theory in that it appears to elicit emotional reactions from the reader (see previous overview on sex differences). Given the "different" or emotional quality of sexual text, this study will determine if the predictions made by schema theory are confirmed when a sexual script is employed. If they are confirmed, we can conclude that sexual scripts are not processed differently from non-sexual scripts. Further, a confirmation of the predictions suggests that we now have a "new" way to study how people view sexuality. If the predictions are not confirmed, then perhaps it is inappropriate to apply schema/scripting theory to sexual text because it is emotionally laden and qualitatively different from other text. This study is the first known attempt to test predictions from schema theory for a sexual script. The results obtained should advance our understanding of how men and women process sexual text.

For the present study, subjects will be instructed to read a story about a sexual encounter from one of the following 3 perspectives: (1) same-sex perspective, (2) opposite-sex perspective, or (3) no directed perspective. They will be asked to recall and to recognize what they remember from the story immediately after reading the story and 3 days later. The story consists of Typical and Atypical (unnecessary) script actions as well as actions that are to be judged as being important to either a male or female perspective.
CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses are organized according to the relevant independent variables. This organizational scheme was chosen because it most closely corresponds to the data sets collected (i.e. "logical" clusters of data that are grouped together by content). The first set of hypotheses (#1, #2, #3) are concerned with the perspective taken by the subject (i.e. same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective). The second set of hypotheses (#4, #5, #6) make predictions based upon script action category: Atypical (unnecessary) or Typical. Hypotheses #7, #8, #9 and #10 are supplementary hypotheses which make predictions based upon possible moderating variables. Hypothesis #7 makes predictions based on the sexual experience of the subject. Hypothesis #8 makes some exploratory predictions based on reported sexual arousal. Hypothesis #9 makes predictions based on the possible differential ability of males and females in assuming the opposite-sex perspective. The last hypothesis, #10, is not a "true" experimental hypothesis and is basically a manipulation check.

Subject Perspective Hypotheses

Perceived Importance Task Ratings

Hypothesis #1. Because readers remember more script actions that are important or relevant to the perspective taken while reading than those
actions that are unimportant to their perspective (Anderson & Pichert, 1978; Pichert & Anderson, 1977) it was predicted that subjects taking the same-sex perspective and control subjects would recall (at immediate recall) more "idea units" or script actions that are judged to be important to the same-sex perspective than judged to be important to the opposite-sex perspective. It was also predicted that subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would recall (at immediate recall) more "idea units" or script actions that are judged to be important to the opposite-sex perspective than judged to be important to the same-sex perspective. This study is the first known attempt to test the effect of male or female perspective on comprehension and recall of a sexual script.

In order to test the above prediction, it was necessary to find a way of determining each of the story's 39 sentences' importance to a male or female perspective. In order to establish this, subjects were asked (after completing the recall and recognition tasks) to rate each sentence on its importance to the perspective taken while reading the story (i.e. same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective). A 2 (male or female) x 3 MANOVA x (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) was computed. Then, 39 separate 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's with subsequent contrasts was computed on each sentence's perceived importance ratings. These analyses were to allow us to determine if the sentences were perceived as being more important to one perspective than another. There were no main or interaction effects predicted for sex or perspective on perceived importance ratings. If the contrasts
showed that sentences differed on their rated importance, then it would have been possible to categorize sentences according to the perspective from which they were seen as most important. Judgments on how to make the categorizations were to be made by using the following planned comparisons:

For Contrast #1, a sentence was to be categorized as important to a male perspective when the contrast for male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition was greater than the contrast for female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition. Similarly, for Contrast #2, a sentence was to be categorized as important to a female perspective when the contrast for female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition was greater than the contrast for male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition.

It was believed that male and female control subjects will "naturally" assume a male or female perspective, respectively. This assumption was tested by using Tukey’s HSD Test to test the difference between the means for (1) male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition and (2) female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition. If differences were found, this would go against our expectations. If no significant differences were found, the data were collapsed accordingly by combining the male control subjects with the male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and the female control subjects with the female subjects in the same-
sex perspective condition to provide more powerful tests. It can also be noted that male and female control subjects were contrasted with subjects in the female and male opposite-sex perspective conditions, respectively, in order to provide the most rigorous test of the perspective manipulation.

The analyses and planned contrasts based upon the identified "male perspective" and "female perspective" sentences are contained in Appendix A.

Relationship Between Recall Frequency and Perceived Importance

It was believed that there would be a positive correlation between recall frequency and perceived importance (Anderson & Pichert, 1978; Pichert & Anderson, 1977). In order to test this assumption, the correlation between mean perceived importance and mean recall frequency for each sentence was computed.

In order to examine the effects of perspective in more detail, each subject's total perceived importance rating (across sentences) was computed. This value was correlated with each subject's total recall score. These correlations were then compared by group. The 6 correlation coefficients were transformed to Z-scores and then compared to one another to determine which of the 6 groups of subjects have higher correlations between recall frequency and perceived importance. These correlations were also collapsed across sex, perspective, and sex and perspective.

Recall and Recognition Tasks

Hypothesis #2. Some exploratory hypotheses were investigated as part of this study. These hypotheses are based upon the research previously
reviewed regarding possible sex differences in response to erotic literature. It was predicted that females subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions than male subjects at both immediate and delayed recall. It was also predicted that male subjects, regardless or perspective, would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects at both immediate and delayed recall. These predictions were tested along with Hypothesis #3 in a MANOVA analysis (see Hypothesis #3 for details on this analysis).

Recall intrusions were examined separately at both immediate and delayed recall for the possibility of identifying sex differences based on intrusion category. Earlier research found some evidence that females may be more responsive to the romantic aspects of erotic literature and males may be more responsive to the sexual aspects (e.g., Sigusch et al., 1970). The following 4 intrusion categories were utilized as they appear to be representative of the most common categories of intrusion errors for sexual script: (1) sexual (actions that are clearly sexual in nature, such as "she unzipped his jeans"), (2) romantic (actions that refer to the romantic aspects of a sexual encounter, such as "he gazed into her eyes"), (3) nonsexual/relevant (actions that are not sexual in nature but that are relevant to the story, such as "he removed her coat from the couch"), and (4) nonsexual/irrelevant (actions that are not sexual in nature and that are irrelevant to the story, such as "he made a telephone call"). The methodology for classifying intrusions is adapted from Owens et al. (1979), but the particular intrusion categories used here were developed for this study. The "romantic" and "sexual" intrusion categories follow
directly from the literature investigating sex differences in response to sexual stimuli (e.g., Fisher & Byrne, 1978; Kinsey et al., 1953; Schmidt et al., 1973; Sigusch et al., 1970). These researchers have generally defined the "romantic" aspects of text as those phrases which describe kissing, embracing with affection, and/or affectionate expressions within the context of an intimate relationship (e.g., Fisher & Byrne, 1978; Schmidt et al., 1973; Sigusch et al., 1970). The "sexual" aspects of text have been described primarily as consisting of petting and coitus without expressions of affection (e.g., Fisher & Byrne, 1978; Sigusch et al., 1970). The present study utilized the above definitions for "romantic" and "sexual" recall intrusions. Raters were instructed to score any action not included in the original story which described kissing, embracing with affection, or an affectionate expression as a "romantic" recall intrusion. In addition, they were told to score any action not included in the original story which described petting or coitus without expressions of affection as a "sexual" recall intrusion. Two judges independently categorized recall intrusions into one of the aforementioned 4 categories, and their interrater reliability was computed. Sexual/relevant and sexual/irrelevant were not used as intrusion categories because, for the purpose of the present study, any sexual action was considered relevant. The only exception to this rule was a sexual action involving a character not in the story. If a response such as this occurred, the response was not be scored. Similarly, romantic/relevant and romantic/irrelevant were also not used as intrusion categories because any romantic action is considered to be relevant to the story.
Hypothesis #3. The same predictions made for recall intrusions were made for recognition task distractor category (i.e. "sexual" versus "romantic"). Both the recall and recognition task predictions were tested by using a 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA analysis on: "sexual" recall intrusions, "romantic" recall intrusions, "sexual" recognition task distractors, and "romantic" recognition task distractors, all obtained at immediate recall. An additional 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA was also computed on these measures obtained at delayed recall (3 days later). A MANOVA analysis was chosen for these data in order to avoid an inflated rate of both Type I error and experiment-wise error for data that are believed to be correlated.

It was anticipated that 4 subsequent 2 (male or female) x 3 (same sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's would then be computed on the recall measures (2 for immediate and 2 for delayed recall) and 4 subsequent 2 (male or female) x (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's would also be computed on the recognition measures (2 for immediate and 2 for delayed). The analyses will now be discussed separately by measure (recall or recognition) and time (immediate or delayed).

(1) A 2 x 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "romantic" intrusions at immediate recall. A main effect for sex was predicted such that female subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions than male subjects. No main effect for perspective was predicted. An interaction between sex and perspec-
tive was predicted such that female subjects taking the same-sex perspective, female subjects in the control condition, and male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions than would male subjects taking the same-sex perspective, male subjects in the control condition, and female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. A contrast between male subjects in the control condition and male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective was to be made. If a significant difference in the number of "romantic" recall intrusions was found between these 2 subject groups, we could conclude that the perspective induction was successful for male subjects in the opposite-sex condition. An additional contrast was also to be made. Female subjects taking the same-sex perspective and female subjects in the control condition were to be contrasted with male subjects taking the same-sex perspective and male subjects in the control condition. Assuming the perspective manipulation was successful, it was predicted that the 2 groups of female subjects will reveal more "romantic" recall intrusions that the 2 groups of male subjects.

(2) A second 2 × 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "romantic" intrusions at delayed recall (3 days later). The same predictions and contrasts made for immediate recall were also predicted for delayed recall.

(3) The third 2 × 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "sexual" intrusions at immediate recall. A main effect for sex was predicted such that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects. No main effect for
perspective was predicted. However, an interaction between sex and perspective was predicted such that male subjects taking the same-sex perspective, male subjects in the control condition, and female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects taking the same-sex perspective, female subjects in the control condition, and male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. A contrast between female subjects in the control condition and female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective was to be made. If a significant difference in the number of "sexual" recall intrusions was found between these 2 subject groups, we would conclude that the perspective induction was successful for female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. An additional contrast was also to be made. Male subjects in the control condition and male subjects taking the same-sex perspective were to be contrasted with female subjects in the control condition and female subjects taking the same-sex perspective. Assuming the perspective manipulation was successful, it was predicted that the 2 groups of male subjects would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than the 2 groups of female subjects.

(4) The fourth 2 x 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "sexual" intrusions at delayed recall (3 days later). The same prediction and contrasts made for immediate recall were also to predicted for delayed recall.

The four 2 x 3 ANOVA analyses that were calculated on the recognition task data will now be presented.
(1) The first 2 x 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "romantic" distractors endorsed at immediate recall. A main effect for sex was predicted such that female subjects, regardless of perspective, would endorse more "romantic" distractors than male subjects. No main effect was predicted for perspective. A Sex x Perspective interaction was predicted such that female subjects taking the same-sex perspective, female subjects in the control condition, and male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would identify more "romantic" distractors than male subjects taking the same-sex perspective, male subjects in the control condition, and female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. A contrast between male subjects in the control condition and male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective was to be made. If a significant difference was found, we could again conclude that the perspective manipulation was successful for male subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. Another contrast was also to be made. Female subjects taking the same-sex perspective and female subjects in the control condition were to be contrasted with male subjects taking the same-sex perspective and male subjects in the control condition. Assuming that the perspective manipulation was successful, it was predicted that the 2 groups of female subjects would endorse more "romantic" distractors than the 2 groups of male subjects.

(2) A second 2 x 3 ANOVA was computed on the number of "romantic" distractors endorsed at delayed recall and was identical to the analysis and contrasts discussed for the distractors endorsed at immediate recall.
(3) A third $2 \times 3$ ANOVA was computed on the number of "sexual" distractors endorsed at immediate recall. A main effect for sex was predicted such that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would endorse more "sexual" distractors than female subjects. No main effect for perspective was predicted. A Sex x Perspective interaction was predicted such that male subjects taking the same-sex perspective, male subjects in the control condition, and female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would identify more "sexual" distractors than female subjects taking the same-sex perspective, female subjects in the control condition, and male subjects in the opposite perspective condition. A contrast between female subjects in the control condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition was to be made. If a significant difference was found, we could conclude that the perspective manipulation was successful for female subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective. An additional contrast was also to be made. Male subjects in the control condition and male subjects taking the same-sex perspective were to be contrasted with female subjects in the control condition and female subjects taking the same-sex perspective. Assuming that the perspective manipulation was successful, it was predicted that the 2 groups of male subjects would endorse more "sexual" distractors than the 2 groups of female subjects.

(4) The last $2 \times 3$ ANOVA was computed on the number of "sexual" distractors endorsed at delayed recall, and was identical to the analysis and contrasts discussed for the distractors endorsed at immediate recall.
Atypical/Typical Script Action Hypotheses

For the following hypotheses, sex is not included as an independent variable as there is no theoretical or à priori rationale for predicting main or interaction effects on Atypical of Typical script action category based upon sex.

Hypothesis #4. Based on the research previously discussed, which suggested that Atypical script actions will initially be remembered better than Typical script actions (Graesser et al., 1979; 1980), it was predicted that both recall and recognition memory would be better for Atypical (unnecessary) script actions than for Typical script actions at immediate recall. This prediction was tested by using 2 one-way repeated measures MANOVA'S with time (immediate or delayed) as the independent variable. The first MANOVA was computed on the number of Atypical, Typical, and total script actions correctly recalled. The second was on the number of Atypical, Typical, and total script actions correctly recognized. A main effect for script action category was predicted such that all subjects, regardless of perspective, would recall and recognize more Atypical script actions than Typical script actions. No main effect for perspective was predicted, and no interaction effects were predicted.

Hypothesis #5. In light of the research which found that the rate of forgetting is greater for Atypical script action than for Typical script actions (Graesser et al., 1980), it was predicted that there would be a significant decrease in the number of Atypical (unnecessary) script actions recalled and recognized by all subjects at delayed recall (3 days later). This prediction was tested along with Hypothe-
sis #6 in a MANOVA analysis (see Hypothesis #6 for details of this analysis).

**Hypothesis #6.** It was also hypothesized that there would be a significant increase in the number of Typical script actions recalled and recognized by all subjects at delayed recall (3 days later). This prediction follows from the literature which suggested that the generic script or schema becomes increasingly important over time (e.g., Bartlett, 1932; Graesser et al., 1980; Kintsch, 1977). These predictions (from Hypothesis #5 and #6) were tested by using a 2 (immediate or delayed recall) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA with repeated measures on the 2 level factor. A main effect for recall interval was predicted such that all subjects, regardless of perspective, would recall (and recognize) fewer Atypical script actions at delayed recall than at immediate recall. No main effect for perspective was predicted, and no interaction effects were predicted.

