

DO MEN EVER SAY NO TO SEX? QUESTIONING STEREOTYPES ABOUT  
SEXUAL GATEKEEPING

BY

C2009

Lauren Nicole Brian

Submitted to the Department of Psychology and the Graduate Faculty of the  
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master's of Arts.

---

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D. (Chair)

Committee Members

---

Ray Higgins, Ph.D.

---

Sarah Kirk, Ph.D.

Date defended: October 1, 2009

The Thesis Committee for Lauren N. Brian certifies that this is the approved  
Version of the following thesis:

DO MEN EVER SAY NO TO SEX? QUESTIONING STEREOTYPES ABOUT  
SEXUAL GATEKEEPING

Committee:

---

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D. (Chair)

Ray Higgins, Ph.D.

Sarah Kirk, Ph.D.

Date approved: October 1, 2009

## Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	6
Abstract.....	7
Introduction.....	8
Method.....	19
Results.....	29
Discussion.....	77
References.....	95
Appendix A: Questionnaires.....	99
Appendix B: Data Collection Session Script.....	117
Appendix C: Informed Consent.....	120
Appendix D: Debriefing Form.....	121
Appendix E: HSCL Application.....	122

## List of Tables

**Tables**

Table 1	Sample Characteristics	<b>21</b>
Table 2	Definitions of Situations N and H	<b>22</b>
Table 3	Prevalence of Gatekeeping in the Entire Sample for Situations N and H; Men's and Women's Initial Reports and Our Classifications	<b>31</b>
Table 4	Settings in Which Gatekeeping Took Place in Situation N	<b>32</b>
Table 5	Settings in Which Gatekeeping Took Place in Situation H	<b>33</b>
Table 6	Current Relationship With Other Person in Situation N	<b>34</b>
Table 7	Current Relationship With Other Person in Situation H	<b>35</b>
Table 8	Desired Relationship With Other Person in Situation N	<b>36</b>
Table 9	Desired Relationship With Other Person in Situation H	<b>37</b>
Table 10	Level of Physical Contact With Other Person in Situation N	<b>38</b>
Table 11	Level of Physical Contact With Other Person in Situation H	<b>39</b>
Table 12	Other Person's Signs of Interest in Sex in Situation N	<b>41</b>
Table 13	Other Person's Signs of Interest in Sex in Situation H	<b>42</b>
Table 14	Participants' Methods of Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>43-44</b>
Table 15	Participants' Methods of Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>45-46</b>
Table 16	Participants' Reasons for Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>48-49</b>
Table 17	Participants' Reasons for Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>51-52</b>
Table 18	Participants' Reasons for Wanting Sex in Situation N, Even Though They Did Not Let It Happen	<b>53</b>
Table 19	Participants' Reasons for Wanting Sex in Situation H, Even Though They Did Not Let It Happen	<b>54</b>

Table 20	Reaction of Other Person in Situation N	<b>56</b>
Table 21	Reaction of Other Person in Situation H	<b>58</b>
Table 22	Participants' Expected Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>60</b>
Table 23	Participants' Expected Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>61-62</b>
Table 24	Participants' Actual Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>63-64</b>
Table 25	Participants' Actual Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>65</b>
Table 26	Participants' Expected Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>67</b>
Table 27	Participants' Expected Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>68-69</b>
Table 28	Participants' Actual Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N	<b>70-71</b>
Table 29	Participants' Actual Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H	<b>72</b>
Table 30	Participants' and Other Person's Alcohol Use	<b>74</b>
Table 31	Participants' Reports of Regretting Gatekeeping	<b>75</b>
Table 32	Participants' Reports of Sex at a Later Date With the Other Person	<b>76</b>

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mom, Dad, and Chris for their words of support and encouragement throughout the process of completing this master's thesis and always. I would also like to thank Alex for being my cheerleader and helping me stay positive and focused when the task at hand seemed overwhelming.

I would also like to give credit to the many members of my undergraduate research groups. Their help was invaluable to the completion of the project, and their enthusiasm, humor, and baking skills were much appreciated features of our weekly meetings. In addition, I would like to thank my committee for taking the time to review my thesis and provide their helpful suggestions and insight.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my advisor, Charlene Muehlenhard, for her dedication to this project. Without her words of wisdom, SAS skills, and careful edits, I would have been lost.

### Abstract

Gender stereotypes exist such that men are thought to be the initiators of sex, whereas women are thought to be the gatekeepers (those that accept or reject a sexual initiation). Research suggests that exceptions exist to these gender roles. The present study examined men's and women's experiences in situations in which they were with someone who seemed interested in having sex, but they did not let sex happen. Two situations were examined in which the participant (a) had never had sex with the other person before and (b) had had sex with the other person before. In the second situation, out of those who had engaged in intercourse, significantly more women than men reported gatekeeping. However, men and women often did not differ in their reported prevalence and incidence of gatekeeping. Gender similarities and differences in the characteristics of these gatekeeping scenarios, and the implications of these findings, are discussed.

## Do Men Ever Say No To Sex? Questioning Stereotypes About Sexual Gatekeeping

In popular culture, men and women are thought to differ in their sexual behaviors and attitudes. Gender stereotypes exist such that in order to be considered truly masculine, men must never refuse sexual opportunities, and they must always be “interested in and ready for sex” (Zilbergeld, 1999, p. 23). Therefore, the male sex role has stereotypically been that of the initiator or aggressor, and the traditional sex role for women has been more passive and restrictive of men’s advances (Allgeier & Royster, 1991; Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007; McCormick, 1979). In other words, women are seen as the *gatekeepers* against men’s initiations of sex (Allgeier & Royster, 1991; Baumeister, 2000; Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995; Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007; McCormick, 1979; O’Sullivan & Byers, 1992; Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977).

Sexual gatekeeping is the phenomenon in which an individual makes a decision either to engage or not engage in sex with a potential partner. For the purposes of this study, gatekeeping is defined as an experience in which “it seemed like someone wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen.” Gatekeeping has been referred to by many researchers and textbook authors, but is rarely specifically defined (Allgeier & Royster, 1991; Baumeister, 2000; Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995; Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007; McCormick, 1979; O’Sullivan & Byers, 1992; Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977). When gatekeeping is discussed in the literature, it is always in reference to the

behavior of women. At times, the term, “gatekeeper” is used directly. For example, O’Sullivan and Byers (1992) commented that “women are expected to control men’s sexual access, or ‘gatekeep’” (p. 435). However, most of the time, authors discuss gatekeeping without giving it a name. Baumeister (2000) described the female role as that of the limiter of sexual activity: “sex generally commences when the woman switches her initially negative stance to a positive one” (p. 349).” At the same time, Baumeister described male sexual desire as “relatively constant and unchanging” (p. 347). McCormick (1979) commented on expected sex roles, as well: “men are expected to be direct in initiating sexual intercourse whereas women are expected to be direct in avoiding sex” (p. 196). Clark and Hatfield (1989) described gatekeeping as women’s “power to veto sexual activity” (p. 46). Kiefer and Sanchez (2007) reported that stereotypes exist such that men are expected to “take on a sexually empowered, directive, dominant, and assertive role,” and women are expected to “take on a sexually disempowered, responsive, rather than active role” (p. 271). Hendrick and Hendrick (1995) referred to women as the “guardians of their own sexuality, as well as restraining forces for men’s sexuality” (p. 57). They reported that “men are expected to be sexually active and exploratory” (p. 57). In addition, according to Allgeier and Royster (1991), “the common wisdom is that the primary role of women is to be receptive or rejective – that is, they may accept or reject a man’s approach” (p. 137).

In each of these discussions of gatekeeping, it is assumed that women take on the role of the gatekeeper, and men take on the role of the initiator/aggressor. None of these references mentions the possibility that men may, at times, take on the gatekeeping role, as well. As stereotypes often do not reflect actual behaviors, we question the assumption that women are the sole sexual gatekeepers. Tiegs, Perrin, Kaly, and Heesacker (2007) reflected our skepticism: “stereotypically – albeit questionably in practice – men initiate sexuality, and women guard the gates of sexuality” (p. 449).

Despite the common gender stereotypes, there is evidence that women take on the masculine gender role of initiating dates and sex, though not as often as men (Peplau et al., 1977). Traditionally, more men than women have taken on the role of asking and paying for dates, providing transportation to and from dates, and initiating sexual intimacy (Allgeier & Royster, 1991; Clark & Hatfield, 1989; McCormick, 1979). However, Lottes (1993) found that a majority of men and women reported having been on female-initiated dates, as well as dates in which the woman paid the entire expense. In addition, Lottes (1993) found that 38% of women had initiated a sexual relationship with a new partner, and 70% of men reported having had a female try to initiate sex with them.

Just as women sometimes defy their stereotypical role as gatekeepers and take on the role of initiators, men may defy their role as initiators and take on the role of gatekeepers. Though the gender stereotype is that men would never reject a woman’s sexual advance, there is some evidence, reviewed below, to suggest

that this is not always the case. The current study will investigate gatekeeping behaviors of both men and women. It will also examine gender differences and similarities in characteristics of these gatekeeping experiences.

#### Research on Both Men's and Women's Gatekeeping

It seems to be accepted in the literature that women's traditional role is that of the gatekeeper and men's traditional role is that of the initiator (Allgeier & Royster, 1991; Baumeister, 2000; Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995; Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007; McCormick, 1979; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992; Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977). However, there is very little empirical data on the frequency of, reasons for, and consequences of this behavior. A PsycINFO search using the terms *gatekeep\** AND *sex\** yielded 70 results, only 2 of which were relevant to our study. The terms *gate keep\** AND *sex\** yielded only 7 results, none of which was relevant. In addition, the concept of *men* as gatekeepers has been overlooked by researchers in the past, as evidenced by the fact that we found little research specifically on this subject. Evidence for this phenomenon can be found indirectly by examining data from studies on related, but different topics such as token resistance, consenting to unwanted sex, and men's acceptance of women's sexual initiations. We now review the relevant studies.

Research would be relevant for the purposes of this study if it provided any of the following:

- 1) Data showing that sometimes men do not want to have sex; these data discount the stereotype that men always want to have sex.

- 2) Data showing that women try to initiate sex (and/or express their willingness); these data would mean that men have the opportunity to engage in gatekeeping
- 3) Data showing that sometimes men do refuse women's attempts to initiate; these data show that men do sometimes engage in gatekeeping.

When researchers use the word, "initiate," they generally do not imply that the attempt at sex was successful. For the purposes of this study, initiation will be defined as any verbal and/or physical demonstration of desire to engage in penile-vaginal intercourse (PVI) when PVI was not currently in progress. O'Sullivan and Allgeier (1998) used this definition, but replaced "PVI" with "any type of sexual activity."

### *Prevalence*

Evidence for men's experiences with unwanted sex was found in a study by Muehlenhard and Cook (1988). In this study almost two thirds of the undergraduate men had engaged in unwanted intercourse. That is, they had sex with someone when they did not want to. This provides support against the common belief that men are always desirous of sex.

In a study on dating couples from four colleges in the Boston area, Peplau et al. (1977) reported that 80% of participants found premarital sex acceptable. Gender differences in attitudes toward premarital sex were not reported. In addition, 95% of participants supported identical standards for men and women in

love (i.e., not casual sex) relationships. Despite these permissive attitudes about premarital sex, women still strongly adhered to their traditional role as the limiters of sex in dating relationships, giving them the ability to “reject the man’s advances or slow the pace of increasing sexual intimacy” (p. 96). Women had a greater impact on whether or not a couple had intercourse. For example, correlations were found between women’s attitudes toward sex (e.g., as a function of religiosity) and whether or not sex occurred. If sex did occur, women’s attitudes were also correlated with the timing of the couple’s first sexual experience, whereas men’s attitudes were not. In keeping with their traditional role, men were found to initiate sex significantly more frequently than women. A total of 42 couples (18% of the sample) reported that they were abstaining from sex with their current partner. In these couples, 64% of the men reported that the major reason for abstaining was to fulfill the woman’s wishes, and 11% of the women reported that it was to fulfill the man’s wishes. The remainder of men and women reported other reasons for abstaining from sex (e.g., sex violated their ethical standards and fear of pregnancy). These data suggest that although, overall, men and women adhered to their expected gender roles, at times both men and women did not want to have sex and were successful in preventing it from happening.

In a groundbreaking study measuring gender differences in receptivity to sexual advances, Clark and Hatfield (1989) compared men’s and women’s responses to the questions, “Would you go out with me tonight?” “Would you

come over to my apartment tonight?,” and “Would you go to bed with me tonight?” Male and female confederates approached undergraduates on a college campus and recorded responses to these questions. This experiment was conducted once in 1978 and again in 1982. In 1978, men were more likely to say yes to each type of invitation than women. In 1982, men and women were equally likely to accept an invitation for a date. In both trials, none of the women was willing to accept the invitation to “go to bed” with the male confederate. In 1978, 75% of men agreed to “go to bed” with the female confederate, and in 1982, 69% of men agreed. This means, however, that 25% of men in 1978 and 31% of men in 1982 rejected a woman’s initiation of sex. That is, in this study, all of the women and some of the men engaged in gatekeeping.

The findings of two more recent studies call into question the traditional sexual scripts of the female gatekeeper and the male initiator. Byers and Heinlein (1989) conducted a study in which 77 married and cohabiting individuals (ages 18-63 with a median age of 29.6) tracked their sexual behavior over a period of one week. In accordance with the traditional sexual script, men initiated sex significantly more often than women, and women responded negatively (i.e., refused sex) significantly more often than men. However, when the number of initiations was controlled for, there was no significant difference in the likelihood that men and women would accept their partner’s sexual initiations. In other words, men were as likely as women to engage in gatekeeping.

In a study using identical methodology, O'Sullivan and Byers (1992) asked 105 undergraduates (ages 18-35 with a median age of 19) to track their sexual and dating experiences over a period of one week. The results of the Byers and Heinlein (1989) study were replicated, indicating that "contrary to the traditional sexual script, women are not serving a restrictive function and men are not obliged to accept every available sexual opportunity" (p. 444).

Two other studies provide evidence for men's and women's gatekeeping. In Muehlenhard and Rodger's (1998) study on token resistance to sex, many participants wrote narratives that fit our description of gatekeeping. In other words, both men and women wrote about situations in which someone wanted to have sexual intercourse with them, but they did not let sex happen.

In the second study, O'Sullivan and Allgeier (1998) examined instances in which individuals consent to unwanted sex (i.e., they do not want to have sex, but, for various reasons, they consent to and engage in it anyway). In this study, undergraduates tracked their sexual experiences across a period of two weeks. O'Sullivan and Allgeier found that men initiated sex significantly more frequently than women, suggesting that women have more opportunities than men to engage in gatekeeping. Furthermore, they found that 26% of men and 50% of women consented to and engaged in unwanted sex. This indicates that, contrary to gender stereotypes, men, as well as women, do not always want to have sex when given the opportunity. In addition, the authors found that individuals did not engage in

sex in 13% of cases in which sex was unwanted. Gender differences in this gatekeeping behavior were not reported.

### *Methods of Gatekeeping*

McCormick (1979) found that both women and men used more direct than indirect strategies for avoiding sexual intercourse. Such direct strategies included telling their partner to leave, telling their partner the reasons why they did not want to have sex (e.g., fear of pregnancy or sexually transmitted disease), telling their partner that they felt the relationship was too new and they were not yet ready for sex, and telling their partner that they believe sex should be reserved for marriage. Examples of lesser used indirect strategies reported by participants included suggesting an activity unrelated to intercourse, refraining from reciprocating physical signs of affection, and lying (e.g., “I don’t have any birth control,” and “I have my period”).

Byers and Heinlein (1989) found that over a one-week period, participants used verbal methods to refuse a sexual initiation 59% of the time, nonverbal methods 21% of the time, and both verbal and nonverbal methods 20% of the time. The authors did not describe the particular verbal and nonverbal behaviors that were used.

### *Reasons for Gatekeeping*

Peplau et al. (1977) found that women were likely to abstain from sex because it was against their ethical or religious standards, it was too early in the relationship for sex, or they were afraid of getting pregnant. The most frequent

reason cited by men for abstaining from sex was fear of getting their partners pregnant.

Lottes (1993) found that the most common reason women provided for refusing to have sexual intercourse was that they did not know the person well enough or that the initiation occurred too soon in the relationship. Men's most common reason for refusing to engage in sexual intercourse was fear of contracting a sexually transmitted disease.

In Muehlenhard and Rodger's (1998) study, participants' narratives included many reasons for not letting sex happen. Women's reasons included not knowing their partner and/or his sexual history well enough. Men's reasons included the fact that there were other people around (e.g., roommates), the man and/or the woman were intoxicated, birth control was not available, the woman's sexual history was unknown, and the man was worried that if he had sex with the woman she would feel used and never talk to or have sex with him again.

Participants in O'Sullivan and Allgeier's (1998) study reported not wanting to engage in sex due to lack of sufficient privacy, tiredness, and inappropriate mood or interest.

### *Consequences*

For women, the consequences of playing the role of the gatekeeper are likely to be less negative than they are for men (Sirin, McCreary, & Mahalik, 2004). Vogel, Wester, Heesacker, and Madon (2003) state that "behaving consistently with normative expectations is less risky than behaving in a

nonnormative manner” (p. 521). If women follow traditional sexual scripts, they are expected to take on this role. To the extent that the double standard persists, women would be likely to experience greater negative consequences if they violated the role and became the initiators of sex instead of the gatekeepers. Peplau et al. (1977) suggested that men may view such a role violation as women robbing them of their masculine control, subsequently damaging their egos. In addition, the sexual double standard leads people to make negative inferences about the motives and character of female initiators (Peplau et al., 1977).

Peplau et al. (1977) speculated that a man acting as a sexual gatekeeper may experience short-term positive consequences in that it sends a signal to the woman that he is interested in her for more than just sex. However, this sex role violation may have negative consequences for a man if he abstains for a long period of time. For example, his partner may come to think he finds her unattractive, and peers may consider him to be lacking in masculinity (Peplau et al., 1977).

In O’Sullivan and Allgeier’s (1998) study, individuals reported engaging in unwanted sex in order to “satisfy a partner’s needs, promote intimacy in their relationship, or avoid relationship tension” (p. 237). If individuals say no to sex, as is the case in gatekeeping, they may run the risk of facing the opposite of these consequences. This suggests that saying no could result in a partner’s not being satisfied, in decreased intimacy, and in relationship tension.

#### The Current Study

The current study was exploratory, with the purpose of determining whether, how, and why men and women engage in sexual gatekeeping (i.e., not letting sex happen when it seems like someone wants to have sex with them). We focused primarily on men's experiences with gatekeeping because less research has been conducted in this area. We were interested in the similarities and differences in men's and women's gatekeeping experiences. In addition, we noted the similarities and differences in individuals' gatekeeping experiences with previous sex partners compared with gatekeeping experiences with new partners. However, an analytic study of these similarities and differences was beyond the scope of the current study. Finally, we were also interested in how cultural expectations about men's and women's sexuality relate to participants' reasons for avoiding sex, methods of avoiding sex, and actual and expected positive and negative outcomes of avoiding sex.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants consisted of 243 introductory psychology students at the University of Kansas. They voluntarily completed the questionnaire as one way to fulfill a course research requirement, and were unaware of the topic of the study prior to participation. Five participants were excluded from the final data set. One man was excluded because his responses appeared unreliable. Though neither of his narratives counted as gatekeeping, he was excluded from the study because he did not appear to answer the questions truthfully. For example, he

identified himself as a woman despite having taken the male version of the questionnaire. Two men and one woman were excluded because they did not follow instructions. For example, they wrote about experiences in which it seemed like someone wanted to have sex with them and they let sex happen. One woman was excluded because her questionnaire was incomplete.