**Supplementary Hypotheses**

**Sexual Experience Hypothesis**

**Hypothesis #7.** It was predicted that all subjects would have better recall and recognition memory for the sexual activities in which they frequently engage (based upon responses to the Sexual Experience Inventory). That is, the more sexually experienced subjects should have recalled and recognized more Typical sexual actions than the less experienced subjects. Schema theory predicts that experience and/or prior knowledge facilitates comprehension and memory (e.g., Dooling & Mullet, 1973; Kintsch & Greene, 1978; Thorndyke, 1977). This study is
the first known attempt at testing this schema theory prediction for comprehension and memory of a sexual script. This prediction was tested by correlating summary scores on the Sexual Experience Inventory with (1) the number of Typical sentences correctly recalled at immediate recall, (2) the number of Typical sentences correctly recognized at immediate recall, (3) the number of Typical sentences correctly recalled at delayed recall, and (4) the number of Typical sentences correctly recognized at delayed recall. There is no basis for differential predictions based upon immediate versus delayed recall. If the correlation(s) between experience and recall (or recognition) were found to be significant, a MANOVA analysis, using sexual experience as the covariate, was to be employed.

Sexual Arousal Hypothesis

Hypothesis #8. For the first part of the interpolated task (a vocabulary test used as a distractor task), subjects were asked to rate their sexual arousal on a scale of 0 (no arousal) to 10 (extremely aroused). A 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA was computed on the arousal ratings in order to determine the possible effects of arousal on the obtained results. No main or interaction effects for sex or perspective were predicted. In order to determine the possible relationship between sexual arousal and recall (or recognition) regardless of subject group, 8 correlation coefficients were computed. Self-report of arousal was correlated (separately) with the following 8 measures: (1) the number of Typical actions correctly recalled at immediate recall, (2) the number of Atypical actions correctly recalled at immediate recall, (3)
number of Typical actions correctly recalled at delayed recall, (4) the number of Atypical actions correctly recalled at delayed recall, (5) the number of Typical actions correctly recognized at immediate recall, (6) the number of Atypical actions correctly recognized at immediate recall, (7) the number of Typical actions correctly recognized at delayed recall, and (8) the number of Atypical actions correctly recognized at delayed recall. If significant, these correlation coefficients were to be compared by group as an exploratory analysis that would help further explain the obtained results. For example, it is possible that subject groups may not have differed in their arousal, yet they may have differed in the degree to which their arousal affected their recall (or recognition) task performance.

**Sex Difference in Ability to Assume the Opposite-Sex Perspective Hypothesis #9.** When considering our data sets, it appeared that the best index of male and female perspective was the perceived importance to perspective ratings. The opposite-sex perspective manipulation assumes that female subjects know what is important to a male perspective and male subjects know what is important to a female perspective. This suggested that an analysis of these data would allow us to determine if males or females were better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective. For example, if male subjects were better at assuming a female perspective than female subjects were at assuming a male perspective, we would expect that the relationship between the perceived importance ratings for male subjects in the opposite-sex condition and female subjects would be stronger than the relationship
between the perceived importance ratings for female subjects in the opposite-sex condition and male subjects.

To test the above expectations, the following analyses were conducted. The mean perceived importance rating for each of the 39 sentences was determined for each of the 6 subject groups. Then, for designated groups, these mean importance ratings by sentences were intercorrelated. These correlation coefficients were transformed to z-scores and compared to determine if males or females were significantly better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective.

It was expected that if the correlation between female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition was greater (or less) than the correlation between male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, then males were better (or worse) than females in assuming the opposite-sex perspective. Similarly, if the correlation between female subjects in the control condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition was greater (or less) than the correlation between male subjects in the control condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex condition, then males were better (or worse) than females in assuming the opposite-sex perspective.

Manipulation Check

Hypothesis #10. Experimental subjects were asked to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 10, how able they felt they were at assuming their given perspective in order to determine if the experimental manipulation was successful. It was expected that all subjects would rate themselves
similarly on this scale. A 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex or opposite-sex perspective) ANOVA was calculated on these ratings.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Subjects

Sixty-three male and 63 female undergraduate students participated in this study, and were run 2 times in same-sex groups. For the first experimental session, subjects were randomly assigned to one of the following three experimental conditions by passing out randomly ordered sets of experimental materials: (1) same-sex perspective, (2) opposite-sex perspective, and (3) no directed perspective. All subjects were asked to recall and recognize twice (immediate-first experimental session and delayed-second experimental session) what they remembered from a story they were instructed to read.

General Procedure for Experimental Session #1

Subjects were run in a classroom setting. They were each given an experimental packet. A consent form (see Appendix B) was attached to the top page of each packet. This form emphasized the sexual explicitness of the experimental materials as well as the confidentiality of the results. A subject number was written on the consent form and on the first page of the experimental packet. Subjects were asked (verbally by the experimenter) to sign the consent form as soon as they were seated. The forms were then collected immediately, and subjects were instructed
to turn to the first page of their experimental packet. A small slip of paper, with the individual's subject number written on it, was attached to the last page of the packet. Subjects were asked (at the conclusion of the first experimental session) to take the slip of paper with their subject number with them and to bring it back to experimental session #2. As described, each subject was given one of 3 experimental packets. The packets contained all of the experimental materials and instructions. The experiment was subject paced. Following is a listing (by page) of all of the experimental materials included in each subject packet for the first experimental session.

1. Subject Instruction Sheet
2. Story about a Sexual Encounter
3. Interpolated Task and Self-Report of Sexual Arousal Rating page #1
4. Interpolated Task page #2
5. Recall Instructions with space provided for writing responses
6. A second sheet of paper for subjects to write their responses should they need additional paper
7. Recognition Task page #1
8. Recognition Task page #2
9. Perceived Importance Task
10. Sexual Experience Inventory
11. Manipulation Check
12. Post-Experimental Session Instruction Sheet
Materials Used for the First Experimental Session

The appendices contain an example of each page of the experimental packet. Following is a detailed description of each page.

1. Subject Instruction Sheet (See Appendix C)

All Subjects were told (in writing) that this study was interested in how people think about and remember stories (adapted from Anderson & Pichert, 1978). Then, depending upon experimental condition, subjects received further instructions. Appendix C contains subject instruction sheets for each of the 3 experimental conditions. Subjects were either asked to (1) pretend as if they were the same-sex character in the story (same-sex perspective condition), (2) pretend as if they were the opposite-sex character in the story (opposite-sex perspective condition), or (3) simply read the story (no directed perspective condition). Then written directions instructed subjects to turn the page and read the story.

2. Story about a Sexual Encounter (see Appendix D)

Subjects were asked (in writing) to read a story about a sexual encounter between 2 fictitious characters, John and Mary. The story contains a total of 39 "idea units" or script actions. An idea unit is defined as either an individual sentence, basic semantic proposition, or phrase (Bransford & Johnson, 1973). In order to determine the inter-rater reliability on the number of idea units used in this story, the idea units were first identified as such by this researcher. Then, 2 raters were asked (independently) to divide the story into idea units. They were told that an idea unit will usually consist of a sentence but may be part of a sentence when one or more actions are involved, even if
the first action is "necessary" for the second action to occur. Perfect agreement was found for the 39 idea units in the present study. Previous researchers (e.g., Anderson & Pichert, 1978; Graesser, 1978; Pichert & Anderson, 1977) have reported interrater reliability estimates on the number of idea units in a story to be similarly high. The story contains 17 "Typical" script actions (see Appendix E) which were first identified by Bentler (1968 a, b) as being "Typical" sexual actions. These actions have been further elaborated and researched in this laboratory in an attempt to delineate standard sexual stimuli. Seventeen "Atypical" (unnecessary) script actions (see Appendix F) were developed and included in the present script to differentially test memory for Atypical versus Typical script actions and to help make the present story more cohesive and readable. It should be noted that there are 5 phrases/script actions included in the story as "filler" actions, but that are not categorized as Atypical or Typical. Appendix D contains the story with the Atypical and Typical script actions appropriately labeled. Subjects were asked (in writing) to turn the page when they finished reading the story.

3. Interpolated Task (See Appendix G)

Written on the top of the first interpolated task sheet were directions asking subjects to rate their sexual arousal on a scale of 0 (no arousal) to 10 (extremely aroused). Other researchers (e.g., Messé and Geer, 1985) have successfully used a 10-point rating scale to assess self-report of arousal. Then, subjects were instructed (in writing) to complete the listed 40 items from the vocabulary subtest of the Shipley Institute of Living Scale (1967), as a distractor task. At the bottom
of the first page of this task were written directions asking subjects to please turn the page to continue. Subjects were also asked (in writing) to turn the page after they completed the second page of this task.

4. Recall Instructions (see Appendix H)

Subjects were asked (in writing) to recall (write) verbatim what they remembered from the story. In addition, they were asked to write the "gist" of what they could not remember verbatim (adapted from Anderson & Pichert, 1978; Pichert & Anderson, 1977). Depending on experimental condition or perspective, subjects were reminded which (if any) perspective they were to keep in mind while recalling what they remembered from the story. Appendix H contains the recall instructions for each experimental condition. At the bottom of the recall instruction page there were written directions instructing subjects to turn the page and continue writing their responses on this second page if necessary. At the bottom of the second response page were directions asking subjects to turn the page when they finished writing what they remembered from the story.

5. Recognition Task (see Appendix I)

Subjects were asked (in writing) to indicate, by circling "yes" or "no" for each sentence, which of the 46 sentences they recognized as being in the story they read. The 17 Atypical and 17 Typical action sentences were listed as well as 12 distractor sentences. The distractors consisted of 6 "romantic" sentences and 6 "sexual" sentences. Appendix I contains the recognition task with the 17 Atypical sentences, 17 Typical sentences, and 12 distractor sentences labeled appropriately.
At the bottom of each of the 2 pages of the recognition task were written directions asking subjects to turn the page when they finished.

6. Perceived Importance Task (see Appendix J)

Subjects were asked (in writing) to rate the importance to the story of each of the listed 39 "idea unit" sentences from the story they read. They were told to write the appropriate number in the space provided (for each sentence) on a scale of 1 (not important at all) to 5 (extremely important). At the bottom of the page there were written directions asking subjects to turn the page when they finished with this task.

7. Sexual Experience Inventory (see Appendix K)

The Mosher and Cross (1971) Sexual Experience Inventory was employed in order to determine the possible relationship between sexual experience and recall for typical sexual actions. Other researchers (e.g., Morokoff, 1980) have used this inventory and found it to demonstrate adequate reliability and validity. Subjects were asked (in writing) to check which of the 12 listed sexual activities they have participated in. At the bottom of the page subjects were instructed, in writing, to turn the page when they completed the task.

8. Manipulation Check (see Appendix L)

Experimental subjects were asked to indicate how well they felt they assumed their given perspective on a scale of 0 (not very well) to 10 (very well). Appendix L contains both a copy of the questionnaire used for subjects who assumed the perspective of John and a copy used for subjects who assumed the perspective of Mary.
9. Post-Experimental Session Instruction Sheet (see Appendix M)

Subjects were instructed (in writing) to bring their signed consent form and completed experimental packet to the front of the room. They were asked to take their subject number slip with them, which was attached to the Post-Experimental Instruction Sheet. They were also requested to (1) sign their name, telephone number, and subject number on the sheet in front of the room so that they could be called and reminded about their second experimental session, and (2) pick up an "appointment card" which contained the date and time of their second session.

General Procedure and Materials Used for Session #2

All subjects returned in three days to participate in the remaining part of the experiment and to receive their extra credit slips. After they were seated, subjects were asked (verbally by the experimenter) to write their subject number on the top page of their experimental materials, which were already sitting on top of each classroom desk. The experimenter had a master list of subject names and numbers in case the subject forgot his/her subject number. The experimental materials (or packets) consisted of the following 4 pages: (1) recall instruction sheet, (2) blank sheet of paper, (3) Recognition Task page #1, and (4) Recognition Task page #2. The same materials were used for all subjects. Session #2 began with written instructions (written on the recall instruction sheet) requesting subjects to recall verbatim (in writing on the paper provided) what they remembered from the story they read in the first experimental session. They were asked to write the
"gist" of what they could not remember verbatim. An additional blank sheet of paper was included in case the subject needed more space to write his/her responses. At the bottom of the blank sheet of paper were written directions asking subjects to turn the page when they finished. Then, subjects were asked, in writing, to complete the recognition task on the last 2 pages of the experimental packet. No reference regarding perspective was made at any point. When all subjects completed their experimental materials, recall protocols and recognition measures were collected. The subjects were handed a detailed written debriefing (see Appendix N) and extra credit slip. An oral debriefing supplemented the written debriefing and described the rationale for the study in more detail. There was also the opportunity to ask questions at this time.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented in the same sequence as were the initial hypotheses. However, pilot data results will be presented first, including a description of the scoring of recall protocols. Then, the results of examining Subject Perspective Hypotheses (#1, #2, #3), Atypical/Typical Script Action Hypotheses (#4, #5, #6), and Supplementary Hypotheses (#7, #8, #9, #10) will be presented.

Pilot data

Seventeen subjects (7 males and 10 females) were randomly selected from undergraduate psychology classes and run as pilot subjects in same-sex groups. Subjects were run according to the procedures outlined in the previous chapter for Experimental Session #1. The purpose of the pilot study was to both identify potential methodological/procedural problems and to refine recall protocol scoring procedures using two raters. No methodological or procedural problems were noted. At the conclusion of the experimental session, subjects were asked by the experimenter to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 10, how well they thought they assumed their given perspective. The mean rating for females in the same-sex perspective condition was 6, and for females in the opposite-sex perspective 3.66. The mean rating for males in the same-sex perspective condition was 8.66, and for males in the opposite-sex
perspective condition 3. Inspection of the pilot data revealed adequate variability.

The scoring of recall protocols for pilot subjects and the computation of interrater reliability estimates will now be discussed as these procedures were also used in the actual experimental study. Recall protocols for each pilot subject were scored independently by two trained raters according to the script action and recall intrusion categories described in the previous chapter. Appendix 0 contains the Recall Protocol Scoring Guide used by the raters. Interrater reliability estimates were computed for each recall category by dividing the number of recall protocols rated the same by the two judges (for each category) by the total number of protocols. The interrater reliability coefficients obtained were .96 for the category of "Atypical" and .95 for the category of "Typical". Interrater reliability estimates were not computed for the recall intrusion categories due to the small number of responses (and lack of sufficient variability) in these categories.