The final sample of participants used for analysis consisted of 238 individuals (136 men and 102 women). The mean age of the participants was 19.02 years ( $SD = 1.22$ ; range = 17-25); for men,  $M = 19.25$  ( $SD = 1.34$ ) and for women  $M = 18.70$  ( $SD = .98$ ). An analysis of variance revealed that the men were significantly older than the women  $F(1,234) = 12.18, p < .01$ ; Cohen's  $d = -.46$ . Data on their race or ethnicity and sexual orientation are presented in Table 1. The majority of participants reported that they were European American or white and identified as heterosexual. Seventeen participants (7 women and 10 men) reported that they were international students.

Table 1 also summarizes participants' sexual history data. Most (84% of the men and 72% of the women) reported engaging in sexual intercourse. An analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between men ( $M = 3.73, SD = 4.28$ ) and women ( $M = 3.20, SD = 6.05$ ) in their number of intercourse partners  $F(1,224) = 15.69, p = .44$ ; Cohen's  $d = .10$ .

Table 1

*Sample Characteristics*

Characteristic	Men		Women	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Race or ethnicity</b>				
African American or Black	3	2	3	3
Asian American	3	2	3	3
European American or White	117	87	86	85
Hispanic American or Latino/a	3	2	4	4
Native American or American Indian	0	0	2	2
Biracial or Multiracial	1	1	0	0
Other	8	6	3	3
No answer	1	1	1	1
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				
Heterosexual	134	99	100	98
Homosexual	1	1	0	0
Bisexual	0	0	2	2
Unsure	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
No answer	1	1	0	0
<b>Current relationship status</b>				
Never dated anyone	9	7	4	4
Not dating anyone now	54	40	39	39
Dating one person casually with no agreement to be exclusive	10	7	8	8
Dating more than one person casually with no agreement to be exclusive	8	6	2	2
Dating one person exclusively	46	34	45	45
Engaged	1	1	0	0
Other	7	5	3	3
No answer	1	1	1	1
<b>Sexual history<sup>a</sup></b>				
Kissing	131	98	98	97
Having someone stimulate your genitals	124	93	85	84
Stimulating someone's genitals	117	89	86	85
Performing oral sex	89	68	74	74
Receiving oral sex	114	87	75	75
Sexual intercourse	107	84	71	72
Anal sex	32	27	12	13
Masturbation	129	96	52	54
Having an orgasm with another person	111	84	71	72
Having an orgasm yourself through masturbation	116	89	41	43

*Note.* Table entries are the *ns* and percentages of participants giving each response. These data are based on the entire sample; unless specified otherwise, *n* = 136 for men and 102 for women. Percentages were calculated separately for men and women. The wording used here is the wording used on the questionnaire.

<sup>a</sup>Each item in the following section had missing data.

### *Questionnaires*

Man and women received separate questionnaires which were identical except that men were asked about their experiences with women, and women were asked about their experiences with men (see Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of three sections: (a) Situation N, (b) Situation H, and (c) demographics and sexual history (see Table 2). Situation N and Situation H were counterbalanced to prevent biased responding.

Table 2

#### *Definitions of Situations N and H*

Situation	Definition
N	You were with a guy/girl you had never had sex with before, it seemed like he/she wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen.
H	You were with a guy/girl you had had sex with before, it seemed like he/she wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen.

*Note.* All definitions appear exactly as they did on the questionnaire.

For Situations N and H, participants were asked to decide which of three response options applied to their own experience. For example, under Situation N, participants were instructed to check one of the following response options: (a) “I have been in this situation,” (b) “I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation with a guy/girl I had never had sex with before” or (c) “I have never been in the situation or anything close to it.” The response options under Situation H were identical except option (b) was worded as follows: “I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation with a guy/girl I

*had* had sex with before.” Participants who checked (a), they had been in the situation, were instructed to write a narrative and answer questions regarding their experience. They were instructed to choose the experience that stood out most in their minds if the situation had happened multiple times. Participants who checked (b), they had never been in the situation but had been in a similar situation, were instructed to write a narrative and answer the set of questions regarding their similar experience. Our rationale for asking about something similar was to catch false negatives. In other words, individuals might not have thought that their experience fit the definition of the situation, even though, in actuality, it did. We later read these similar narratives to determine if any fit our definition of gatekeeping. Participants who checked (c), they had never been in the situation or anything close to it, were asked to write a narrative and answer the set of questions the way they thought a hypothetical man named Tom or woman named Kate would have answered if he or she had been in the situation. Our rationale for this was to ensure that the participants’ privacy was protected; all participants were writing, and there was no way to tell who had or had not been in the described situations. We used hypothetical individuals with made-up names so it was clear to us that participants were not writing about themselves. These data were not analyzed.

For each situation, after participants checked response option a, b, or c, they were instructed to answer a series of questions with the following content: the number of times in the past year they had been in the situation; their

relationship with the other person at the time; their desired relationship with the person; the length of time they had known the person; their age and the age of the other person at the time; the number of times they had had sex with the person (for Situation H only); the reasons they believed the person wanted to have sex with them; their level of certainty that the person wanted to have sex with them; the extent of physical contact that occurred before they did not let sex happen; what they did to not let sex happen; their reasons for not letting sex happen; any reasons they might have had for wanting sex; how the situation would have needed to have been different in order for sex to have happened; the other person's reaction when they did not let sex happen; the positive and negative consequences they had expected related to not letting sex happen; the actual positive and negative consequences related to not letting sex happen; whether they had been using alcohol and/or drugs in the situation, and what, if any, effect their own alcohol or drug use had on the situation; whether the other person had been using alcohol and/or drugs in the situation, and what, if any, effect the other person's alcohol or drug use had on the situation; whether they had any regrets about not letting sex happen; whether sex occurred with the person at a later date; and reasons for engaging in sex if it did occur at a later date. Finally, participants were asked if they had any information to add about the situation and if they had ever used any other methods for not letting sex happen. A "reality check" was included, inquiring again whether the described situation actually occurred or was a hypothetical scenario constructed by the participant.

Section 3 contained demographic and sexual history questions.

Participants were asked about their age, sex, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, and status as an international student. Sexual history questions were about current relationship status, previous engagement in various sexual behaviors, and total number of penile-vaginal intercourse partners (see Table 1).

### *Procedure*

Participants signed up electronically for one-hour timeslots through the Psychology Department's SONA website. Both male and female participants met in classrooms in groups of up to 20. They were seated in alternate seats to protect their privacy. Two undergraduate research assistants administered each data-collection session (see Appendix B). Participants were given the informed consent form to read (see Appendix C). They were informed of their freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Those who chose to stay were asked to fill out a questionnaire anonymously. They were instructed not to provide any form of identification on the questionnaires. The research assistants oriented the participants to the layout of the questionnaires and explained Situations N and H. Participants were informed that they could complete all items on the questionnaire, regardless of their histories with gatekeeping or their level of sexual experience. Each participant was given a blank manila envelope in which to return his or her completed questionnaire. When participants completed the questionnaires and returned their envelopes, they were given the debriefing form (see Appendix D), which discussed the purpose of the study and contained a list

of available counseling services, as well as contact information for the researchers and the Institutional Review Board. Participants who completed the questionnaire were awarded 2 credits toward their introductory psychology course research requirement. Those who withdrew before completing the study received 1 credit for every 30 minutes of the study (or portion thereof) in which they participated. Only one male chose to withdraw from the study prior to completing the questionnaire. This study was approved by the Human Subjects Committee, Lawrence (HSCL; see Appendix E).

### *Analysis*

Each participant's narratives were read by two research assistants. Narratives of participants who marked the first two response options (indicating that they had been in the situation or in a similar situation) were coded as to whether or not their situations fit our definition of gatekeeping (1 = gatekeeping, 0 = not gatekeeping). If a narrative fit our definition of gatekeeping, even if the participant considered it to be in the "similar" category, it was included in the final dataset and coded as a 1. Consider the following narrative as an example (participants' responses have been quoted verbatim except that spelling errors have been corrected),

I was hanging out with this girl I knew liked me. She was flirting with me all night. We ended up going to a bedroom and started making out. When things were about to get heated, I told her I didn't want to send the wrong message. She left the room crying and left the party. We talked a couple weeks later and she said thank you. (M-634)

This narrative was coded as gatekeeping, even though the participant considered it to be “something similar,” because it met our criteria for gatekeeping in Situation N.

Conversely, if a participant wrote a narrative that they considered to be gatekeeping, but it did not fit our definition of gatekeeping, it was coded as a 0.

Consider the following examples,

- (1) We started making out and feeling around. I was drunk and soon after she was naked. I passed out. (M-577)
- (2) It was my first time going on a date with this girl and we went back to her place. We turned on a movie and I thought she was down to fool around. We started kissing and when I tried to make a move she denied me. (M-575)
- (3) We both love each other and we just make love when we both feel it. We both know we want each other, and when we want it we make love (M-515).
- (4) We had dated before and she was the first person I had sex with. We broke up last year but still remained friends. She came over one day to study and we studied for half an hour then got bored and just laid on my bed. We talked for a while then she brought up our dating record. We joked about how much sexual tension there was between us and I asked about if she ever thought about us having sex again. She said she had then we somehow started kissing and ended up having to stop because my roommate came back. (M-540)

Example 1 was not coded as gatekeeping because the participant did not actively prevent sex from happening. He indicated in his further responses that he would have had sex if he had not “passed out.” Example 2 was not coded as gatekeeping because the participant wrote about a situation in which he wanted to have sex and his partner denied him. Example 3 was not coded as gatekeeping because the participant wrote about a situation in which he did not engage in gatekeeping and

he and his girlfriend ended up having sex. Finally, example 4 was not coded as gatekeeping because the participant indicated that he and his partner would have had sex if his roommate had not interrupted them. He did not actively prevent sex from happening.

Narratives of participants who marked the third response option (indicating that they had never been in the situation) and wrote a hypothetical gatekeeping scenario were coded as a 0. The research assistants discussed each participant's questionnaire until they came to an agreement on how it was to be coded. Disagreements were resolved by the research group as a whole.