Subject Perspective Hypotheses

Perceived Importance Task Ratings

Hypothesis #1. It was predicted that subjects taking the same-sex perspective and control subjects would recall (at immediate recall) more script actions judged to be important to the same-sex perspective than judged to be important to the opposite-sex perspective. It was also predicted that subjects taking the opposite-sex perspective would recall (at immediate recall) more script actions judged to be important to the opposite-sex perspective than judged to be important to the same-sex
perspective. In order to test this prediction, it was necessary to identify sentences that were rated as being more important to either the male or female perspective. A 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA was computed on each of the 39 sentences' perceived importance ratings. A MANOVA analysis was chosen for these data in order to avoid the inflated rate of both type I error and experiment-wise error associated with the use of multiple ANOVA analyses. See Table 1 for the results of the MANOVA analysis. All F's reported are Pillia's statistics, which are thought to be more robust than Wilk's, Roys, and Hotellings statistics (Olson, 1974). As Table 1 indicates, there is a significant Sex x Perspective interaction, $F=1.457 (1, 78), p<.05$. There is also a significant main effect for sex, $F=1.74 (1, 32), p<.05$. Thirty-nine separate 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's were then computed in order to determine for which sentence there is a significant Sex x Perspective interaction. Table 2 contains the significant Sex x Perspective interactions obtained from these analyses. As Table 2 indicates, a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found for sentences #5, 7, 11, 14, 32, 33, and 38 (see Appendix J for a listing of sentences by number). The planned comparisons proposed (in previous chapter) were then computed using Scheffe's à posteriori test in order to more closely determine the source of the significant interaction effects. These results are presented in Table 3. Using the Scheffe critical value, only sentence #14 was identified as a "male perspective" sentence. No sentence was identified as a "female perspective" sentence. It appears, then, that the Sex x Perspective interaction
Table 1

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Perceived Importance Task Ratings

Pillai's Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex x</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex **</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S=2, M=18, N=40

**S=1, M=18 1/2, N=40
Table 2

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance of Perceived Importance Task Ratings

Significant Sex x Perspective Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent. #</th>
<th>Hypothesis SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.286</td>
<td>100.571</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>87.142</td>
<td>2.484</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.825</td>
<td>156.952</td>
<td>4.913</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>3.756</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.857</td>
<td>139.238</td>
<td>6.929</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>5.971</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.254</td>
<td>146.381</td>
<td>6.127</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>5.023</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.682</td>
<td>132.190</td>
<td>5.341</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>4.849</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
term is primarily found in the opposite-sex perspective condition data, which was not used for these planned comparisons. Thus, the proposed analyses and planned comparisons (see Appendix A) based upon the identification of a set of "male perspective" and "female perspective" sentences could not be conducted as we were unable to identify these 2 sets of sentences.

As proposed, Tukey's HSD test was used to test the difference between Perceived Importance Task rating means (separately) on the above 7 sentences for (1) male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition, and (2) female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition in order to determine if the data could be collapsed (when appropriate) to provide more powerful tests. That is, if there is not a significant difference between means for male and female control subjects and male and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, respectively, for statistical purposes we can combine the same-sex and control groups (by sex) in order to increase our subject group size. The results of Tukey's HSD Test are also presented in Table 3. It should be noted that for these comparisons, only the difference between male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition should be compared to the Tukey critical value. That is, these contrasts are pairwise, as opposed to the complex planned comparisons described above using Scheffé's test.

As Table 3 indicates, using the Tukey critical value, the data can be collapsed for both male and female subjects on sentences #5, 7, 11,
Table 3

Planned Comparisons Using Mean Rating on Perceived Importance Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male Perspective</th>
<th>Female Perspective</th>
<th>Scheffe Value</th>
<th>Tukey Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Control</td>
<td>Female Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #5</td>
<td>(3.66 - 3.52)</td>
<td>(4.09 - 3.52)</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #7</td>
<td>(4.24 - 4.43)</td>
<td>(4.14 - 3.67)</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #11</td>
<td>(3.81 - 3.19)</td>
<td>(3.67 - 3.67)</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #14</td>
<td>(3.38 - 2.38)</td>
<td>(2.67 - 2.43)</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #32</td>
<td>(4.33 - 3.76)</td>
<td>(4.43 - 3.81)</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #33</td>
<td>(4.14 - 4.28)</td>
<td>(4.38 - 3.71)</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent #38</td>
<td>(3.48 - 4.48)</td>
<td>(4.19 - 3.71)</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32, 33, and 38. On sentence #14, however, only female subjects can be collapsed as there is a significant difference between male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition, with male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition rating this sentence as being more important than male subjects in the control condition. However, since the analyses proposed based on the identification of "male perspective" and "female perspective" sentences (see Appendix A) could not be conducted, collapsing of data on these sentences was not necessary. However, it is interesting to note that on 6 out of 7 sentences on which a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found, male and female control subjects rated these sentences on the Perceived Importance Task much like male and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, respectively.

As proposed, in order to provide the most rigorous test of the perspective manipulation, male and female control subjects were contrasted with female and male opposite-sex perspective subjects, respectively, on the sentences for which a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found (i.e. #5, 7, 11, 14, 32, 33, and 38) using Tukey's HSD test. Results indicated that neither sex was "better" at assuming the opposite-sex perspective on sentences #5, 11, 14, 32, 33, and 38 as there was no significant difference between mean perceived importance ratings for these subject groups on these sentences. However, on sentence #7, the difference between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male control subjects was significant (.81), and exceeded the Tukey critical value of .763, suggesting that males
were "better" at assuming the opposite-sex perspective than females on this particular sentence.

The 39 separate 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's calculated on the perceived importance ratings described above also yielded significant main effects for sex, which are presented in Table 4. The main effects are also discussed (in addition to the interaction effects) as they were found for sentences other than those for which the interaction effects were found. As the table indicates, a significant main effect for sex was found for sentences #13, 20, 22, 26, 31, 35, and 37. Table 5 contains the mean perceived importance ratings and mean standard deviations of these ratings (collapsed across perspective) for these sentences. Inspection of the table reveals that the mean rating for males was significantly higher than the mean rating for females for every sentence with the exception of sentence #35, on which the mean rating for females was significantly higher than the mean rating for males. Thus, it seems that male subjects, regardless of perspective, rated the 6 out of 7 sentences on which a clear sex difference was found as being more important to their given perspective. Female subjects as a group, however, only rated one sentence (#35) as being more important to their given perspective. Males, then, rated significantly more sentences as being important to whatever perspective they took than did females.

**Relationship Between Recall Frequency and Perceived Importance**

In order to examine the hypothesized positive relationship between recall and perceived importance, a correlational analysis was conducted between recall frequency and perceived importance ratings. Table 6
Table 4

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance of Perceived Importance Task Ratings

Main Effect for Sex: Significant Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent. #</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>104.000</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>4.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>89.952</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>5.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>113.333</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>4.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.222</td>
<td>96.381</td>
<td>6.222</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>7.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.143</td>
<td>93.524</td>
<td>7.143</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>9.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.175</td>
<td>185.810</td>
<td>9.175</td>
<td>1.548</td>
<td>5.925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Mean Perceived Importance Ratings and Standard Deviations
By Sentence # and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.363</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>4.173</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.950</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>4.237</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.793</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>4.283</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.810</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35</td>
<td>3.617</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.160</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Pearson Correlations Between Recall Frequency and Perceived Importance By Subject Group, Perspective, Sex, and Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| **Female**       |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| **Perspective**  |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| r                | .032  | .155   | .290    |       |        |         |
| p                | .839  | .326   | .061    |       |        |         |
| df               | 41    | 41     | 41      |       |        |         |

|                  | Male  | Female | Control |       |        |         |
| **Sex**          |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| **Male**         |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| r                | .090  | .105   |         |       |        |         |
| p                | .441  | .414   |         |       |        |         |
| df               | 62    | 62     |         |       |        |         |

|                  | Male  | Female | Control |       |        |         |
| **Overall**      |       |        |         |       |        |         |
| r                | -.040 |        |         |       |        |         |
| p                | .655  |        |         |       |        |         |
| df               | 125   |        |         |       |        |         |
contains the correlations between recall frequency and perceived importance (1) by group, (2) collapsed across sex, (3) collapsed across perspective, and (4) collapsed across sex and perspective. As can be seen, none of the correlations coefficients obtained were significant. Thus, it appears that there is no relationship, positive or negative, between recall frequency and perceived importance for experimental subjects.

**Scoring of Recall Protocols**

The scoring of recall protocols will now be discussed as it should prove helpful in understanding the results based upon the recall data. In order to test the predictions based upon recall intrusions, intrusions were classified into the 4 categories (sexual, romantic, nonsexual/relevant, and nonsexual/irrelevant) described in the previous chapter. Two trained raters independently scored each subject's recall protocols (for both immediate and delayed recall) by using the Recall Protocol Scoring Guide found in Appendix 0. Recall intrusions were classified into the 4 aforementioned categories. The number of Atypical and Typical script actions correctly recalled was also computed, as were the total number of script actions correctly recalled. Table 7 contains the interrater reliability estimates for each recall intrusion and script action (Atypical, Typical, and total) category. As can be seen, very high reliability coefficients were obtained for each of the script action categories and for the romantic and nonsexual/irrelevant intrusion categories. Somewhat lower reliability coefficients were found for
Table 7
Recall Protocol Interrater Reliability Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script Action Category</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recall Intrusion Category</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the sexual and nonsexual/relevant intrusion categories. It can be noted that "spot checks" were conducted by the trainer at various times while the raters independently scored recall protocols. For these checks, the trainer reviewed and compared the scoring (by both raters) of randomly selected recall protocols. These checks were performed both in order to determine if the trainer agreed with the raters' scoring of the recall protocols and to insure sufficient interrater reliability. Adequate agreement with scoring and interrater reliability was found. After the raters completed scoring all of the protocols, scoring discrepancies were identified and resolved by having a third rater (the trainer) rate the discrepant protocols.

Recall and Recognition Data Results

Results based upon the recall and recognition tasks will now be presented together as they were analyzed together.

Hypothesis #2. It was predicted that female subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions than male subjects at both immediate and delayed recall. It was also predicted that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects at both immediate and delayed recall. The results of these predictions will be presented below, as they were tested along with hypothesis #3 in a MANOVA analysis. A MANOVA analysis was chosen in order to avoid both an inflated Type I and experiment-wise error rate for data that are assumed to be correlated.
Hypothesis #3. The same predictions made for the "romantic" and "sexual" recall intrusion categories were made for recognition task distractor category. Both the recall and recognition task predictions were tested by using a 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA on the following variables: "sexual" recall intrusions (CSEX), "romantic" recall intrusions (CROM), "sexual" recognition task distractors (RSEX), and "romantic" recognition task distractors (RROM), all obtained at immediate recall. An additional 2 x 3 MANOVA was also computed on these variables obtained at delayed recall (3 days later). The delayed recall measures are designated by the number 2 after the variable name (e.g., CSEX2).

Table 8 contains the results of the 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA on immediate recall (and recognition) measures. There is a significant main effect for sex, $F=5.577$ (1, 78), $p<.001$. Table 9 contains the univariate F-test for the sex main effect. It is evident that this effect is only significant for the "sexual" (CSEX) and "romantic" (CROM) intrusions. Table 10 contains the means and standard deviations (collapsed across perspective) for these variables. Inspection of the table indicates that males scored higher than females on both CSEX and CROM. The prediction that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would reveal more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects at immediate recall was supported. However, the results also indicate that male subjects revealed more "romantic" recall intrusions at immediate recall than female subjects. This latter finding was unexpected as it was predicted that female subjects would reveal more "romantic" recall intrusions than
### Table 8

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Immediate Recall and Recognition Tasks

**Pillai's Tests of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF of F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp</td>
<td>* .040</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>236.000</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>* .036</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>236.000</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>** .160</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>117.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S=2, M=1/2, N=57 1/2

**S=1, M=1, N=57 1/2
Table 9

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance of Immediate Recall and Recognition Tasks

Main Effect for Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSEX</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>233.429</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>.494 .484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>54.238</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.266 .607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEX</td>
<td>37.786</td>
<td>298.477</td>
<td>37.786</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td>15.191 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROM</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>5.833 .017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RSEX=number of "sexual" recognition task distractors endorsed at immediate recall

RROM=number of "romantic" recognition task distractors endorsed at immediate recall

CSEX=number of "sexual" recall intrusions at immediate recall

CROM=number of "romantic" recall intrusions at immediate recall
Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for CSEX and CROM By Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEX</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>1.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROM</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
male subjects. Thus, male subjects, regardless of perspective, revealed more "sexual" and "romantic" intrusions at immediate recall than did female subjects.

Table 11 contains the results of the 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANOVA on delayed recall (and recognition) measures. Again there is a significant main effect for sex, $F=2.796$ (1, 117), $p<.05$. Table 12 contains the univariate $F$-test for the sex main effect. It appears that this effect is only significant for the "sexual" recall intrusion (CSEX2) category. Table 13 contains the means and standard deviations (collapsed across perspective) for these variables. As predicted, males scored higher than females on CSEX2. However, the prediction that females would score higher than males on CROM2 was not supported. Overall, then, it seems that for both immediate and delayed recall, males revealed more "sexual" recall intrusions than females as predicted. The prediction that females would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions than males was not supported. In fact, it was found that males actually revealed more "romantic" intrusions at immediate recall.

For descriptive purposes, Table 14 contains the mean "proportion endorsed" and mean standard deviations for these proportions for subjects (by group) on the following variables: RSEX, RROM, RSEX2, and RROM2. The mean "proportion endorsed" refers to the proportion of the total number of "sexual" and "romantic" recognition task distractors (6 total possible for each distractor category) endorsed by subjects. Inspection of table 14 indicates that all subjects endorsed significantly more "sexual" than "romantic" recognition task distractors at
### Table 11

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Delayed Recall and Recognition Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Hypothesis Error Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>7.07, 8.000, 236.000, .686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>7.22, 8.000, 236.000, .672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>2.796, 4.000, 117.000, .029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S=2, M=1/2, N=57 1/2

**S=1, M=1, N=57 1/2
Table 12

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance of Delayed Recall and Recognition Tasks

Main Effect for Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSEX2</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>377.714</td>
<td>377.714</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR0H2</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>109.429</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEX2</td>
<td>36.698</td>
<td>398.476</td>
<td>36.698</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>11.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR0H2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10.476</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RSEX2=number of "sexual" recognition task distractors endorsed at delayed recall
RR0H2=number of "romantic" recognition task distractors endorsed at delayed recall
CSEX2=number of "sexual" recall intrusions at delayed recall
CR0H2=number of "romantic" recall intrusions at delayed recall
Table 13
Means and Standard Deviations for CSEX2 and CR0M2 By Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean  S.D.</td>
<td>mean  S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEX2</td>
<td>2.397 2.220</td>
<td>1.317 1.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR0M2</td>
<td>.0952 .292</td>
<td>.0952 .239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Male Mean</td>
<td>Female Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX2</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM2</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both immediate and delayed recall. These data mean that all subjects to
incorrectly remembered more "sexual" distractor actions than "romantic"
distractor actions both after they read the story and 3 days later.
Table 15 contains the aforementioned recognition distractor variables
collapsed across sex, and Table 16 contains these values collapsed
across perspective.