The open-ended responses to our questionnaire were analyzed using the constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, pp. 101-115; Parry, 2004). This is a commonly used technique for analyzing qualitative data in which we created and revised categories based on patterns we discovered while reading the responses. After categories were created, two research assistants coded each questionnaire. The two datasets (one from each research assistant) were then compared to identify disagreements between the research assistants. Two research assistants discussed and recoded items on which there were discrepancies. These recoded data were entered to arrive at a single dataset.

Frequencies in each category were calculated in order to conduct comparisons. Chi-square tests might not have been valid because 25% or more of the cells had expected values less than 5. Therefore, for the following analyses,  $p$  was always derived from Fisher's exact test unless otherwise specified.

## Results

### *Prevalence of Gatekeeping*

After participants' reports of gatekeeping were re-coded as to whether or not they fit our definition of gatekeeping, 71% of men and 78% of women reported gatekeeping in Situation N, whereas 51% of men and 59% of women reported gatekeeping in Situation H (see Table 3). Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine if there were gender differences in the prevalence of gatekeeping in Situations N and H. No significant differences were found between men and women in the prevalence of gatekeeping in Situation N,  $\chi^2(1, N=238) = 1.86, p = .18, \phi = -.09$ . In other words, when gatekeeping percentages were taken out of the entire sample, there was no difference between the percentage of men and the percentage of women who reported ever having been in a situation in which they were with a person they had never had sex with before, and it seemed like that person wanted to have sex with them, but they did not let it happen.

Similarly, no significant differences were found between men and women in the prevalence of gatekeeping in Situation H,  $\chi^2(1, N = 238) = 1.54, p = .24, \phi = -.08$ . When gatekeeping percentages were taken out of the entire sample, there was no difference between the percentage of men and the percentage of women who reported ever having been in a situation in which they were with a person they had had sex with before, and it seemed like that person wanted to have sex with them, but they did not let it happen. However, when gatekeeping percentages were taken out of only those individuals who reported that they had had

intercourse, significantly more women (84%) than men (64%) were found to have engaged in gatekeeping in Situation H,  $\chi^2(1, N = 178) = .28, p = .00, \text{phi} = -.23$ .

Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to assess whether there were gender differences in the number of times men and women reported gatekeeping in the past year out of those participants who indicated that they had been in Situations N and H. No significant differences were found between men ( $M = 1.64, SD = 1.48$ ) and women ( $M = 3.04, SD = 7.26$ ) in Situation N,  $F(1, 147) = 2.82, p = .10, \text{Cohen's } d = .28$ . One woman indicated that she had engaged in gatekeeping 60 times in the past year, which led to the unusually large standard deviation for women. When this individual was excluded from the analysis, no significant differences were found between men ( $M = 1.64, SD = 1.48$ ) and women ( $M = 2.22, SD = 2.27$ ) in Situation N,  $F(1, 146) = 3.46, p = .06, \text{Cohen's } d = .31$ . Similarly, no significant differences were found between men ( $M = 2.28, SD = 2.92$ ) and women ( $M = 3.53, SD = 4.66$ ) in Situation H,  $F(1, 93) = 2.52, p = .12, \text{Cohen's } d = .33$ .

Table 3

*Prevalence of Gatekeeping in the Entire Sample for Situations N and H; Men's and Women's Initial Reports and Our Classifications*

Gender	Participants' reports <sup>a</sup>						Our classifications <sup>b</sup>			
	Gatekeeping		Something similar		Neither		Gatekeeping		Not gatekeeping	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Situation N										
Men	88	65	23	17	25	18	96	71	40	29
Women	70	69	12	12	20	20	80	78	22	22
Situation H										
Men	67	49	22	16	47	35	69	51	67	49
Women	57	56	6	6	39	38	60	59	42	41

*Note.*  $n = 136$  men and  $n = 102$  women. Percentages for women's initial reports in Situation N do not add to 100% because of rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Numbers and percentages of participants' initial reports based on which response option they checked. For Situation N,  $\chi^2(2, N = 238) = 1.23, p = .54; \phi = .07$ . For Situation H,  $\chi^2(2, N = 238) = 5.96, p = .05; \phi = .16$ .

<sup>b</sup>Our classifications based on participants' narratives. For Situation N, we reclassified 14 men and 10 women from *something similar* to *gatekeeping*, and 6 men and 0 women from *gatekeeping* to *not gatekeeping*. For Situation H, we reclassified 8 men and 4 women from *something similar* to *gatekeeping*, and 6 men and 1 woman from *gatekeeping* to *not gatekeeping*. No gender differences were found in prevalence of gatekeeping in both Situations N and H.

### *Gatekeeping Settings*

The settings in which gatekeeping occurred were coded from participants' narratives. In Situation N, both men and women reported that the most prevalent setting was at party (see Table 4). Women reported that gatekeeping often took place in the house, apartment, or room of the other person, whereas men reported that it took place in their own house, apartment, or room. Significantly more women (25%) than men (9%) reported that gatekeeping took place in the other person's house, apartment, or room.

Table 4

*Settings in Which Gatekeeping Took Place in Situation N*

Gatekeeping setting	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Vague/unknown/did not say	34	35	26	33	.03	0.17
Party	33	34	21	26	.09	1.35
OP's house/apartment/room	9	9	20	25	-.21	7.74*
Your house/apartment/room	16	17	9	11	.08	1.05
In bed	4	4	5	6	-.05	0.40
Car	3	3	4	5	-.05	0.40
Multiple locations	3	3	2	3	.02	0.06
Other	6	6	5	6		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one situation in which gatekeeping took place, and some did not report any situations. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, women reported that the most common setting was in the other person's home, apartment, or room, and significantly more women (30%) than men (9%) reported gatekeeping in this setting (see Table 5). Men reported that gatekeeping most often took place in their own home, apartment, or room, and significantly more men (20%) than women (5%) reported gatekeeping in this setting. In both Situations N and H, the home, apartment, or room of the male partner was a commonly reported setting for gatekeeping.

Table 5

*Settings in Which Gatekeeping Took Place in Situation H*

Gatekeeping setting	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Vague/unknown/did not say	36	52	21	35	.17	3.84
OP's house/apartment/room	6	9	18	30	-.27	9.62***
Your house/apartment/room	14	20	3	5	.23	6.56*
Party	5	7	1	2	.13	2.25
In bed	3	4	1	2	.08	0.77
Car	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Other	4	6	15	25		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one situation in which gatekeeping took place, and some did not report any situations. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

*Current Relationship With the Other Person*

Participants were asked what their relationship with the other person was at the time that gatekeeping occurred. In Situation N, both men and women reported that the most common type of relationship with the other person was that of "friends" (see Table 6). Men and women also often reported that the other person was a recent acquaintance or someone they had just met that night. There were no significant gender differences in the participants' reported current relationship with the other person.

Table 6

*Current Relationship With Other Person in Situation N*

Current relationship	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Friends	38	40	32	40	-.00	0.00
Just met that night	23	24	12	15	.11	2.20
Recent acquaintance	12	13	12	15	-.04	0.23
Non-exclusive (talking, hanging out, dating casually)	6	6	10	13	-.12	2.06
Classmate	9	9	6	8	.03	0.20
Girlfriend/boyfriend	5	5	7	9	-.07	0.86
Dating	5	5	4	5	.00	0.00
Friends with benefits	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
Friend of a friend	4	4	4	5	-.02	0.07
Other	2	2	2	4		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one type of current relationship with the other person, and some did not report any relationship with the other person. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

In Situation H, both men and women most commonly reported that their relationship with the other person was that of girlfriend and boyfriend (see Table 7). Other commonly reported relationships were those of ex-boyfriend and girlfriend and friends. Therefore, Situation H includes more types of relationships than committed dating relationships. No gender differences were found in the participants' reported current relationship with the other person.

Table 7

*Current Relationship With Other Person in Situation H*

Current relationship	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Girlfriend/boyfriend	30	43	25	42	.02	0.04
Friends	16	23	12	20	.04	0.19
Ex-girlfriend/boyfriend	13	19	13	22	-.04	0.16
Dating	6	9	8	13	-.07	0.71
Friends with benefits	8	12	4	7	.08	0.92
Non-exclusive (talking, hanging out, Dating casually)	3	4	4	7	-.05	0.34
Recent acquaintance	5	7	0	0	.19	4.52
Other	3	4	2	3		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one type of current relationship with the other person, and some did not report any relationship with the other person. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

*Desired Relationship With the Other Person*

Participants were asked what their desired relationship with the other person was when gatekeeping occurred. In Situation N, the most common desired relationship with the other person that men and women reported was that they wished to become or remain friends (see Table 8). However, some participants reported that they did not want any relationship with the other person, and others reported that they wanted the other person to be their boyfriend or girlfriend. Significantly more men (14%) than women (4%) said that they desired a sexual relationship with the other person without commitment.

Table 8

*Desired Relationship With Other Person in Situation N*

Desired relationship	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Friends/"just friends"	45	47	41	51	-.04	0.33
None/nothing	20	21	8	10	.15	3.83
Girlfriend/boyfriend	15	16	16	20	-.06	0.58
Sex without commitment	13	14	3	4	.17	5.06*
Unsure/exploratory	7	7	7	9	-.03	0.13

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one desired relationship with the other person, and some did not report any desired relationship with the other person. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

In Situation H, the most common desired relationship reported by both men and women was that they would like to remain or become "boyfriend and girlfriend" (see Table 9). The second most common desired relationship reported by men and women was friends or "just friends." As in Situation N, significantly more men (16%) than women (3%) said that they desired a sexual relationship with the other person without commitment.

Table 9

*Desired Relationship With Other Person in Situation H*

Desired relationship	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Girlfriend/boyfriend	30	43	37	62	-.18	4.25
Friends/"just friends"	19	28	17	28	-.01	0.01
Sex without commitment	11	16	2	3	.21	5.63*
None/nothing	6	9	2	3	.11	1.59
Unsure/exploratory	0	0	2	3	-.13	2.34

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one desired relationship with the other person, and some did not report any desired relationship with the other person. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

*Level of Physical Contact With the Other Person*

Participants were asked if there was any physical contact with the other person before gatekeeping occurred, and, if so, how far they let it go before it stopped. In Situation N, both men and women most commonly reported that they engaged in kissing or "making out" with the other person before gatekeeping occurred (see Table 10). However, significantly more women (54%) than men (36%) reported that their physical contact with the other person stopped with kissing or "making out." Significantly more men (31%) than women (13%) reported that their physical contact with the other person went "almost all the way" and included "everything but PVI (penile vaginal intercourse)" before gatekeeping occurred. Finally, more men (8%) than women (1%) reported that the other person "grabbed my crotch" before gatekeeping occurred.

Table 10

*Level of Physical Contact With Other Person in Situation N*

Physical contact	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Kissing/making out	35	36	43	54	-.17	5.29*
Almost all the way/everything but PVI	30	31	10	13	.22	8.74**
Vague (fooling around, grabbed me, Touched me)	12	13	12	15	-.04	0.23
“Petting”	10	10	11	14	-.05	0.46
Grabbed my crotch	8	8	1	1	.16	4.51*
Undressing	6	6	6	8	-.02	0.11
Manual genital stimulation (handjob/fingering)	5	5	6	8	-.05	0.39
None	5	5	6	8	-.05	0.39
Other	14	15	11	14		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one type of physical contact with the other person, and some did not report any physical contact. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher’s exact test. The abbreviation PVI stands for “penile vaginal intercourse.”

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

In Situation H, as in Situation N, both men and women most commonly reported that they engaged in kissing or “making out” with the other person before gatekeeping occurred (see Table 11). Many men and women often also reported that their physical contact with the other person went “almost all the way” and included “everything but PVI.” In contrast to Situation N, however, in Situation H, there were no gender differences in the prevalence of any of these behaviors. Men’s and women’s behavior was more similar with someone they had already had sex with than with new partners.

Table 11

*Level of Physical Contact With Other Person in Situation H*

Physical contact	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Kissing/making out	27	39	34	57	-.18	3.96
Almost all the way/everything but PVI	16	23	9	15	.10	1.38
Vague (fooling around, grabbed me, touched me)	11	16	9	15	.01	0.02
None	9	13	9	15	-.03	0.10
Undressing	6	9	2	3	.11	1.59
“Petting”	3	4	5	8	-.08	0.88
Grabbed my crotch	3	4	1	2	.08	0.77
Other (handshake, cuddling)	7	10	10	17		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one type of physical contact with the other person, and some did not report any physical contact. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher’s exact test. The abbreviation PVI stands for “penile vaginal intercourse.”

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

*Other Person’s Signs of Interest in Sex*

Participants were asked what made it seem like the other person wanted to have sex. In Situation N, both men and women most commonly reported that they knew the other person wanted to have sex with them because they either asked or specifically said so (e.g., “She asked to do sexual things with her and I told her I didn’t think it was a good idea,” M-512; see Table 12). The second most common sign of interest reported by men and women was that the other person touched them in some way. Significantly more men (8%) than women (1%) said that the other person “touched my genitals” to show interest in sex. For example, one man wrote,

I was at a party and this girl, who I had been talking to, got pretty drunk. I had been drinking too, but I was in no way drunk. I would be talking to my friends and she would come up and start talking to me, hugging on me, touching me, and even touching my crotch. (M-517)

Other commonly reported ways the other person showed interest in sex were removing his or her own clothes or the clothes of the participant, kissing the participant, and making seductive hints.

Men appeared to send more nonverbal messages of interest in sex. For instance, significantly more women (9%) than men (0%) reported that the other person got out or put on a condom (e.g., “He took his pants off and started to put a condom on but I told him I thought it was too soon for us to be having sex,” W-163), and significantly more women (5%) than men (0%) reported that the other person sent them a sexual text message. One woman wrote,

A few weeks ago I did an interview with a guy from class. We talked as friends and he walked me home afterwards. I thought it was nothing but being friendly. He then started texting me sexual things and wanted to come over and have sex....I tried to tell him I just wanted to be friends but he still texts me crude things. I stopped responding to his messages. I would get like 10 a day. He just recently stopped bothering me but I have class with him which is awkward. (W-193)

In Situation H, as in Situation N, both men and women reported that they knew the other person wanted to have sex with them because he or she either asked or specifically said so (see Table 13). Other common signs of interest in sex shown by the other person were engaging in the same routine as in the past (e.g., “She was basically giving me a handjob on the top of my pants and we had done this before and it ended in sex,” M-536), and touching the participant in a sexual way. No gender differences were found in Situation H in the other

person's signs of interest in sex. When men and women had been sexually intimate in the past, their signs of interest in sex were more similar than when they had not.

Table 12

*Other Person's Signs of Interest in Sex in Situation N*

Signs of interest in sex	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Physical contact						
Touch	14	15	20	25	-.13	3.04
OP removed/tried to remove my clothing	11	11	16	20	-.12	2.45
Kissing	14	15	9	11	.05	0.43
OP removed/tried to remove own clothing	12	13	5	6	.12	1.95
Touched my genitals	8	8	1	1	.16	4.51*
Got on top of me	5	5	3	4	.03	0.21
Verbal						
Asked/said so	38	40	27	34	.06	0.64
Made seductive hints	12	13	8	10	.04	0.27
Wanted to go to a private place	8	8	7	9	-.01	0.01
Flirting	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
Asked about a condom	3	3	1	1	.06	0.69
Nonverbal						
Got out/put on a condom	0	0	7	9	-.22	8.75**
Sexual text message	0	0	4	5	-.17	4.91*
Hanging around	4	4	3	4	.01	0.02
Vague (the way she looked, made obvious move, made moves...)	17	18	8	10	.12	2.13
Other	14	15	8	10		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported that the other person showed more than one sign of interest in sex, and some did not report that the other person showed signs of interest in sex. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Table 13

*Other Person's Signs of Interest in Sex in Situation H*

Signs of interest in sex	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Physical contact						
Touch	8	12	14	23	-.16	3.13
Engaged in same routine as in past /usual expectations	11	16	11	18	-.03	0.13
Kissing	7	10	11	18	-.12	1.79
OP removed/tried to remove my Clothing	7	10	9	15	-.07	0.70
OP removed/tried to remove own Clothing	5	7	3	5	.05	0.28
Got on top of me	3	4	1	2	.08	0.77
Verbal						
Asked/said so	28	41	24	40	.01	0.00
Made seductive hints	6	9	4	7	.04	0.18
Wanted to go to a private place	3	4	2	3	.03	0.09
Asked about a condom	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
Nonverbal						
Got out/put on a condom	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.50
Staying late at night	0	0	0	0		
Sexual text message	0	0	0	0		
Vague (the way she looked, made obvious move, made moves...)	9	13	4	7	.11	1.44
Other	7	10	7	12		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported that the other person showed more than one sign of interest in sex, and some did not report that the other person showed signs of interest in sex. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

*Methods of Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what they did to not let sex happen. In Situation N, both men and women most commonly reported telling the other person they did not want to have sex, saying that sex could not happen, or simply saying no (see Table 14). Though both men and women listed this as their most common method of gatekeeping, significantly more women (64%) than men (33%)

mentioned that this is what they did to not let sex happen (e.g., “Just said no and stayed to my word,” W-102). Significantly more men (7%) than women (0%) said that sex was not a good idea to stop it from happening (e.g., “Told her it was a bad idea tonight, that we should wait,” M-624). Similar percentages of men (20%) and women (26%) reported that they left the gatekeeping setting to signify that they were not interested in having sex (e.g., “I left while she was up going to the bathroom,” M-598). Other common methods of gatekeeping reported by participants were simply stopping the sexual behavior (e.g., “Just stopped making out and got up,” M-515) or making the other person stop the sexual behavior (e.g., “I grabbed her hands, looked her in the eye, and said ‘no, we really shouldn’t do this right now,’” M-517). Overall, men and women used similar methods of gatekeeping in Situation N.

Table 14

*Participants’ Methods of Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Method of gatekeeping	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Verbal. “I said...”						
No/it can’t happen/I don’t want to	32	33	51	64	-.30	16.20***
It’s not a good idea	7	7	0	0	.19	6.08*
Made up excuse/lie	4	4	1	1	.09	1.34
Already in a relationship	4	4	0	0	.14	3.41
Bad location: people in other room, in a car...	3	3	0	0	.14	3.41
I was drunk	2	2	1	1	.03	0.18
Didn’t know OP long enough	2	2	1	1	.03	0.18
Didn’t want a relationship with person/not interested	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP was drunk	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69

*Methods Of Gatekeeping, Continued...*

Pregnancy content: Didn't want to get pregnant/get OP pregnant	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Didn't have a condom	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP was a virgin	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Not in mood	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Made a joke/used humor to say no	0	0	2	3	-.12	2.43
Values/religion	0	0	2	3	-.12	2.43
Suggested another activity (sexual)	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
Intimidatingly large penis	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
Didn't want to give OP wrong idea	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Didn't want OP to get attached	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Didn't want to ruin friendship	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
OP already in a relationship	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Wanted to wait because I was interested in relationship with OP	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Wanted to wait until marriage	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
I'm a virgin	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
Suggested another activity (nonsexual)	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Other/vague	7	7	1	1		
Nonverbal						
Left	19	20	21	26	-.08	1.04
Stopped sexual behavior	7	7	11	14	-.11	1.98
Made OP stop sexual behavior	7	7	7	9	-.03	0.13
Kept distance from OP	7	7	5	6	.02	0.07
Ignored OP	5	5	3	4	.03	0.21
Avoided sexual behavior (behavior leading to sex)	4	4	2	3	.05	0.37
Engaged in alternative sexual behavior	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
Vague	3	3	1	1	.06	0.69
Other	9	9	6	8		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one method of gatekeeping, and some did not report any methods of gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, as in Situation N, the most commonly reported method of gatekeeping for both men and women was telling the other person they did not

want to have sex, saying that sex could not happen, or simply saying no (see Table 15). A significant gender difference was found for this method of gatekeeping, as well, with 77% of women and 36% of men reporting that they said they did not want to have sex. The most common methods of gatekeeping in Situation N were also common in Situation H. For example, both men and women often reported that they left the gatekeeping setting to prevent sex from happening (e.g., “Said no, it didn’t feel right, and left,” M-561; “She tried to make a move. I had a girlfriend. I refused and left,” M-565). Another method participants reported was stopping the sexual behavior or making the other person stop the sexual behavior. One difference in methods of gatekeeping in Situation H was that the gatekeeping method of saying “I’m not in the mood” was slightly more common. That is, whereas only 2% of men in Situation N reported saying they were not in the mood to prevent sex from happening, 9% of men and 6% of women reported saying this as their method of gatekeeping (e.g., “Told her I was tired and wanted to go to bed,” M-572; “I told him I wasn’t in the mood,” W-183). As in Situation N, overall, men and women used similar methods of gatekeeping in Situation H.