Atypical/Typical Script Action Hypotheses

Results based upon the script action category (i.e. Atypical or
Typical) predictions will now be presented. It can be noted that these
results, like those described above, are also based upon the recall and
recognition task data.

Hypothesis #4. It was predicted that recall and recognition memory
would be better for Atypical (unnecessary) script actions than for
Typical script actions at immediate recall. Two one-way repeated
measures MANOVA's were calculated: (1) Time (immediate or delayed) on
recall of Atypical script actions (CATYP), recall of Typical script
actions (CTYP), and recall of total script actions (CTOT) and (2) Time
(immediate or delayed) on recognition of Atypical script actions
(RATYP), recognition of Typical script actions (RTYP), and recognition
of total script actions (RTOT). Only the results of the first analysis
(on the recall task) will be presented (in Table 17) because the second
analysis (on the recognition task) was not run due to an assumption
violation.

For the MANOVA analyses, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was used to
test the hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an
### Table 15

Mean "Proportion Endorsed" and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX2</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM2</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Mean "Proportion Endorsed" and Standard Deviations for "Sexual" and "Romantic" Recognition Task Distractors By Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEX2</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RROM2</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**One-Way Multivariate Analysis**

**of Variance of Recall Task**

**Pillai's Tests of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>of $F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>123.000</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$S=1, M=1/2, N=60 1/2$*
identity matrix. Results of this test for the second analysis (on the recognition task) indicated that the dependent variables were not considered to be independent as the determinant of the within cells correlation matrix was 0 (i.e. the hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix was not rejected). Thus, the within cells error matrix was found to be singular. That is, the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix, thus indicating that one or more of the dependent variables can almost be expressed as a linear function of the other dependent variables. Some deviation from linearity is required for a MANOVA analysis. Thus, the second MANOVA analysis was not considered to be appropriate for the dependent variables RATYP, RTYP, and RTOT. Table 17 contains the results of the first MANOVA analysis (on the recall task) and indicates that no significant effects were obtained.

An alternative analysis was then conducted as it was believed to provide a more powerful test of the recall and recognition task data (see Huck & McLean, 1975 for discussion of analysis of covariance). Two separate 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANCOVA's were computed, using immediate recall scores as the covariate and difference scores (between immediate or delayed recall) as the dependent measure. Dependent measures for the first MANCOVA analysis were the difference scores obtained for CATYP, CTYP, and CTOT. Dependent measures for the second MANCOVA analysis were the difference scores obtained for RATYP, RTYP, and RTOT. Again, only the results of the first MANOVA analysis (on the recall task) are presented (in Table 18) because the second analysis (on the recognition task) was
not run due to a violation of one of the assumptions underlying use of this analysis (i.e. variables were not found to be linearly independent). As the table indicates, no significant main or interaction effects were obtained. Thus, inclusion of immediate recall scores as the covariate did not significantly alter any of the findings of the original MANOVA analysis.

Hypothesis #5. It was predicted that there would be a significant decrease in the number of Atypical (unnecessary) script actions recalled and recognized by all subjects at delayed recall (3 days later). The results of this prediction will be presented below as is was tested along with hypothesis #6 in a MANOVA analysis.

Hypothesis #6. It was also predicted that there would be a significant increase in the number of Typical script actions recalled and recognized by all subjects at delayed recall (3 days later).

These predictions (hypotheses #5 and #6) were tested by using a 2 (immediate or delayed recall) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) repeated measures MANOVA on the following variables: CATYP, CTYP, RATYP, and RTYP. Table 19 contains the results of this analysis. No significant main or interaction effects were obtained. Again, an alternative analysis was then employed in order to provide a more powerful test of the data. A 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) MANCOVA was computed on the above four variables using immediate recall scores as the covariate. Results of the MANCOVA analysis are presented in
Table 18

2(Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Covariance of Recall Task Difference Scores with Immediate Recall Scores as a Covariate

Pillai's Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>232.000</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>232.000</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>115.000</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S=2, M=0, N=56 1/2

**S=1, M=1/2, N=56 1/2
Table 19

2 (Time) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Recall and Recognition Tasks

Pillai's Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F</th>
<th>Hypothesis DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persp x Time *</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>242.000</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time **</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>120.000</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp *</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>242.000</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S=2, M=1/2, N=59

**S=1, M=1, N=59
Table 20. Again, using immediate recall scores as the covariate did not significantly alter the previous findings.

For descriptive purposes, Table 21 contains the means and standard deviations for the following measures (collapsed across sex and perspective): CATYP, CTYP, RATYP, RTYP, CATYP2, CTYP2, RATYP2, and RTYP2. Examination of the table indicates that all subjects did better at correctly identifying script actions on the recognition task than they did at remembering these actions on the free recall task. This finding is not surprising given the different nature of the task (i.e. recognition versus reconstructive memory). Table 22 contains the mean "proportion correct" and mean standard deviations for these proportions (on the above 8 variables) by subject group. Table 23 presents this data collapsed across sex, and Table 24 presents this data collapsed across perspective.

**Supplementary Hypotheses**

The results based upon the following hypotheses are considered to be supplementary as they relate to the effects of possible moderating variables.

**Sexual Experience Hypothesis**

**Hypothesis #7.** It was predicted that all subjects would have better recall and recognition memory for the sexual activities in which they frequently engage (based on responses to the Sexual Experience Inventory). This prediction was tested by correlating (separately) summary scores on the Sexual Experience Inventory with the following variables: CTYP, RTYP, CTYP2, and RTYP2. None of the correlation coefficients
Table 20

2 (Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Multivariate Analysis of Covariance of Recall and Recognition Tasks with Immediate Recall Scores as a Covariant

Pillai's Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF of F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp*</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>228.000</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>228.000</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>113.000</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S=2, M=1/2, N=55 1/2

**S=1, M=1, N=55 1/2
Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations of Recall and Recognition Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATYP</td>
<td>5.984</td>
<td>2.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP</td>
<td>7.810</td>
<td>2.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP</td>
<td>12.790</td>
<td>2.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>1.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATYP2</td>
<td>5.929</td>
<td>2.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP2</td>
<td>8.238</td>
<td>3.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP2</td>
<td>12.968</td>
<td>2.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP2</td>
<td>14.429</td>
<td>1.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Mean "Proportion Correct" and Standard Deviations of Recall and Recognition Tasks By Subject Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Male mean</th>
<th>Female mean</th>
<th>Control mean</th>
<th>Male S.D.</th>
<th>Female S.D.</th>
<th>Control S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male CATYP</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male CTYP</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male RATYP</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male RTYP</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female CATYP</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female CTYP</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female RATYP</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female RTYP</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control CATYP</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control CTYP</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control RATYP</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control RTYP</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATYP</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATYP2</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP2</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP2</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP2</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23
Mean "Proportion Correct" and Standard Deviations of Recall and Recognition Tasks By Perspective
### Table 24
Mean "Proportion Correct" and Standard Deviations of Recall and Recognition Tasks By Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATYP</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATYP2</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYP2</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATYP2</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTYP2</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
obtained were significant. Thus, the proposed ANCOVA analysis was not conducted.

**Sexual Arousal Hypothesis**

**Hypotheses #8.** For the first part of the interpolated task, subjects were asked to rate their arousal on a scale of 0 (no arousal) to 10 (extremely aroused). In order to determine the possible effects of arousal on the obtained results, a 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA was computed on the arousal ratings. These results are presented in Table 25. Examination of the table reveals that no significant main or interaction effects were obtained. In order to determine the possible relationship between sexual arousal and recall (or recognition), regardless of subject group, 8 correlation coefficients were computed. Self-report of arousal was correlated (separately) with each of the following 8 variables: (1) CTYP, (2) CATYP, (3) CTYP2, (4) CATYP2, (5) RTYP, (6) RATYP, (7) RTYP2, and (8) RATYP2. Table 26 contains the results of these correlations. An can be seen, only the correlation between self-report of arousal and RATYP2 is significant ($r=.177$, $p<.047$), suggesting that across all subjects, arousal may have affected the ability to correctly recognize Atypical script actions at delayed recall.

**Sex Difference in Ability to Assume the Opposite-Sex Perspective**

**Hypothesis #9.** It was hypothesized that a differential ability of males and females to assume the opposite-sex perspective may have occurred and might have influenced the obtained results. To test this hypothesis, it was necessary to determine if, in fact, males and females differed in
Table 25
2(Sex) x 3 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance
of Arousal Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>529.524</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2471.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2471.143</td>
<td>560.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>11.460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.460</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>6.619</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp</td>
<td>5.254</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.627</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean=</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.=</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 26**  
**Pearson Correlations Between Arousal, Recall, and Recognition Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTYP</th>
<th>CATYP</th>
<th>CTYP2</th>
<th>CATYP2</th>
<th>RTYP</th>
<th>RTYP2</th>
<th>RATYP</th>
<th>RATYP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 125

*p < .05
their ability to assume the opposite-sex perspective. The mean perceived importance rating (from the Perceived Importance Task) for each of the 39 sentences was determined for each of the 6 subject groups. These mean perceived importance ratings by group were then intercorrelated. The correlation coefficients obtained were transformed to $z$-scores and compared to one another. Specifically, it was expected that if (1) the correlation between female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition is greater (or less) than (2) the correlation between male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, then males are better (or worse) than females in assuming the opposite-sex perspective. Similarly, if (3) the correlation between female subjects in the control condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition is greater (or less) than (4) the correlation between male subjects in the control condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, then males are better (or worse) than females in assuming the opposite-sex perspective. The correlation coefficients obtained between the above groups are as follows: (1) .744, (2) .805, (3) .832, and (4) .886. These coefficients do not significantly differ from one another. Thus, it can be concluded as indexed by these data that neither sex is better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective.

**Manipulation Check**

**Hypothesis #10.** It can be noted that the manipulation check is not a "true" experimental hypothesis. However, it was expected that all subjects would rate themselves as having been equally able to assume
their given perspective. In order to test this assumption, a 2 (male or female) x 2 (same-sex or opposite-sex perspective) ANOVA was calculated on the results obtained from the manipulation check questionnaire. On this questionnaire, experimental subjects were asked to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 10, how able they felt they were at assuming their given perspective. The results of the ANOVA analysis are presented in Table 27. Inspection of the table reveals that there is a significant Sex x Perspective interaction effect, F=15.294 (1, 80), p<.001. There is also a significant main effect for sex, F=4.310 (1, 80), p<.05. Tukey's HSD test was used to test the difference (pairwise) between means for the interaction effect. Results of these comparisons are presented in Table 28. As Table 28 indicates, significant differences were found between the following group means: (1) female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, (2) female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, (3) male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition, and (4) male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition. It appears that for males, subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition felt that it was easier to assume their given perspective than did females in the opposite-sex perspective condition. In addition, males in the same-sex perspective condition felt that it was easier to assume their given perspective than both males in the opposite-sex perspective condition and females in the opposite-sex
### Table 27

2 (Sex) x 2 (Perspective) Analysis of Variance of Manipulation Check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>408.571</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1876.298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1876.298</td>
<td>367.387</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>22.012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.012</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Persp</td>
<td>78.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.107</td>
<td>15.294</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Tukey's HSD Test on Difference Between Means
for Manipulation Check

Critical Value=1.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>4.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>5.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>1.630*</td>
<td>2.960*</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>1.330*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.240*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perspective condition. For females, only those in the same-sex perspective condition felt that it was easier to assume their given perspective than those in the opposite-sex perspective condition. Overall, then, males (in both the same-sex and opposite-sex perspective conditions) seemed to feel that they were better able to assume their given perspective than females in the opposite-sex perspective condition. However, females in the same-sex perspective condition felt that it was easier to assume their given perspective than did females in the opposite-sex perspective condition, and males in the same-sex perspective condition also felt that it was easier to assume their given perspective than did males in the opposite-sex perspective condition.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Prior to a discussion of the findings of this study, the theoretical rationale, predictions, and methodology forming the basis of this study will be briefly reviewed. This study was designed to address how men and women "process" sexual text (i.e., text describing a heterosexual encounter). The term "process" refers here to the "information processing" approach used by cognitive scientists to describe the way in which input is treated from the moment it arrives in the sensory system until it affects behavior in some way. The present study objectively examined the responses believed to be reflective of such processes. Cognitive scientists have studied how individuals process non-sexual text, and schema theory appears to be a useful way of conceptualizing their findings. A "schema" is a cluster of knowledge that represents a particular concept (e.g., Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977). In general, cognitive researchers have demonstrated how schemata can facilitate comprehension by providing the reader with expectations about new information which facilitate interpretation even when incomplete information is presented.

Schank and Abelson (1977) introduced a "script pointer plus tag" (SP+T) hypothesis which can be viewed as a specific application of schema theory. They suggested that knowledge is organized around
stereotyped sequences or routine activities called scripts. These researchers proposed the concept of scripting to explain how a reader's comprehension is guided by his or her understanding of these stereotyped sequences or routine activities. It seems reasonable to assume that since scripts are stereotyped or routine activities (e.g., eating at a restaurant), sexual encounters that are often quite stereotyped should also provide a way of conceptualizing how individuals process stories about sexual encounters. Yet sexual text seems to differ from text commonly used in testing schema/scripting theory in that it may elicit emotional reactions in the reader. Given the "different" or emotional quality of sexual text, this study was designed to determine if the predictions made by schema theory would be confirmed when a sexual text is employed. This study is the first known attempt to test predictions from schema theory for a sexual text.

The SP+T hypothesis assumes that a memory trace contains a "pointer" to the generic script that best fits the activity, along with a set of "tagged actions". The generic script interrelates the various typical actions as a whole, whereas each inconsistent or atypical action is tagged as a functionally separate organizational unit. The SP+T hypothesis predicts that discriminative accuracy should be better for atypical than for typical script actions because each atypical action is "tagged" or processed separately. These predictions have generally been supported (e.g., Graesser et al., 1979). When further testing the SP+T theory, Graesser et al. (1980) found that both recognition and recall memory is initially better for atypical actions, but that the rate of forgetting is also greater for atypical actions.
The present study applied the above schema/scripting theory findings and predicted that atypical or unnecessary script actions would initially be remembered better than typical script actions, but that over time typical script actions would be remembered better as the generic script becomes increasingly important.