Table 15

*Participants’ Methods of Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Method of gatekeeping	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Verbal. “I said...”						
No/it can’t happen/didn’t want to	25	36	46	77	-.41	21.20***
Not in mood	6	9	4	7	.04	0.18

*Methods Of Gatekeeping, Continued...*

It's not a good idea	3	4	1	1	.08	0.77
Didn't have a condom	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Already in a relationship	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Bad location: people in other room, in a car...	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
I was drunk	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Didn't want a relationship with person/ not interested	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Suggested another activity (sexual)	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Made up an excuse/lied	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Made a joke/used humor to say no	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP was drunk	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Crazy/clingy/annoying/bitch/pervert/ ass/etc.	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Pregnancy content: Didn't want to get pregnant/ get OP pregnant	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Didn't want to ruin friendship	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Didn't want to give OP the wrong idea	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
More interested in someone else	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Didn't want to make a decision I'd regret	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Regretted previous sex with OP	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Other/vague	6	9	2	3		
<b>Nonverbal</b>						
Left	8	12	8	13	-.03	0.09
Stopped sexual behavior	4	6	7	12	-.10	1.42
Made OP stop sexual behavior	3	4	6	10	-.11	1.58
Avoided sexual behavior (behavior leading to sex)	2	3	4	7	-.09	1.03
Kept distance from OP	3	4	2	3	.03	0.09
Did not make the next move	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Engaged in alternative sexual behavior	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Pretended to sleep	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Ignored OP	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Rolled over	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Acted tired	0	0	0	0		
Other	4	6	1	2		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one method of gatekeeping, and some did not report any methods of gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

*Reasons for Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what their reasons were for not letting sex happen.

In Situation N, one of men's and women's most cited reasons for not letting sex

happen was because they did not know the other person long or well enough (see Table 16). However, significantly more women (30%) than men (16%) reported this as their reason for gatekeeping (e.g., “I didn’t know her well at all,” M-540; “Didn’t know her well enough to know if I wanted that kind of relationship,” M-520; “We weren’t dating. I didn’t know him that well,” W-133).

Men and women differed significantly on many of the reasons they provided for gatekeeping. For instance, men’s most cited reason for gatekeeping was because the other person was drunk, with 23% of men, compared with only 6% of women, reporting this reason (e.g., “No. You don’t have sex with a drunk girl. Not cool man,” M-550; “I deemed it not a good idea because she was too intoxicated, even though I had not seen her drink a drop the entire night,” M-528; “I feel like both partners should be in a straight mindset before having sex. Being drunk is not the only scenario that would prevent me from having sex with a willing partner,” M-567; “She was too drunk, and when girls are that drunk, it’s no fun,” M-547).

Significantly more men (14%) than women (3%) reported that they did not let sex happen because they thought the other person was physically unattractive (e.g., “I didn’t find her attractive in the least,” M-505; “She was ugly,” M-505 and M-599; “She wasn’t hot and I didn’t know her,” M-536). Significantly more men (7%) than women (0%) reported that they did not let sex happen because the other person was a virgin (e.g., “She was a virgin and she told me when we started dating that she wanted to wait until marriage,” M-552). One man reported that his

reason for gatekeeping was “feeling guilty having already taken 3 girls’ virginity” (M-530).

More women than men tended to cite reasons having to do with religion, tradition, or emotional closeness with the other person. For example, significantly more women (11%) than men (2%) said they did not let sex happen because they were waiting until marriage to have sex (e.g., “I am a virgin and come from a very traditional background. Although we are getting married soon, we both agree that we will wait,” W-107; “I’m a Christian and I want to wait for my wedding day!” W-119). Many women reported that they were not necessarily waiting for marriage to have sex, but they would not have sex if they were not in a relationship. Significantly more women (9%) than men (1%) cited this as their reason for gatekeeping (e.g., “I don’t want to have sex with a guy I’m not dating,” W-149).

Table 16

*Participants’ Reasons for Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Reasons for gatekeeping	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Didn’t know OP long/well enough	15	16	24	30	-.17	5.23*
OP was drunk	22	23	5	6	.23	9.33**
I’m a virgin	6	6	12	15	-.14	3.64
Didn’t want a relationship with person /not interested	6	6	11	14	-.13	2.81
Ugly	13	14	2	3	.12	6.82*
Wanted to wait until marriage	2	2	9	11	-.19	6.26*
Already in a relationship	10	10	6	8	.05	0.45
Didn’t want to ruin friendship	5	5	8	10	-.09	1.46
Didn’t have a condom	10	10	3	4	.13	2.84
I was drunk	8	8	7	9	-.01	0.01
Had to be in a relationship to have sex	1	1	7	9	-.18	5.98*

*Reasons For Gatekeeping, Continued...*

OP was a virgin	7	7	0	0	.19	6.08*
Unattractive (didn't like OP as a person)	4	4	5	6	-.05	0.39
Content						
Values/religion	6	6	4	5	.03	0.13
Didn't want to get an STD/STI	6	6	3	4	.06	0.56
OP was/seemed promiscuous	6	6	3	4	.06	0.56
Crazy/clingy/annoying/bitch/pervert/ass, etc.	6	6	2	3	.09	1.41
Bad location: people in other room, in a car...	5	5	1	1	.11	2.08
More interested in someone else	4	4	1	1	.09	1.34
I didn't want to take advantage of OP	4	4	0	0	.14	3.41
Pregnancy content: Didn't want to get pregnant /get OP pregnant	3	3	3	4	-.02	0.05
OP came on too strong/too pushy	3	3	2	3	.02	0.06
Wanted to wait because I was interested in Relationship with OP	3	3	2	3	.02	0.06
Didn't want to make a decision I'd regret	3	3	1	1	.06	0.69
I wasn't in love with OP	0	0	3	4	-.14	3.66
OP already in a relationship	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
Didn't want OP to get attached	2	2	2	3	-.01	0.01
My peers would disapprove	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP was too young	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP was girlfriend/boyfriend or ex of a friend	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Didn't want to give OP the wrong idea	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Vague	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Unattractive –physical content	0	0	0	0		
Overweight	0	0	0	0		
Not in mood	0	0	0	0		
Other	12	13	17	21		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one reason for gatekeeping, and some did not report any reasons for gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person." The abbreviation STD/STI stands for "sexually transmitted disease/sexually transmitted infection."

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

Interestingly, though no participants in Situation N cited "not in the mood" as a reason for gatekeeping, both men and women most commonly reported this as their reason for not letting sex happen in Situation H (see Table 17). More women (50%) than men (20%) reported this (e.g., "I just wasn't in the mood and I was just happy being with my girlfriend," M-510). One man reported that his father was ill and he was preoccupied with thoughts about him: "I was thinking

about something else that had importance to me more than sex at that time. I wasn't emotionally available. I couldn't concentrate" (M-566).

Men's most common reasons for gatekeeping in Situation H were significantly different from those of women, with 12% of men and 2% of women reporting gatekeeping because they did not have a condom (e.g., "I didn't have a condom, so we chose not to have sex," M-571), and 12% of men and 2% of women reporting that they were already in a relationship (e.g., "Sex is great. She's hot with a nice body....I wanted to, but I couldn't do that to me or my girlfriend," M-634). Twelve percent of women and 4% of men did not let sex happen because the other person was an "ex" and they were trying to move on from the relationship (e.g., "I was wanting things to end with him. I didn't have the same feelings for him and I wasn't dating him," W-147). In addition, 7% of men and 5% of women said they did not want to have sex with the other person because they did not want a sexual relationship with him or her, despite having had sex previously (e.g., "I didn't want the relationship to carry on any further," M-505).

In Situation H, the gatekeeping reasons of the other person being physically unattractive, having to wait until marriage to have sex, and having to be in a serious relationship to have sex were not frequently cited. Therefore, the reasons for gatekeeping were different between Situations N and H.

However, within Situation H, there were fewer gender differences, and men's and women's reasons for gatekeeping in Situation H were more similar than in Situation N.

Table 17

*Participants' Reasons for Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Reasons for gatekeeping	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Not in mood	14	20	40	50	-.31	12.60***
Didn't have a condom	8	12	1	2	.19	4.87*
Already in a relationship	8	12	1	2	.19	4.87*
OP was an ex and I was trying to move on	3	4	7	12	-.14	2.40
OP was drunk	6	9	2	3	.11	1.59
Didn't want a relationship with person /not interested	5	7	3	5	.05	0.28
Pregnancy content: Didn't want to get pregnant /get OP pregnant	4	6	2	3	.06	0.44
Bad location :people in other room, in a car...	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
I didn't want to take advantage of OP	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
I was drunk	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
Didn't want to ruin friendship	3	4	3	5	-.02	0.03
Unattractive –didn't like OP as a person content	3	4	2	3	.03	0.09
Didn't want to give OP the wrong idea	0	0	3	5	-.17	3.53
Regretted previous sex with OP	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Didn't want to make a decision I'd regret	2	3	2	3	-.01	0.02
More interested in someone else	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
OP was/seemed promiscuous	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
Ugly	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Crazy/clingy/annoying/bitch/pervert/ass, etc.	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Didn't want to get an STD/STI	0	0	2	3	-.13	2.34
Didn't want OP to get attached	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Values/religion	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
OP came on too strong/too pushy	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
My peers would disapprove	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP already in a relationship	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP was a girlfriend/boyfriend or ex of a friend	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Wanted to wait because I was interested in relationship with OP	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Didn't know OP long/well enough	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Had to be in a relationship to have sex	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Wanted to wait until marriage	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
I wasn't in love with OP	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Unable to perform sexually	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88

*Reasons For Gatekeeping, Continued...*

Unattractive-physical content	0	0	0	0
Didn't have enough in common with OP	0	0	0	0
Overweight	0	0	0	0
Knew OP in other role (friend, TA, classmate, Co-worker); didn't want it to be awkward	0	0	0	0
Other	11	16	19	32

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one reason for gatekeeping, and some did not report any reasons for gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

*Participants' Reasons for Wanting Sex, Even Though They Did Not Let It Happen*

Participants were asked what, if any, reasons they had for wanting sex, even though they did not let it happen. In Situation N, women most commonly reported that they did not feel any ambivalence about gatekeeping, and that they did not want to have sex at all (see Table 18). Significantly more women (31%) than men (15%) reported this lack of ambivalence. Women that did feel ambivalent, and over half of the men, reported that they wanted to have sex, even though they did not let it happen, because the other person was physically attractive (e.g., "She was amazingly hot, I knew her well, I knew her family, typical lifestyle," M-529, "She was very good looking. She made me feel like a pimp," M-572). However, significantly more men (53%) than women (28%) reported this reason for wanting sex. Other common reasons listed by both men and women included enjoying sex and wanting to feel physical pleasure, as well as being attracted to the other person for non-physical reasons.

Table 18

*Participants' Reasons for Wanting Sex in Situation N, Even Though They Did Not Let It Happen*

Reasons for wanting sex	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
OP was physically attractive	51	53	22	28	.26	11.80***
No reason/I did not want sex	14	15	25	31	-.20	7.03*
My physical pleasure/I like sex	24	25	12	15	.12	2.68
OP was attractive as a person	20	21	16	20	.01	0.02
I'm attracted to OP	9	9	11	14	-.07	0.83
I want(ed) to get closer to OP	3	3	3	4	-.02	0.05
I love OP	2	2	2	3	-.01	0.03
I wanted to please OP	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
I wanted to lose my virginity (get it over with)	1	1	3	4	-.09	1.44
It's my obligation as boyfriend /girlfriend	0	0	0	0		
Other	12	13	8	10		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one reason for wanting sex, even though they did not let it happen, and some did not report any reasons for wanting sex. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, men and women differed in their most common reasons for wanting sex, even though they did not let it happen (see Table 19). Significantly more men (36%) than women (7%) reported that they wanted to have sex because the other person was physically attractive. Significantly more women (45%) than men (17%) reported that they were ambivalent about gatekeeping because they knew that the sex was good from previous experience with the other person. Significantly more women (7%) than men (0%) also reported wanting to have sex with the other person in order to get closer to them emotionally (e.g., "I probably wanted sex just so I could keep him in the relationship and he wouldn't go back to

his slut of an ex-girlfriend,” W-166). As in Situation N, other commonly reported reasons included enjoying sex and wanting to feel physical pleasure, being in love with the other person, being attracted to the other person for non-physical reasons, wanting to please the other person, and wanting to fulfill relationship obligations. Sixteen percent of men and 7% of women reported that they did not feel any ambivalence and did not want sex at all.

Table 19

*Participants’ Reasons for Wanting Sex in Situation H, Even Though They Did Not Let It Happen*

Reasons for wanting sex	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
I knew sex was good from previous experience	12	17	27	45	-.30	11.60***
OP was physically attractive	25	36	4	7	.35	16.10***
My physical pleasure/I like sex	24	35	18	30	.05	0.33
I love OP	7	10	11	18	-.12	1.79
No reason/I did not want sex	11	16	4	7	.14	2.69
I’m attracted to OP	5	7	6	10	-.05	0.31
OP was attractive as a person	6	9	4	7	.04	0.18
I wanted to please OP	2	3	4	7	-.09	1.03
It’s my obligation as boyfriend /girlfriend	1	1	4	7	-.13	2.34
I want(ed) to get closer to OP	0	0	4	7	-.19	4.75*
Other	5	7	5	8		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one reason for wanting sex, even though they did not let it happen, and some did not report any reasons for wanting sex. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher’s exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for “other person.”

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

*Other Person’s Reaction to Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked how the other person reacted when they did not let sex happen. For Situation N, women most commonly reported that the other

person's reaction was that of being understanding and accepting of the gatekeeping (see Table 20). Significantly more women (48%) than men (21%) reported this as the other person's reaction (e.g., "He stopped. He was fine with it," W-132; "He was cool with it. He was a really nice guy," W-133). When women engaged in gatekeeping, their male partners commonly accepted and understood this behavior more often than did women when their male partners engaged in gatekeeping.

Other common reactions of both men's and women's partners were unhappiness, sadness, disappointment, and anger. Significantly more women (16%) than men (1%) reported that the other person kept trying to have sex with them after they engaged in gatekeeping (e.g., "He said 'OK. I know,' but kept trying to move further," W-103; "[He reacted] like I was being mean, then like I was playing hard to get and he just got more persistent," W-141).

Significantly more men (8%) than women (0%) reported that the other person was surprised when they did not let sex happen (e.g., "She seemed surprised, but she said she was glad I didn't want to," M-586; "She was shocked," M-633; "[She was] kind of shocked, actually ... it was weird when she left she wanted at least a kiss. But NO," M-526).

Finally, significantly more men (6%) than women (0%) reported that their partner left after gatekeeping occurred (e.g., "She got mad, slammed my door, and left," M-517; "She left me and [went] back to other guys," M-525; "She cried, put her clothes on, and ran out of the room," M-634).

Table 20

*Reaction of Other Person in Situation N*

Reactions	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Positive						
Understanding/accepted it	20	21	38	48	-.28	14.04***
Didn't care	4	4	2	3	.05	0.37
Cuddled/positive physical reaction	0	0	3	4	-.14	3.66
Neutral						
Surprised	8	8	0	0	.20	6.98*
Left	6	6	0	0	.17	5.18*
Moved on to someone else	5	5	1	1	.12	2.08
Engaged in alternative sexual Activity	3	3	1	1	.06	0.69
Negative						
Unhappy/sad/disappointed	23	24	14	18	.08	1.10
Angry	16	17	13	16	.01	0.01
Kept trying	1	1	13	16	-.28	13.78***
Confused/didn't understand	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
Defensive	1	1	3	4	-.09	1.44
Cried	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
Not sure/don't know	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
Other	9	9	16	20		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported that the other person had more than one reaction to gatekeeping, and some did not report any reactions of the other person to gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

In Situation H, as in Situation N, common reactions reported by both men and women included the other person being understanding and accepting of the fact that they did not want to have sex (e.g., "She was totally cool and understanding," M-555), or having a reaction of unhappiness, sadness, or disappointment (e.g., "She was not happy," M-546; "[She was] upset that I stopped it," M-562; see Table 21).

Significantly more women (38%) than men (16%) reported that the reaction of the other person to gatekeeping was one of anger. Women's accounts of their partner's angry reactions included the following, "He and I were together and he wanted to have sex. I didn't feel like it. Then he decided to get pissy and ridiculous," W-102; "He was upset and talked about how we rarely saw one another and shouldn't waste our time," W-120; "He was like 'Why are you acting like this? Why are you being gay?' I was like 'Sorry I just don't want to.' He acted this way until I left. I think there was a reason that relationship didn't last," W-139; "He got mad because he felt stupid for being turned down," W-169; "He got angry and yelled. He said things like 'I thought you actually liked me, but I guess not. That is fucked up,'" W-173; "He was very angry and yelled at me, accusing me of cheating on him," W-200). As in Situation N, significantly more women (10%) than men (0%) reported that the other person kept trying to have sex with them after they engaged in gatekeeping. Consider the following examples,

I'd had sex with the guy before. We were no longer dating, but decided to watch a movie together. He tried to initiate sex again, but I told him no and pushed him away because we weren't dating anymore. He was disappointed and he kept trying. (W-147)

He was fine with it but sometimes could not control himself and would touch me again and kiss me so I would have to tell him to stop. (W-179)

Table 21

*Reaction of Other Person in Situation H*

Reactions	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Positive						
Understanding/accepted it	16	23	17	28	-.06	0.45
Didn't care	1	1	3	5	-.10	1.35
Cuddled/positive physical reaction	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.50
Neutral						
Surprised	3	4	1	2	.08	0.77
Left	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
Negative						
Unhappy/sad/disappointed	30	43	19	32	.12	1.90
Angry	11	16	23	38	-.25	8.29*
Kept trying	0	0	6	10	-.24	7.24*
Cried	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Embarrassed	0	0	0	0		
Defensive	0	0	0	0		
Not sure/don't know	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
Other	8	12	7	12		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported that the other person had more than one reaction to gatekeeping, and some did not report any reactions of the other person to gatekeeping. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

*Expected Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what positive or negative consequences they expected related to not letting sex happen. Responses were coded as positive or negative depending on participants' other responses. For Situation N, many men and women reported that they did not expect any negative consequences related to gatekeeping (see Table 22). However, of those who did, men and women occasionally differed. Both men and women commonly expected the other person to react angrily to gatekeeping, but more women (25%) than men (8%) reported

this expectation (e.g., “He was going to get mad,” W-204; “I expected that he would be mad and break up with me,” W-192; “I thought he might get angry and tell his friends I was frigid or something, but I didn’t care because I didn’t know them,” W-173; “I thought she would be extremely angry and not want to talk to me again,” M-540).