The present study also incorporated findings from another line of research relevant to schema/scripting theory. Pichert and Anderson (1977) found that after reading a story from a directed perspective, their subjects recalled significantly more information relevant to their given perspective than to another perspective. The present study applied these findings to sexual text and predicted that the perspective taken by the reader while reading a story about a sexual encounter would affect memory in that the reader should remember more script (or story) actions that are important or relevant to their own perspective.

Some exploratory hypotheses based on "sexual" versus "romantic" recall intrusions and recognition task distractor category were also investigated as part of this study. In light of earlier research which suggested that females may be more responsive to the romantic aspects of erotic literature and males may be more responsive to the sexual aspects (e.g., Sigusch et al. 1970), it was predicted that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would produce more "sexual" recall intrusions and would endorse more "sexual" recognition task distractors than would female subjects. It was also predicted that female subjects, regardless of perspective, would produce more "romantic" recall
intrusions and would endorse more "romantic" recognition task distrac-
tors than would male subjects.

The above predictions were tested by randomly assigning subjects to one of 3 experimental conditions. Subjects were instructed to read a story about a sexual encounter from one of the following 3 perspec-
tives: (1) same-sex perspective, (2) opposite-sex perspective, or (3) no directed perspective. Subjects were then asked to recall and recognize what they remembered from the story immediately after they read the story and 3 days later. The story consisted of Typical and Atypical (or unnecessary) script actions as well as actions that were to be judged as being important to either a "male" or "female" perspec-
tive.

Analysis of Subject Perspective

The predictions based upon subject perspective could not be tested. We were unable to identify a set of "male perspective" or "female perspective" sentences based on responses to the Perceived Importance Task. However, findings from those analyses did indicate that on 6 out of 7 sentences on which a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found (#5, 7, 11, 32, 33, and 38), male and female control subjects rated these sentences on the Perceived Importance Task much like male and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condi-
tion. That is, there was not significant difference for perceived importance means on these 6 sentences between control subjects and subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. This finding suggests that both subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and control
subjects viewed these sentences as being important to their "natural" perspective (i.e. male or female, depending on the sex of the subject). Appendix J contains a listing of sentences by number. Comparing Appendix J to the list of Typical and Atypical sentences found in Appendices E and F, respectively, it can be seen that sentence #5 consists of a Typical script action, sentences #7, 32, and 33 consist of Atypical script actions, and sentences #11 and 38 are "filler" actions. It is interesting to note that for 2 of these sentences (#5: "He caresses Mary's breasts through her clothing" and #11: "Then he slowly moves his hand down"), John initiates the sexual activity. However, there was no behavior initiated by Mary in any of these 6 sentences. This finding suggests that in those instances in which sentences are perceived as being more important for one sex than the other, the male initiated sentences are so identified. For both males and females who are "naturally" assuming their "biological" (i.e. same-sex) perspective, male-initiated sexual activity seems to be remembered as being more important to a sexual encounter than female-initiated sexual activity.

There is only one sentence, #14 ("They both quickly sit down on the couch"), on which a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found in which there also is a significant difference on perceived importance means between control subjects and subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. On this sentence, which is categorized as Atypical, there is a significant difference between perceived importance means for male control subjects and male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. The male subjects in the same-sex perspective
condition rated this sentence as being more important to their given perspective than the control group of male subjects. It is unclear as to why male control subjects and male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition did not rate this sentence as being similarly important to their given (i.e. male) perspective.

Further comparison between perceived importance means on the 7 sentences for which a significant Sex x Perspective interaction was found (i.e. #5, 7, 11, 14, 32, 33, and 38) revealed that neither sex was "better" at assuming the opposite-sex perspective on these sentences. However, for sentence #7 ("She starts to quiver in pleasure"), which is an Atypical sentence, the difference between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective and male control subjects was significant (and the difference between male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and female control subjects was nonsignificant), suggesting that male subjects in the control condition were "better" at assuming the opposite-sex perspective than females on this particular sentence. Perhaps males were better able to "think" like females while rating this sentence because it is clearly describing a physiological component of sexual arousal (i.e. "quiver") which they have actually experienced. However, if this is true, it is unclear as to why this differential ability to assume the opposite-sex perspective did not affect the perceived importance ratings for other sentences which also describe a physiological response (e.g., #6: "Mary now begins to get really turned on", #18: "Mary focuses on the intense feelings of pleasure that she is now experiencing"). It is certainly possible that the finding for sentence #7 (that male subjects in the control condi-
tion reported being better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective than females) is a chance finding.

Analysis of the subject perspective data also indicated that a significant main effect for sex was found for sentences #13, 20, 22, 26, 31, 35, and 37. Comparing these sentences to the list of Typical and Atypical sentences found in Appendices E and F, respectively, it can be seen that sentences #13, 20, 22, and 37 consist of Typical script actions and sentences #26, 31, and 35 consist of Atypical script actions. It was found that the mean perceived importance rating for males was significantly higher than the mean rating for females for every one of these sentences, with the exception of #35 ("They both whisper I love you"), on which the mean importance rating for females was significantly higher than the mean importance rating for males. These findings are generally consistent with the literature which suggests that males attend more to the "sexual" aspects of erotic text and females attend more to the "romantic" aspects. Each of the 6 sentences that were rated higher in importance by males described specific sexual behaviors (#13: "Then he kisses her breasts", #20: "She feels his penis", #22: "She touches his bare penis", #26: "She guides his head down to her genital area", #31: "She slowly licks his penis", and #37: "Then he enters Mary's vagina from behind"), with 4 of the 6 sentences describing behaviors performed by the female (i.e. Mary) on the male (i.e. John).

It can be noted that the finding reported above which suggests that males attend more to the "sexual" aspects and females attend more to the "romantic" aspects of erotic text differs somewhat from the
finding reported by Broussard and Geer (1988), who used the same set of

typical sexual actions in their study. In their study, it was found

that female subjects, as opposed to male subjects, judged sentences

which described sexual behaviors performed by John "on" Mary as being

more sexually arousing. This finding contrasts with the finding from

the present study that males rated behaviors performed by the female

"on" the male as being more important. Across both studies, however,

it seems that subjects rated sexual behaviors performed "on" the same

sex (as subject) character (i.e. John or Mary) as being more salient

(i.e. more important or arousing).

A direct comparison between the present study and the Broussard

and Geer (1988) study should be made with caution for several reasons.

First of all, the methodologies utilized in these 2 studies are quite

different, as Broussard and Geer used a paired-comparison task to

obtain their arousal judgements. A paired-comparison task in which

perspective was not manipulated may be somewhat less complex than the

perspective induction used in the present study. It should be noted

also that the Broussard and Geer study obtained judgements on arousal

whereas the present study assessed perceived importance. Lastly,

social desirability factors may have been more evident in the present

study in that female subjects who put themselves into the role of Mary

may have been less likely to report female-initiated sexual behaviors

as being more important to the story given societal inhibitions against

such behaviors.

Results of examining the correlation between recall frequency and

perceived importance will now be discussed as they seem to be relevant
to the above findings. In regard to the hypothesized positive rela-
tionship between perceived importance ratings and recall frequency,
results indicated that no such relationship exists. This is at
variance with many studies of memory for sentences in non-emotional and
non-sexual text. It had been predicted that subjects would recall what
they considered to be important or "worth remembering" given their
perspective. Given the lack of relationship between perceived impor-
tance and recall, it cannot be assumed that males rated sexually
explicit sentences as being more important to their perspective because
they just happened to remember these particular sentences better than
other sentences. Similarly, it cannot be assumed that females remem-
bered sentence #35 ("They whisper I love you") better than other
sentences just because they rated this sentence as being important to
their perspective. Rather, perhaps males would have rated the sexually
explicit sentences as being important (in a sexual encounter) whether
or not they even read the story. Similarly, females may have rated
sentence #35 as being important in whatever context the rating was
taken. That is, it seems that neither accuracy of memory or perspec-
tive taken while reading the story can account for the above findings.
The subject perspective manipulation failed to yield results consistent
with prior research on memory for text. Analyses of the individual
sentences for perspective effects yielded limited findings. These
issues will be discussed later in the "Summary and Integration."
Analysis of Recall and Recognition Task Data

Results of the recall and recognition task data will now be discussed. The prediction that male subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "sexual" recall intrusions than female subjects was confirmed at both immediate and delayed (3 days later) recall. This finding is consistent with schema theory in that males' schema (or script) of a sexual encounter most likely consists of more "sexual" than "romantic" aspects. However, the prediction that males would also endorse more "sexual" recognition task distractors than females was not supported, as a main effect for sex was found on only immediate and delayed recall measures. It was expected that female subjects, regardless of perspective, would evidence more "romantic" recall intrusions and would endorse more "romantic" recognition task distractors than male subjects at both immediate and delayed recall. The results obtained did not support that expectation. Interestingly, it was found that male subjects, regardless of perspective, evidenced more "romantic" (in addition to "sexual") recall intrusions than female subjects at immediate recall.

When examining the above results, it becomes evident that males revealed "inaccurate" immediate recall memory in regard to both the "sexual" and "romantic" aspects of the story, whereas females did not reveal such memory distortions. Males also revealed inaccurate delayed recall memory for the "sexual" aspects of the story.

It is important to note that no sex differences were found on the recognition task. Thus, sex differences in "romantic" and "sexual" memory distortions (as measured by recall intrusions of the endorsement
of recognition distractors) occurred only when subjects were required to reconstruct their memory representations (recall task) and not when they were asked to merely recognize what they remembered reading (recognition task).

In order to better understand these results, it is necessary to briefly review the exploratory hypotheses upon which part of this study is based. Based upon earlier research which suggested that females may be more responsive to the romantic aspects of erotic literature and males may be more responsive to the sexual aspects (e.g., Sigusch et al., 1970), it was hypothesized that females would reveal more "romantic" recall intrusions and would endorse more "romantic" recognition task distractors than males. Similarly, it was expected that male subjects would reveal more "sexual" recall intrusions and would endorse more "sexual" recognition task distractors than females. It was believed that these main effects would occur because 2 out of the 3 groups of male subjects (i.e. the control subjects and same-sex perspective condition subjects) would be reading the story from a "male perspective", and 2 out of the 3 groups of female subjects (i.e. the control subjects and same-sex perspective condition subjects) would be reading the story from a "female perspective".

There are several possible explanations for the finding that males evidenced both more "romantic" and "sexual" recall intrusions at immediate recall than females. First of all, it may be that prior experience with sexually explicit stimuli affected the obtained results. Perhaps males, as opposed to females, have had more experience reading erotic literature (i.e. pornography), allowing them
to more easily integrate new information (i.e. the story about a sexual encounter) with prior knowledge (i.e. schema/script for a sexual encounter). That is, as schema theory predicts, prior knowledge or exposure facilitates the comprehension and memory (not necessarily accurate) of new (related) information (e.g., Anderson et al., 1977; Morris et al., 1981). It is possible that males were better able to integrate the story they read into their schema or script of a sexual encounter because they have had more experience (i.e. previous exposure to sexually explicit stimuli) to do so. That is, perhaps males' schema or script of a sexual encounter is "richer" than females, allowing for better integration of the new information with prior knowledge. Once new knowledge is integrated with prior knowledge, schema theory predicts inaccurate retrieval of the new knowledge (at immediate recall, closer in time to when the process of integration occurs). The results of this study support that explanation as males revealed inaccurate immediate recall memory of both the "sexual" and "romantic" aspects of the story they read. Along these lines, the finding that males revealed only more "sexual" recall intrusions than females at delayed recall is also consistent with schema theory in that over time (i.e. at delayed recall) one's generic schema of a sexual encounter (primarily sexual in content for males) becomes more cognitively "available" (e.g., Graesser et al., 1980; Kintsch, 1977). Thus, males may have initially reported (incorrectly) remembering both "romantic" and "sexual" aspects of the story because the "richness" or complexity of their schema/script for a sexual encounter allowed for better integration (and consequently inaccurate retrieval). Over time, at
delayed recall, they may have inaccurately recalled only more "sexual" aspects of the story because their schema for a sexual encounter (which is more sexual in content) became more "available".

The finding that sex differences were only evidenced on recall, and not recognition, measures is consistent with the above interpretations. It seems that the reconstructive nature of the recall task somehow "accessed" subjects' memory representations (i.e. schemata) more readily than the recognition task, which is more limited in regard to subject response. The recall task appears to have allowed subjects to embellish, using their schemata, upon their memories of the "sexual" and "romantic" aspects of the story more than the recognition task. The finding that males embellished upon their immediate recall memory more than females is not surprising and suggests, as discussed above, that males incorrectly recalled more "romantic" and "sexual" aspects of the story than females at immediate recall because they were able to integrate new information with prior knowledge, causing inaccurate retrieval of the new information (i.e. recall intrusions). It is possible that females did not evidence these recall intrusions because their schema of a sexual encounter is somewhat more restricted, possibly due to more limited exposure to sexually explicit material (i.e. pornography).

Another possible explanation for the finding of sex differences only on the recall measures may be related to the particular aspects of the methodology used in the present study. Subjects were asked to report their memory of the story by either endorsing the sentences they remembered reading in the story (recognition task) or by free recall.
Neither of these tasks allowed for measurement of subject response time. A related study recently conducted by Geer and McGlone (1988) demonstrated sex differences in response time on a recognition task measuring the number of "romantic" and "erotic" sentences correctly identified from a story about a sexual encounter. These investigators found that females took less time to identify romantic sentences and accurately recognized more romantic sentences than males. It is certainly possible that differential response times (not measured in this study) might have influenced the results obtained in the present study.

A final possible explanation for the finding of sex differences only on the recall task may be that females were more reluctant than males to report memory of a sexually explicit story due to societal inhibitions against explicit sexual expression in females. That is, perhaps females felt uncomfortable reporting their memories of sexually explicit information because the reporting of such information from females is not as well-accepted in this culture as it is from males. This interpretation is consistent with the findings reported by Geer and McGlone (1988) that females were both less accurate at identifying "erotic" sentences and slower to respond on a recognition task containing "erotic" sentences. Thus, a response bias factor may have influenced the results obtained in both the Geer and McGlone (1988) and present studies.

Although no sex differences were found on the recognition task, it can be noted that all subjects endorsed significantly more "sexual" than "romantic" recognition task distractors at both immediate and
delayed recall. It may be that all subjects simply remembered that they had read a sexually explicit story, and therefore reasoned that sexually explicit behaviors must have been included in the story. Further, females may have been more likely to report memory of sexually explicit information on the recognition task because it is somehow less revealing. That is, perhaps females were more likely to "admit" to their sexually explicit memories when they were not required to write their sexually explicit responses (i.e. recall task), but were asked to only identify the sexually explicit sentences they remembered (i.e. recognition task).

Analysis of Atypical/Typical Script Actions

Results of the analyses testing the Atypical/Typical script action hypotheses will now be discussed. These results are also based on the data from the recall and recognition tasks, but, as in previous chapters, they will be discussed separately because of the different content of the hypotheses/predictions.

It was predicted that for all subjects, recall and recognition memory would be better for Atypical (unnecessary) script actions than for Typical script actions at immediate recall. It was also predicted that for all subjects at delayed recall there would be both a decrease in the number of Atypical script actions recalled and recognized and an increase in the number of Typical script actions recalled and recognized. These predictions were based on research from schema/scripting theory which suggested that initially Atypical script actions would be remembered better as they are "tagged" separately in memory (Graesser
et al., 1979; 1980), but over time typical script actions should become more "available" as one's general schema for a sexual encounter becomes increasingly important (e.g., Bartlett, 1932; Graesser et al., 1980; Kintsch, 1977).

Although the above predictions were not supported by this study, the results did approach significance for the prediction that recall memory would be better for atypical script actions at immediate recall. Since this study is the first known attempt to test scripting theory for a sexual text, the atypical sexual actions designed for this particular study were not modeled after any previous research on sexual script actions. It does seem that we are on the "right track" in the first attempt to identify atypical script actions as the results did approach significance, providing partial support for the schema/scripting theory prediction that more atypical script actions will be remembered at immediate recall.

The results of this study did not support the schema/scripting theory prediction that over time memory for atypical script actions would decrease and memory for typical script actions would increase. Results did show, however, that all subjects did better at correctly identifying script actions on the recognition task than they did at remembering these actions on the free recall task. This finding is not surprising given the different nature of the tasks (i.e. recognition versus reconstructive memory).
Analysis of Possible Moderating Variables

Other variables were investigated to examine their role, if any, in affecting the results obtained.

**Sexual Experience**

The prediction that all subjects would have better recognition and recall memory for the sexual activities in which they frequently engage was not supported. It appears that differential sexual experience did not affect the findings of this study regarding Atypical/Typical script actions, as sexual experience was not found to correlate with recall or recognition memory of Atypical or Typical script actions.

**Sexual Arousal**

Results suggest that sexual arousal is only correlated ($r=.177$, $p<.047$) with recognition of Atypical script actions at delayed recall, and that there are no differences in arousal based on subject group. It is unclear as to why arousal is only associated with recognition of Atypical script actions. Given the aforementioned finding that, contrary to expectation, subjects did not recognize less Atypical script actions at delayed recall than they recognized at immediate recall, it is possible that sexual arousal (across all subjects) somehow facilitated the recognition of Atypical script actions at delayed recall.

**Sex Differences in Ability to Assume the Opposite-Sex Perspective**

It was hypothesized that a differential ability of males and females to assume the opposite-sex perspective may have occurred and might have influenced the obtained results. Analysis of the Perceived Importance Task data indicated that neither sex reported being better
at assuming the opposite-sex perspective as all correlation coefficients obtained (between perceived importance means for each subject group) were approximately equal. That is, both males and females in the opposite-sex perspective condition rated sentences on their perceived importance significantly differently than did females and males, respectively, in the same-sex and control conditions.

**Manipulation Check**

Results of the Manipulation Check Questionnaire were examined in order to determine if the perspective manipulation was equally successful for all subjects. It was found that males in both the same-sex and opposite-sex perspective conditions felt that they were better able to assume their directed perspective than females in the opposite-sex perspective condition. It was also found that both males and females in the same-sex perspective condition felt that they were better able to assume their directed perspective than males and females in the opposite-sex perspective conditions, respectively. Across both males and females, then, it seems that it was easier for subjects to assume the perspective of their own rather than the opposite sex. However, males in both the same-sex and opposite-sex conditions seemed to feel as though they were better able to assume their directed perspective than females in the opposite-sex perspective condition. It can be noted, however, that the results of the Perceived Importance Task (discussed above) suggested that neither sex is better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective. Thus, it seems that males may have "over-estimated" their ability to assume the opposite-sex perspective (or females may have underestimated their ability). It appears that across
all subject groups, females in the opposite-sex perspective condition rated themselves as least able to assume their given perspective, although results from the Perceived Importance Task suggest that neither sex is better at assuming the opposite-sex perspective (at least in regard to rating sentences on their perceived importance).

It is possible that the results obtained on this questionnaire were influenced by the "demand characteristics" (Orne, 1959) of the study in that subjects may have been more likely to report that it was easier for them to assume the same-sex perspective since this perspective seems "natural" to them. These factors may have affected the responses of female subjects more than male subjects on this questionnaire because females may have found it particularly awkward and socially undesirable to admit that it was easier to assume the male rather than the female perspective in the context of a sexually explicit story.

Summary and Integration

Subject Perspective

The predictions based upon subject perspective were not confirmed or disconfirmed as we were unable to identify a set of "male perspective" or "female perspective" sentences based on responses to the Perceived Importance Task. It was found, however, that both males and females in the control and same-sex perspective conditions remembered male-initiated sexual actions as being more important to the story than female-initiated sexual actions, suggesting that both sexes may have remembered male-initiated sexual behavior because their schema or
script for a sexual encounter consists of male-initiated activity. Other findings suggested that neither sex was "better" able to assume the opposite-sex perspective on the Perceived Importance Task with the exception of differences found on one sentence (which may be a chance finding) describing a physiological component of sexual arousal on which males (in the same-sex and control conditions) seemed to be better at assuming the opposite-sex (i.e. female) perspective. This solitary sentence finding makes sense since it is the female in the story who responds physiologically by "quivering" in pleasure on this particular sentence. Thus, it seems that males assumed that females would remember this sentence as being important to the story. Why similar sentences did not show this effect is not known and urges caution in overinterpreting this finding.

On the 7 sentences for which a significant main effect for sex was found, male subjects rated 6 of the sentences, all describing explicit sexual behaviors, as being more important to their perspective than did females. Only one sentence was rated as being more important by females, and this sentence was clearly romantic in nature. These findings provide some general support for the literature which suggests that males attend to the "sexual" aspects of erotic text and females attend to the "romantic" aspects. In fact, the sex effect seems to have been more powerful than the perspective manipulation in producing these results. That is, it seems that male and female subjects "thought" like males and females, respectively, in spite of the opposite-sex perspective manipulation.
It appears that subjects performed on the Perceived Importance Task in a manner generally consistent with how they would have performed without the perspective induction. Perhaps it is too difficult or "foreign" for males and females to maintain an opposite-sex "cognitive set" due to overlearning. That is, in our culture males and females are generally taught to perform like males and females in a variety of contexts, including sexual. Even though subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition were explicitly requested to "try on the shoes" of the opposite-sex, they were unable to successfully do this as they responded on the Perceived Importance Task much like they would have responded without the perspective induction. It appears that what was perceived as important in the story about a sexual encounter remained important regardless of the opposite-sex perspective manipulation. Subjects for the most part encoded the story from the perspective of their own biological sex (i.e. much like subjects in the same-sex perspective condition). Further, some of the information that was encoded and perceived as important differed between the sexes. The difference between what males and females perceive as important is consistent with the notion of sex-role stereotyping in that on 6 sentences males perceived sexually explicit actions as being more important, and females only rated one "romantic" sentence as being more important to the story they read.

Recall and Recognition Tasks

Results of this study revealed an important finding that males evidenced "inaccurate" immediate recall memory in regard to both the "sexual" and "romantic" aspects of the story, whereas females did not
show as many memory distortions (i.e. recall intrusions). Males also revealed inaccurate delayed recall memory for the "sexual" aspects of the story. In light of the literature on cognitive processing which does not support the notion or sex differences in information processing, the sex differences in recall memory found in the present study are particularly valuable. The findings of the present study suggest that studying the processing of sexual text is an effective way of investigating sex differences in cognitive processing. There are several possible explanations consistent with schema theory for the sex differences obtained in the present study. Perhaps males were initially better able to integrate new information (i.e. the story) with prior knowledge (i.e. an enriched schema/script of a sexual encounter) than females due to more previous exposure to sexually explicit stimuli. Schema theory predicts inaccurate retrieval (at immediate recall) after the process of integration occurs, and male subjects, in fact, revealed more "sexual" and "romantic" immediate recall intrusions, suggesting that the process of integration (which produces the inaccuracy) did indeed occur for males. Over time, at delayed recall, males may have inaccurately recalled only more "sexual" aspects of the story because their schema or script for a sexual encounter is more sexual in content, and it became more "available". This interpretation is also consistent with schema theory in that over time (i.e. delayed recall) one's generic schema or script of a sexual encounter should become more cognitively available. Results of this study reveal that males evidenced fewer "romantic" recall intrusions over time (and less
inaccuracy in their "romantic" memory), whereas females consistently revealed no "romantic" recall intrusions.

It is interesting to note that no sex differences in "romantic" versus "sexual" memory were found on the recognition task, possibly because only the recall task allowed subjects to embellish upon their schema for a sexual encounter, with males having more to embellish upon than females given their prior exposure to sexually explicit stimuli.

Another possible explanation for the finding of sex differences only on the recall task may be due to particular aspects of methodology utilized in the present study. It is possible that differential subject response times, not measured in this study, might have influenced the present results in that females might have revealed more recall intrusions and endorsed more recognition task distractors if they were allowed more response time. Perhaps it takes females longer than males to "access" their schema for a sexual encounter. In addition, it may also be that females were more reluctant than males to report memory of a sexually explicit story due to societal inhibitions against the reporting of such information. The difference between data-driven and schema-driven retrieval processes (discussed later) may also have affected the results obtained.

The finding of sex differences only on the recall (and not recognition) measures merits further discussion given its implications for studying how men and women process sexual text in the context of schema theory. In the present study, recall task results suggested that males and females in the control, same-sex, and opposite-sex perspective conditions encoded the information they read in a similar
manner, consistent with their own biological sex. That is, males and females in all 3 experimental conditions processed (and later retrieved) the information they read from their "natural" or biological perspective, regardless of the experimental instructions (i.e. the opposite sex perspective manipulation). However, it was expected that subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition would process, and later remember, the story they read from the perspective of the opposite sex. Recall and recognition task results indicated that this did not occur. It appears, then, that sex differences in the processing (and recalling) of sexual text are stronger than we had anticipated, as our opposite-sex perspective manipulation was not powerful enough to "overcome" the effects due to subject sex. This is an important finding, and suggests that males and females do process sexual text according to their own schema/script for a sexual encounter. Further, efforts to induce subjects to "unlearn" what they have obviously overlearned were unsuccessful. That is, we were unable to induce males to "think" like females and females to "think" like males on the recall tasks. Men and women appear to respond to a story about a sexual encounter according to their own schema or script of a sexual encounter, which has most likely been determined by multiple factors (e.g., biological, sociocultural).

When further considering the discrepant findings obtained on the recall and recognition tasks, it seems reasonable to assume that subject response bias factors affected the results obtained, particularly on the recognition task. Alba and Hasher (1983) discuss several response biases (in the context of schema theory) that might
influence subject performance on recall and recognition tasks. These researchers note that free recall tends to be a form of organized retrieval (schema-driven), whereas recognition memory is primarily data-driven. This notion is consistent with the findings of the present study that the free recall task seemed to allow subjects to rely more on their schemata than did the recognition task. Alba and Hasher (1983) propose that when subjects see familiar (but incorrect) items on a recognition task, they respond due to a response bias to respond to what is familiar, and not due to the effects of schemata. Further, when subjects are particularly unsure about their memory representation, they are likely to assume that the item (or items) was, in fact, in the text they read (external attribution bias). Perhaps all subjects in the present study endorsed more "sexual" than "romantic" distractors on the recognition task because they were unsure, but reasoned that the listed "sexual" actions must have been included in the story they read since they were previously told that they were to read a story about a sexual (and not a romantic) encounter (external attribution bias).

It is important to note that the sex differences obtained in this study are most likely a function of not only the dependent measures used (e.g., response bias factors), but also of the stimulus materials (i.e. the story). The story did seem to "access" subjects' schema or script of a sexual encounter, as evident by the recall task results. It is encouraging to find that our attempt (which is the first known attempt) at testing the predictions of schema theory for a sexual script has proved to be valuable in that we now know much more about
how men and women process sexual text. We have utilized an heuristic approach, based upon the predictions of schema/scripting theory, to interpret the results obtained. That is, heuristics allow for attention to certain forms of information (and less emphasis on others) in developing judgments. We have related our findings to the model (i.e. schema/scripting theory) used to predict these findings in an effort to further our advancement and understanding of schema/scripting theory. Our findings indicate that men and women do, in fact, process sexual text differently. Further, our interpretation of the findings obtained suggests that men and women do appear to process sexual text according to their own schema or script for a sexual encounter. Finally, we now know that men and women will process sexual text according to their own (biological) perspective, in spite of our efforts to change this.

**Atypical/Typical Script Actions**

The predictions regarding immediate and delayed recall and recognition of Atypical and Typical script actions were not supported by this study. However, the results did approach significance for the prediction that recall memory of Atypical script actions would be better at immediate as opposed to delayed recall, providing partial support for the schema/scripting theory prediction that more Atypical script actions will be remembered at immediate recall. It is possible that the Atypical and Typical sentence categories utilized in this study (and based upon their use by cognitive researchers) may have a different meaning when applied to sexual text. Perhaps what is viewed as atypical, or unnecessary, in a sexual encounter needs to be more closely defined. It may be that what is perceived both as unnecessary
(or unimportant) and necessary (or important) becomes different when emotional (i.e. sexual) material is used as previous research has demonstrated that perceived importance is important to memory for non-sexual text. Perhaps importance variables affect memory more for unfamiliar than familiar text. Although subjects in the present study had not previously read the particular story utilized, it is likely that they have read (or been exposed in some way to) similar stories. Perhaps the perceived importance ratings obtained in this study did not effectively measure importance because subjects were more familiar with the sexual text (as opposed to text commonly used in cognitive scripting research).

**Possible Moderating Variables**

Results suggest that sexual experience did not affect the findings of this study regarding memory for Atypical and Typical script actions. Further, there appear to be no differences in sexual arousal based on subject group which could have affected the results obtained. However, an association was found between arousal and recognition of Atypical script actions at delayed recall, suggesting that perhaps sexual arousal somehow facilitated the recognition of Atypical script actions at delayed recall. Sex research is characterized by a lack of relationship between demographic variables and sexual arousal. Perhaps this lack of relationship generalizes to this domain (i.e. sexual text).

Results of the manipulation check Questionnaire suggest that both males and females (in the same-sex perspective condition) felt that they were better able to assume the same-sex perspective than the opposite-sex perspective. However, it was also found that males felt
that it was easier to assume the opposite-sex perspective than did females. That is, males seemed to feel as though it was easier to put themselves into the role of the female in the story than females felt about assuming the role of the male. This finding differs from the finding reported above that neither sex was better able to assume the opposite-sex perspective on the Perceived Importance Task. It seems that males may have overestimated their ability to assume the opposite-sex perspective (or females may have underestimated their ability). Further, it may be that females found it somewhat awkward and socially undesirable to admit that it was easier to assume the male rather than the female perspective in the context of a sexually explicit story (i.e. response bias factors). Of course, it is also possible that there is some individual difference which we did not effectively assess.

Suggestions for Future Research

The results of this study suggest several promising lines of research which might be pursued in order to evaluate more fully the role of schema/scripting theory in predicting how men and women process stories about sexual encounters.

It is believed that the sexual script utilized in the present study is more "emotional" in content than the scripts commonly used by cognitive psychologists investigating schema/scripting theory. In order to more closely examine the role of emotion and affective responding to a sexual script, it would prove informative to design a
study which investigates and compares an emotionally salient sexual script to a sexual script that is more neutral.

The role of prior exposure to sexually explicit literature should also be more closely examined in future research in order to confirm or disconfirm the findings of this study which suggest that prior exposure to sexual text facilitates the process of integration (by "accessing" subjects' schema for a sexual encounter), leading to inaccurate immediate memory retrieval (i.e. "sexual" and "romantic" recall intrusions) for males. It would be interesting to know how much exposure and what kind of exposure is necessary to "enrich" one's schema or script of a sexual encounter.

It seems that the free recall task appears to be a particularly useful dependent measure to use in future studies investigating schema/scripting theory as it allows subjects to reconstruct their memory representations (schemata) more fully. Future researchers investigating recall intrusions should consider omitting some of the typical sexual actions used in the present story in order to "leave something to the imagination," thus increasing the probability of obtaining "sexual" recall intrusions from all subjects.

It can be noted that this study examined "inaccurate" and not "accurate" memory for the "sexual" and "romantic" aspects of sexual text. That is, only recall intrusions and recognition task distractors were used as measures of sexual and romantic memory. It seems that identifying "sexual" and "romantic" sentences a priori (as independent variables) would prove useful in investigating the accuracy of memory for these aspects of text as the number of "sexual" and "romantic"
sentences correctly recalled and recognized would further increase our understanding of male and female schemata for a sexual encounter. The present results suggest that males and females do, in fact, utilize their schemata for a sexual encounter when reading a story about a sexual encounter. If females' schemata for a sexual encounter are primarily "romantic," then more clearly "romantic" sentences should be included in the story.

Response time is another measure that would be useful to incorporate into future studies utilizing a learning and recall paradigm. It may be that the results obtained in this study are partially due to the methodology employed, which was time-limited in regard to subject response time.

It may also prove interesting for future researchers to administer an interpolated task to only some subjects, allowing for closer examination of the role of rehearsal in subjects' reconstructive memory. It may be that subjects' schemata for a sexual encounter will become even more accessible if they are allowed time to more fully integrate (through rehearsal) what they read. This should provide researchers with "richer" recall protocols.

Lastly, it seems that attempting to manipulate subject perspective (regarding sex) may not be an effective methodology to utilize when investigating the role of schema/scripting theory in how men and women process sexually explicit text. Interestingly, sex differences (i.e. main effects for sex) were found in the present study regardless of the opposite-sex perspective manipulation, suggesting that males and females process sexual text by utilizing their schema or script for a
sexual encounter in spite of our efforts to modify this. Perhaps we should now focus on understanding more fully how men and women utilize their own schemata when processing sexual stimuli. The present study proves valuable in this quest as we now have an effective way of investigating sex differences in the processing of sexual text. By utilizing sexual text, we have been able to identify sex differences in cognitive processing for the first time, as the previous literature on cognitive processing is not suggestive of such sex differences. We now know that men and women do in fact, process sexually information differently. Our findings reveal that men and women remember sexual text differently, as evidenced by differences obtained on our objective measures of cognitive processing (i.e. recall tasks). We also know that men and women utilize their schema for a sexual encounter when reading a story about a sexual encounter. The present results further suggest that males' schemata for a sexual encounter are more "enriched" and sexual in content than females' schemata. It is believed that the results obtained in the present study have significantly advanced our understanding of the role of cognition in the processing of sexual text.
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Appendix A
Recall Effects:

After we categorize each sentence by its importance to perspective, two 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's will be computed. The dependent variable for the first ANOVA will be the number of male perspective sentences correctly recalled by each subject. A main effect for sex is predicted such that male subjects, regardless of perspective, will recall more male perspective sentences than will female subjects. No main effect for perspective is predicted. A Sex x Perspective interaction is predicted such that subjects in the "male perspective" condition (i.e. male subjects in the control condition, male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition) will recall more male perspective sentences than will subjects in the "female perspective" condition (i.e. female subjects in the control condition, female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition). Three contrasts will be made in order to examine the effectiveness of the male perspective manipulation. The first contrast will be between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. The second contrast will be between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition. Assuming that the perspective manipulation was effective, if differences are found, this would go against our expectations. An additional contrast will also be made. Male subjects in the control condition and male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition will be contrasted with female subjects in the control condition and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. It is predicted that, if the perspective manipulation was successful, the two groups of male subjects will be better at recalling the male perspective sentences than will the two groups of female subjects.

The dependent variable for the second 2 x 3 ANOVA will be the number of female perspective sentences correctly recalled. A main effect for sex is predicted such that female subjects, regardless of perspective, will recall more female perspective sentences than will male subjects. No main effect for perspective is predicted. It is predicted that there will be a Sex x Perspective interaction such that subjects in the "female perspective" condition (i.e. female subjects in the control condition, female subjects in the same-sex condition, and male subjects in the opposite-sex condition) will recall more female perspective sentences than will subjects in the "male perspective" condition (i.e. male subjects in the control condition, male subjects in the same-sex, and female subjects in the opposite-sex condition). Three contrasts will be made in order to examine the effectiveness of the female perspective manipulation. The first contrast will be between male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. The second contrast
will be between male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition. If differences are found, this would go against our expectations. For the third contrast, female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition will be contrasted with male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition. If the female perspective manipulation was successful, the two groups of female subjects should recall more female perspective sentences than the two groups of male subjects.

**Perceived Importance Task Ratings:**

In order to further evaluate the role of perspective, two 2 (male or female) x 3 (same-sex, opposite-sex, or no directed perspective) ANOVA's will be computed on the data obtained from the sentences categorized as being important to a male or female perspective. The dependent variable for the first ANOVA will be each subject’s mean perceived importance rating for the set of sentences that were identified as being from the male perspective. A main effect for sex is predicted such that male subjects, regardless of perspective, will rate the male perspective sentences as being more important than will female subjects. No main effect for perspective is predicted. Most importantly, a Sex x Perspective interaction is predicted such that male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, male subjects in the control condition, and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition will rate the male perspective sentences as being more important than will female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, female control subjects, and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition. In order to more closely examine the effects of the male perspective induction, female control subjects will be contrasted with female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition in order to determine if a significant difference for perceived importance of the male perspective sentences exists between these 2 subject groups. If a significant difference is found, we can conclude that the "male perspective" induction was successful for female subjects in the opposite-sex condition.

Two additional contrasts will also to be made in order to further examine the effectiveness of the male perspective manipulation. The first contrast will be between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, and the second contrast will be between female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and male subjects in the control condition. Assuming that the perspective manipulation was successful, if significant differences are found, this would go against our expectations.

The dependent variable for the second 2 x 3 ANOVA will be each subject’s mean perceived importance rating for the set of sentences that were identified as being from a female perspective. A main effect for sex is predicted such that female subjects, regardless of perspective,
will rate the female perspective sentences as being more important than will male subjects. No main effect for perspective is predicted. Most importantly, a Sex x Perspective interaction is predicted such that female subjects in the control condition, female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition, and male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition will rate the female perspective sentences as being more important than will male subjects in the control condition, male subjects in the same-sex condition, and female subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition. If a significant difference between these 2 subject groups is found for perceived importance of the female perspective sentences, we can conclude that the "female perspective" induction was effective for male subjects in the opposite-sex condition.

Two additional contrasts will also be made in order to further examine the role of the female perspective manipulation. The first contrast will be between male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the same-sex perspective condition. The second contrast will be between male subjects in the opposite-sex perspective condition and female subjects in the control condition. Assuming that the perspective manipulation was successful, if significant differences are found, this would go against our expectations.
Appendix B
SUBJECT CONSENT FORM

Please read the following statements carefully and sign your name below only when you fully understand the study and what is being asked of you. Your signature is required for participation.

The policy of both LSU and the Department of Psychology is that all research participation in the Department is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time, without prejudice, should you object to any aspect of the research. You should also know that your responses are confidential. No one will be able to identify you with the material you provide. Any report of data collected will be in summary form, without identifying individuals.

In this experiment you will first be asked to read a story that describes the details of a sexual encounter. What you will read is very sexually explicit, and may be offensive to some of you. If you believe that you may be offended by sexually explicit material, please do not participate in this study. After you read the story you will be asked to define some vocabulary words. Then you will be asked to write down what you remember from the story that you read. You will also be asked to identify (from a list of sentences) which sentences you remember as being in the story. Lastly, you will be asked some questions about your sexual experiences. Please remember that all of your responses are completely confidential. Please sign your name below if you agree to participate in this study. After you sign your name, please turn this for over and read the first page of the experimental packet for instructions on what you are to do next.

signature

date
Experimental Instructions for Same-Sex Perspective Condition
(male subjects)

This study is interested in how people think about and remember stories. You are to pretend as though you are the man in the following story. Please try your best to really put yourself in this story. Imagine that whatever the man in this story is doing or feeling, you are doing or feeling. It is very important that you try and put yourself right into what's happening, just as if it were happening to you. This is an explicit story that describes the details of a sexual encounter between a man (John) and a woman (Mary). It is important that you try and put yourself into the role of John while reading this story. Pretend that you are John. Now please turn the page and begin.
Experimental Instructions for Same-Sex Perspective Condition
(female subjects)

This study is interested in how people think about and remember stories. You are to pretend as though you are the woman in the following story. Please try your best to really put yourself in this story. Imagine that whatever the woman in this is doing or feeling, you are doing or feeling. It is very important that you try and put yourself right into what's happening, just as if it were happening to you. This is an explicit story that describes the details of a sexual encounter between a man (John) and a woman (Mary). It is important that you try and put yourself into the role of Mary while reading this story. Pretend that you are Mary. Now please turn the page and begin.
Experimental Instructions for Opposite-Sex Perspective Condition (male subjects)

This study is interested in how people think about and remember stories. This may be difficult and awkward for you, but you are to pretend as though you are the woman in the following story. Please try your best to really put yourself in this story. Imagine that whatever the woman in this story is doing or feeling, you are doing or feeling. It is very important that you try to put yourself right into what's happening, just as if it were happening to you. This is an explicit story that describes the details of a sexual encounter between a man (John) and a woman (Mary). Although this may be hard for you, it is important you try and put yourself into the role of Mary while reading this story. Pretend that you are Mary. Now please turn the page and begin.
Experimental Instructions for Opposite-Sex Perspective Condition (female subjects)

This study is interested in how people think about and remember stories. This may be difficult and awkward for you, but you are to pretend as though you are the man in the following story. Please try your best to really put yourself in this story. Imagine that whatever the man in this story is doing or feeling, you are doing or feeling. It is very important that you try to put yourself right into what’s happening, just as if it were happening to you. This is an explicit story that describes the details of a sexual encounter between a man (John) and a woman (Mary). Although this may be hard for you, it is important you try and put yourself into the role of John while reading this story. Pretend that you are John. Now please turn the page and begin.
Experimental Instructions for the Control Condition

This study is interested in how people think about and remember stories. You will be reading an explicit story that describes the details of a sexual encounter between a man (John) and a woman (Mary). Please read the story carefully. Concentrate on what you are reading. Try to put yourself "right there" in the story. It is very important that you try your best to focus on what you are reading. Please treat this task seriously, and try to do your best. Now please turn the page and begin.
T = Typical

A = Atypical

Mary and John have been looking forward to this evening (A). Mary immediately notices that John's face looks unshaven (A). They kiss each other on the lips (T). John becomes quickly aroused (A) as he caresses Mary's breasts through her clothing (T). Mary now begins to get really turned on (A). She starts to quiver in pleasure (A) as she feels John slip his hand under her blouse and caress her nipples (T). He then fingers her erect nipples (A). Then he slowly moves his hand down and feels her vaginal lips through her panties (T). Then he kisses her breasts (T). They both quickly sit down on the couch (A) and Mary notices John's erect penis through his jeans (A). John slips his hand under Mary's panties (T) and touches her genitals (T). Mary focuses on the intense feelings of pleasure that she is now experiencing (A). Mary moves her hand over John's pants (T) and feels his penis (T). She then moves her hand under his pants (T) and touches his bare penis. (T) John puts his hand over Mary's (A) as she strokes his erect penis. He then puts his fingers into Mary's vagina (T). She guides his head down to her genital area (A) and John kisses her genitals (T). He is really turned on by the wetness of her vagina (A). She reciprocates by kissing his penis (T). Then John kisses Mary's vagina (T) while she slowly licks his penis (A). John feels overwhelmed with desire for Mary (A). Mary also feels consumed by passion (A) as she guides John's penis into her vagina (T). They both whisper "I love you" (A). John withdraws after a few minutes of thrusting. Then he enters Mary's vagina from behind (T). They move together in complete harmony. Finally, they both climax (A).

Please turn to the next page.
Typical (necessary) Sentences:

1. They kiss each other on the lips.
2. He caresses her breasts through her clothing.
3. He caresses her nipples under her clothing.
4. He feels her vaginal lips through her panties.
5. He kisses her breasts.
6. He slips his hand under her panties.
7. He touches her genitals.
8. She moves her hand over his pants.
9. She feels his penis.
10. She moves her hand under his pants.
11. She feels his bare penis.
12. He puts his fingers into her vagina.
13. He kisses her genitals.
14. She kisses his penis.
15. He kisses her vagina.
16. She guides his penis into her vagina.
17. He enters her vagina from behind.
Appendix F
Atypical (unnecessary) sentences:

1. Mary and John have been looking forward to this evening.
2. Mary immediately notices that John's face looks unshaven.
3. John becomes quickly aroused.
4. Mary now begins to get really turned on.
5. She starts to quiver in pleasure.
6. He then finger her erect nipples.
7. They both quickly sit down on the couch.
8. Mary notices John's erect penis.
9. Mary focuses on the intense feelings of pleasure that she is now experiencing.
10. John puts his hands over Mary's.
11. She guides his head down to her genital area.
12. He is really turned on by the wetness of her vagina.
13. She slowly licks his penis.
14. John feels overwhelmed with desire for Mary.
15. Mary also feels consumed by passion.
16. They both whisper "I love you".
17. They both climax.
Appendix G
Interpolated Task

Please rate your present state of sexual arousal by circling the appropriate number on the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not aroused at all</td>
<td>moderately aroused</td>
<td>extremely aroused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: In the test below, the first word in each line is printed in capital letters. Opposite it are four other words. Circle the one word which means the same thing, or most nearly the same thing, as the first word. If you don’t know, guess. Be sure to circle the one word in each line that means the same thing as the first word.

(1) TALK draw eat speak sleep
(2) PERMIT allow sew cut drive
(3) PARDON forgive pound divide tell
(4) COUCH pin eraser sofa glass
(5) REMEMBER swim recall number defy
(6) TUMBLE drink dress fall think
(7) HIDEOUS silvery tilted young dreadful
(8) CORDIAL swift muddy leafy hearty
(9) EVIDENT green obvious skeptical afraid
(10) IMPOSTER conductor officer book pretender
(11) MERIT deserve distrust fight separate
(12) PASCINATE welcome fix stir enchant
(13) INDICATE defy excite signify bicker
(14) IGNORANT red sharp uniformed precise
(15) FORTIFY submerge strengthen vent deaden
(16) RENOWN length head fame loyalty
(17) NARRATE yield buy associate tell
(18) MASSIVE bright large speedy low
(19) HILARITY laughter speed grace malice
(20) SMIRCHED stolen pointed remade soiled
(21) SQUANDER tease belittle cut waste
(22) CAPTION drum ballast heading ape
(23) FACILITATE help turn strip bewilder
(24) JOCOSE humorous paltry fervid plain
(25) APPRISE reduce strew inform delight
(26) RUE eat lament dominate cure
(27) DENIZEN senator inhabitant fish atom
(28) DIVEST dispossess intrude rally pledge
(29) AMULET charm orphan dingo pond
(30) INEXORABLE untidy involatile rigid sparse
(31) SERRATED dried notched armed blunt
(32) LISSOM moldy loose supple convex

Please turn page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOLLIFY</td>
<td>mitigate</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>certain</td>
<td>abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAGIARIZE</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td>intend</td>
<td>revoke</td>
<td>maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIFICE</td>
<td>brush</td>
<td>hole</td>
<td>building</td>
<td>lute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUERULOUS</td>
<td>mechanical</td>
<td>curious</td>
<td>devout</td>
<td>complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARIAH</td>
<td>outcast</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>lentil</td>
<td>locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>waken</td>
<td>ensue</td>
<td>incite</td>
<td>placate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMERITY</td>
<td>rashness</td>
<td>timidity</td>
<td>desire</td>
<td>kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISTINE</td>
<td>vain</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECALL INSTRUCTION SHEET
Same-sex Perspective Condition (Female Subjects)

Please write verbatim (word-for-word) what you can remember from the story you read given your perspective as Mary in the story. Also, please write the gist of what you cannot remember verbatim.

Please turn the page and continue writing on the next page if necessary. If you are through writing, skip the next page and turn to the following page for further instructions.
RECALL INSTRUCTION SHEET
Same-sex Perspective Condition (Male Subjects)

Please write verbatim (word-for-word) what you can remember from the story you read given your perspective as John in the story. Also, please write the gist of what you cannot remember verbatim.

Please turn the page and continue writing on the next page if necessary. If you are through writing, skip the next page and turn to the following page for further instructions.
RECALL INSTRUCTION SHEET
Opposite-sex Perspective Condition (Female Subjects)

Please write verbatim (word-for-word) what you can remember from the story you read given your perspective as John in the story. Also, please write the gist of what you cannot remember verbatim.

Please turn the page and continue writing on the next page if necessary. If you are through writing, skip the next page and turn to the following page for further instructions.
RECALL INSTRUCTION SHEET
Opposite-sex Perspective Condition (Male Subjects)

Please write verbatim (word-for-word) what you can remember from the story you read given your perspective as Mary in the story. Also, please write the gist of what you cannot remember verbatim.

Please turn the page and continue writing on the next page if necessary. If you are through writing, skip the next page and turn to the following page for further instructions.
RECALL INSTRUCTION SHEET (No-direct perspective condition)

Please write verbatim (word-for-word) what you can remember from the story you read. Also, please write the gist of what you cannot remember verbatim.

Please turn the page and continue writing on the next page if necessary. If you are through writing, skip the next page and turn to the following page for further instructions.
Appendix I
Recognition Task

Please indicate which of the following sentences you recognize as being in the story you read by circling "yes" or "no" after each sentence.

1. Then he kisses her breasts. yes no
2. Mary now begins to get really turned on. yes no
3. John puts his hand over Mary's hand. yes no
4. John kisses her genitals. yes no
5. He dims the lights. yes no
6. She guides John's penis into her vagina. yes no
7. John becomes quickly aroused. yes no
8. John slips his hand under Mary's panties. yes no
9. She starts to quiver in pleasure. yes no
10. John sucks Mary's erect nipples. yes no
11. He touches her genitals. yes no
12. Mary and John have been looking forward to this evening. yes no
13. Mary notices John's erect penis through his jeans. yes no
14. Then John kisses Mary's vagina. yes no
15. Mary gazes into John's eyes. yes no
16. He feels her vaginal lips through her panties. yes no
17. Mary sucks John's penis. yes no
18. He caresses Mary's breasts through her clothing. yes no
19. Mary immediately notices that John's face looks unshaven. yes no
20. He tells her how beautiful she looks. yes no
21. He can feel how wet she is becoming. yes no
22. She feels his penis. yes no
23. They both quickly sit down on the couch. yes no
24. He is really turned on by the wetness of her vagina. yes no
25. When they first meet, their hearts beat with anticipation. yes no
26. John feels overwhelmed with desire for Mary. yes no
27. They move their tongues in and out of each other's mouths. yes no
28. She slowly licks his penis. yes no
29. He then puts his fingers into Mary's vagina. yes no
30. Mary is turned on by the smell of John's aftershave lotion. yes no
31. She reciprocates by kissing his penis. yes no
32. Mary focuses on the intense feelings of pleasure that she is now experiencing. yes no
33. Mary moves her hand over John's pants. yes no
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34. He then fingers her erect nipples.  yes no
35. They kiss each other on the lips.  yes no
36. Finally, they both climax.  yes no
37. John puts some soft music on the stereo.  yes no
38. Mary also feels consumed with passion.  yes no
39. She touches his bare penis.  yes no
40. He caresses her nipples.  yes no
41. She guides his head down to her genital area.  yes no
42. She then moves her hand under his pants.  yes no
43. John licks Mary's nipples.  yes no
44. Then he enters Mary's vagina from behind.  yes no
45. They both whisper "I love you."  yes no
46. John lays on top of Mary as he inserts his penis.  yes no
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Appendix J
Perceived Importance Task

Please rate (using the following scale) how important each of the following sentences are to the story you read. Please write the appropriate number in the blank space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not important</td>
<td>mildly</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Mary and John have been looking forward to this evening.
2. Mary immediately notices that John's face looks unshaven.
3. They kiss each other on the lips.
4. John becomes quickly aroused.
5. He caresses Mary's breasts through her clothing.
6. Mary now begins to get really turned on.
7. She starts to quiver in pleasure.
8. See feels John slip his hands under her blouse.
9. He caresses her nipples.
10. He then fingers her erect nipples.
11. Then he slowly mover his hand down.
12. He feels her vaginal lips through her panties.
13. Then he kisses her breasts.
14. They both quickly sit down on the couch.
15. Mary notices John's erect penis through his jeans.
16. John slips his hands under Mary's panties.
17. He touches her genitals.
18. Mary focuses on the intense feelings of pleasure that she is now experiencing.
19. Mary moves her hand over John's pants.
20. She feels his penis.
21. She then moves her hand under his pants.
22. She touches his bare penis.
23. John puts his hands over Mary's.
24. She strokes his erect penis.
25. He then puts his fingers into Mary's vagina.
26. She guides his head down to her genital area.
27. John kisses her genitals.
28. He is really turned on by the wetness of her vagina.
29. She reciprocates by kissing his penis.
30. Then John kisses Mary's vagina.
31. She slowly licks his penis.
32. John feels overwhelmed with desire for Mary.
33. Mary also feels consumed with passion.
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34. She guides John’s penis into her vagina.
35. They both whisper "I love you."
36. John withdraws after a few minutes of thrusting.
37. Then he enters Mary’s vagina from behind.
38. They move together in complete harmony.
39. Finally, they both climax.

Please turn page
Appendix K
SEXUAL EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

Please place a check mark in the space provided before each item if you have engaged in that sexual activity (i.e. indicating that you have done this to someone or someone has done it to you).

_____ 1. Kissing

_____ 2. Kissing with tongue contact

_____ 3. Manual manipulation of clad (dressed) female breast by male

_____ 4. Manual manipulation of unclad female breast by male

_____ 5. Manual manipulation of female genitalia by male

_____ 6. Oral contact with female genitalia by male

_____ 7. Manual manipulation of male genitalia by female

_____ 8. Heterosexual intercourse: ventral-ventral (front to front)

_____ 9. Oral contact with male genitalia by female

_____ 10. Oral contact with female genitalia by male

_____ 11. Heterosexual intercourse: ventral-dorsal (front to back)

_____ 12. Homosexual relations

Please turn the page when you are finished.
Appendix L
How able do you feel you were at pretending as though you were John while you were reading the story? Please circle the appropriate number on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was not able to do this well at all.</td>
<td>I was moderately able to do this</td>
<td>I was very able to do this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How able do you feel you were at pretending as though you were Mary while you were reading the story? Please circle the appropriate number on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was not able to do this well at all.</td>
<td>I was moderately able to do this</td>
<td>I was very able to do this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M
POST-EXPERIMENTAL INSTRUCTION SHEET

Thank you for completing all the experimental materials. Please take the slip of paper with your subject number home with you. You are to bring it back with you to your next experimental session. You will be asked to write your subject number on your materials at that time.

Now please bring your completed experimental packet to the front of the room. Also, please sign the sheet in the front of the room by writing your name and telephone number. You will be called and reminded about your next experimental session which will be in 3 DAYS. Lastly, please take an appointment card (on the desk at the front of the room) with you which should also serve as a reminder of when you are to return. You will receive your extra credit slip at the conclusion of your next experimental session. Thank you for your cooperation. I'll see you in 3 DAYS!
Appendix N
DEBRIEFING

The study that you just participated in is concerned with how people understand written text, specifically, text that is sexual in content. Findings from previous research suggest that we can learn about how people comprehend and remember written text by asking them to read a text, and them to recall what they remember. We can learn more about how people "think" by doing research such as this. We are hoping that the present study will help us understand how men and women "think" about sexuality.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me (Janis Kirsch) through the Department of Psychology (388-8745). Thank you for your cooperation.
RECALL PROTOCOL SCORING GUIDE

You are to score the protocols by using the following categories:

1. # of ATYPICAL ACTIONS correctly recalled (see coded story)
2. # of TYPICAL ACTIONS correctly recalled (see coded story)
3. # of TOTAL ACTIONS correctly recalled

4. # of ROMANTIC INTRUSIONS: Intrusions are "extra things" that subjects recall which are not in the original story. Romantic intrusions are actions that refer to the romantic aspects of a sexual encounter, such as "he gazed into her eyes."

5. # of SEXUAL INTRUSIONS: Sexual intrusions are actions that are clearly sexual in nature, such as "she unzipped his jeans."

6. # of NONSEXUAL/RELEVANT INTRUSIONS: These are actions that are not sexual in nature but are clearly relevant to the story, such as "he removed her coat from the couch."

7. # of NONSEXUAL/IRRELEVANT INTRUSIONS: These are actions that are not sexual in nature and that are irrelevant to the story, such as "he made a telephone call."

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The only time an action is not scored is when it is repeated.

2. If initiator of action is changed, it's okay. But remember, score it only once.

3. Although wording can vary a bit, it must be the same action. Some examples:

   "puts in mouth" and "kissing": NOT the same,
   "fingers" and "caresses": SAME for nipples;
   DIFFERENT for vagina,
   "kissing" and "licking": NOT the same.

4. "Aroused" or "turned on" can happen anytime and are scored one time only for each sex (i.e. once for John and once for Mary).

5. For # of TOTAL ACTIONS, sum A+T plus any action that is correctly recalled but not coded in the story (e.g., "They move together in complete harmony").
VITA

Name: Janis R. Kirsch  
Date of Birth: 10-18-60  
Age: 28  
Marital Status: Engaged

Address: 5801 Walnut Creek Rd.  
Apt. C222  
River Ridge, LA 70123  
Telephone: (504) 733-6719 (H)  
888-2066 (V)

Education:

August 1984 - Present  
Doctoral Candidate at Louisiana State University  
Department of Psychology/Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
(504) 388-8745  
Major: Clinical Psychology  
Specialty Area: Behavioral Medicine  
Minor: Behavioral Neurology  
Ph.D. expected December, 1988  
Doctoral Dissertation: Comprehension and Memory of a Sexual Script: A test of Schema/Scripting Theory

September 1987 - August 1988  
Clinical Psychology Internship at  
University of Tennessee Medical School Consortium in Professional Psychology  
University of Tennessee, Memphis  
College of Medicine  
Department of Psychiatry  
66 N. Pauline, Suite 633  
Memphis, TN 38105  
(901) 528-6628

August 1982 - August 1984  
Illinois State University  
Normal, IL  
Major: Clinical Psychology  
Received M.A. August, 1984  
Masters Thesis: Perceived Control and Stress: A Test of the Congruency Hypothesis

August 1978 - May 1982  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL  
Major: Psychology  
Received B.A. May, 1982
DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Janis R. Kirsch

Major Field: Psychology

Title of Dissertation: Comprehension and Memory of a Sexual Script:
A Test of Schema/Scripting Theory

Approved:

[Signatures]

Major Professor and Chairman
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[Signatures]

Date of Examination:

Nov. 16, 1988