Significantly more women (11%) than men (2%) were also concerned about the negative impact of gatekeeping on the relationship (e.g., “Our friendship would end,” W-124; “Potential for friendship would be lost,” W-141; “He would end it or cheat with other girls,” W-148).

Significantly more men (8%) than women (0%) reported they expected the negative consequence of not being able to have sex (e.g., “[I] wouldn’t have sex that night,” M-543; “No sex for me ☺,” M-548).

Other common negative expectations of both men and women were that the other person would be upset, sad, or disappointed (e.g., “I thought she was going to get upset with me and leave,” M-586), and that it would be awkward with the other person afterwards (e.g., “[I expected] things to be weird in class from then on,” M-564; “It could be a very awkward subject between us,” M-633). One man (M-580) reported that “It’s awkward when I check out at Wal-Mart” because he engaged in gatekeeping with a Wal-Mart employee.

Table 22

*Participants' Expected Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Expected negative consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
OP would be angry	8	8	20	25	-.23	9.06**
None	14	15	8	10	.07	0.84
It would be awkward with OP afterwards	7	7	8	11	-.07	0.83
OP would be upset, sad, disappointed	5	5	9	11	-.11	2.18
Negatively impact relationship	2	2	9	11	-.19	6.26*
No sex for me	8	8	0	0	.20	6.98*
OP would stop contacting me	3	3	5	6	-.07	0.98
OP would have hurt feelings/feel Rejected	4	4	1	1	.09	1.34
I don't know/don't care	4	4	0	0	.14	3.41
OP would be less attracted to me	2	2	2	3	-.01	0.03
OP would retaliate (e.g., rumors, stalking, tell others)	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.55
OP would hate me	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.55
OP would use force/rape me	0	0	2	3	-.12	2.43
OP would find someone else to have sex with	0	0	2	3	-.12	2.43
OP would be less willing to initiate sex in future	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
No pleasure for OP	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
OP would get more attracted to me	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
OP would keep asking me for sex (persistence)	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
OP would get revenge (e.g., withhold sex)	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
OP would think I'm a tease/call me a tease	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
I would get made fun of by my friends	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
There would be rumors that I'm gay	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Other	6	6	4	5		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one expected negative consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any expected negative consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, many men and women expected no negative consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 23). Of those that did have negative expectations, men

and women only significantly differed on the expectation that the other person would react angrily, with 32% of women and 7% of men reporting this. Across situations, women expected anger in their male partners more often than did men with their female partners (e.g., “Him getting mad....or raping me ‘cause he was drunk,” W-110; “I assumed he’d probably be mad at me and not want to hang out as much,” W-122; “[I expected to] hear her bitch,” M-622).

Men and women also commonly expected the negative consequence of the other person being upset, sad, or disappointed (e.g., “[I] thought she would get upset, then get the picture,” M-632; “I expected him to be upset with me,” W-192). Others feared that the other person would stop contacting them after they did not let sex happen (e.g., “[I expected] that I would never talk to her again,” M-616; “I would probably never see or talk to ‘Betty’ again,” M-612; “I was scared he wouldn’t talk to me,” W-170).

Table 23

*Participants’ Expected Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Expected negative consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
OP would be angry	5	7	19	32	-.31	12.64***
OP would be upset, sad disappointed	13	19	4	7	.18	4.16
None	7	10	8	13	-.05	0.32
OP would stop contacting me	2	3	7	12	-.17	3.80
It would negatively impact relationship	2	3	5	8	-.12	1.85
It would be awkward with OP afterwards	5	7	0	0	.19	4.52
No sex for me	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
OP would get revenge (e.g., withhold sex)	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
OP would have hurt feelings/feel rejected	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
No pleasure for OP	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88

*Expected Negative Consequences, Continued...*

OP would use force/rape me	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
OP would be less willing to initiate sex in Future	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP would keep asking me for sex (persistence)	0	0	0	0		
OP would retaliate (e.g., rumors, stalking, tell others)	0	0	0	0		
OP would think I'm a tease/call me a tease	0	0	0	0		
OP would be less attracted to me	0	0	0	0		
OP would hate me	0	0	0	0		
OP would find someone else to have sex with	0	0	0	0		
I would get made fun of by my friends	0	0	0	0		
There would be rumors that I'm gay	0	0	0	0		
Other	1	1	4	7		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one expected negative consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any expected negative consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP means "other person."  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

### *Actual Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what actual positive and negative consequences occurred related to not letting sex happen. Responses were coded as positive or negative based on participants' other responses. For Situation N, men and women most often reported that there were no actual negative consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 24). Despite the common expectation that the other person would react angrily, only 3% of men and 6% of women reported that this actually occurred (e.g., "She got mad," M-635; "He was mad and frustrated. [He] kicked me out of his house," W-172; "He threw the water glass," W-174).

Men and women often reported that the other person stopped or decreased contact with them (e.g., "She talks less and less to me every day," M-525; "She pretty much stopped talking to me," M-610) or that the gatekeeping negatively impacted the relationship in some way (e.g., "We stopped seeing each other," M-

619; “Things weren’t the same between us. It created a barrier that I hadn’t foreseen at the time,” M-549).

Significantly more men (6%) than women (0%) reported that the actual negative consequence of gatekeeping was that they did not get to have sex (e.g., “Didn’t have sex that night,” M-543; “No sex happiness at that time,” M-576; “No booty,” M-622). Men and women did not differ significantly on any other actual negative consequence. However, three men mentioned that they were ridiculed by their friends as a result of gatekeeping (e.g., “My friends called me a pussy, and all were astonished I would not have sex,” M-593). This consequence was not reported by any women.

Table 24

*Participants’ Actual Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Actual negative consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
None	17	17	13	16	.02	0.07
OP stopped contacting me	5	5	8	10	-.09	1.46
It negatively impacted our relationship	3	3	8	10	-.14	3.52
No sex for me	6	6	0	0	.17	5.18*
OP was angry	3	3	5	6	-.07	0.98
It was awkward with OP afterwards	2	2	5	6	-.11	1.98
OP was upset, sad, disappointed	2	2	3	4	-.05	0.44
I got made fun of by my friends	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
I don’t know/don’t care	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP hated me	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
I got made fun of by my friends	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
I don’t know/don’t care	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP hated me	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
OP kept asking me for sex (persistence)	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
OP was less willing to initiate sex in the future	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
No sex for OP	0	0	0	0		
OP had hurt feelings/felt rejected	0	0	0	0		
OP was more attracted to me	0	0	0	0		

*Actual Negative Consequences, Continued...*

OP used force/raped me	0	0	0	0
OP got revenge (e.g., withheld sex)	0	0	0	0
OP retaliated (e.g., rumors, stalking told others)	0	0	0	0
OP thought I'm a tease/called me a tease	0	0	0	0
OP was less attracted to me	0	0	0	0
OP found someone else to have sex with	0	0	0	0
There were rumors that I'm gay	0	0	0	0
Other	4	4	4	5

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one actual negative consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any actual negative consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, significantly more men (16%) than women (3%) reported that there were no actual negative consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 25). Women's most commonly reported negative consequence was that the other person reacted angrily, with significantly more women (20%) than men (3%) reporting this reaction (e.g., "He got pissed and I broke up with him," W-151, "He got really mad/acidic towards me. He even spread rumors about me and publicly humiliated me," W-153, "He got angrier than I thought he would. I actually had to leave his house because he got so violent," W-200).

Both men and women commonly reported that the other person was upset, sad, or disappointed in response to their gatekeeping (e.g., "She was upset until we had sex the next day," M-509, "My girlfriend was upset with me for a while," M-571, "She put on a pouty face and we went out to drink more," M-608, "[She] got upset and no longer called," M-632).

Table 25

*Participants' Actual Negative Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Actual negative consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
OP was upset, sad, disappointed	13	19	4	7	.12	4.16
OP was angry	2	3	12	20	-.27	9.70**
None	11	16	2	3	.21	5.63*
It negatively impacted our relationship	1	1	5	8	-.16	3.43
No sex for me	3	4	3	5	-.02	0.03
OP stopped contacting me (persistence)	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.50
It was awkward with OP afterwards	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
OP had hurt feelings/felt rejected	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP was more attracted to me	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
OP retaliated (e.g., rumors, stalking, told others)	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
OP thought I'm a tease/called me a tease	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
OP was less willing to initiate sex in the future	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
I got made fun of by my friends	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
No sex for OP	0	0	0	0		
OP used force/raped me	0	0	0	0		
OP got revenge (e.g., withheld sex)	0	0	0	0		
OP was less attracted to me	0	0	0	0		
OP hated me	0	0	0	0		
OP found someone else to have sex with	0	0	0	0		
There were rumors that I'm gay	0	0	0	0		
Other	2	3	4	7		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one actual negative consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any actual negative consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

*Expected Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what positive and negative consequences they expected related to not letting sex happen. Responses were coded as positive or negative based on the participant's other responses. In Situation N, participants most commonly responded that they did not expect any positive consequences of

gatekeeping (see Table 26). Significantly more women (8%) than men (0%) reported that they expected the other person to understand or not mind that they engaged in gatekeeping (e.g., “He might agree and want to wait,” W-155; “Him being like ‘OK that’s fine,’” W-172; “I didn’t think he cared. He knew I would probably say no,” W-183).

Six percent of men and 4% of women reported that they expected that gatekeeping would make them look good or gain the respect of the other person (e.g., “I believed that afterwards we would respect each other more,” M-507; “I thought she would think more of me for preventing it,” M-614; “She’d understand that I’m a good guy,” M-622; “He would know I just wasn’t going to have sex with just anyone,” W-197). Other relatively common expected positive consequences were that participants would not have any regrets (e.g., “We wouldn’t do anything we might regret,” M-528; “I wouldn’t have to regret it in the morning,” M-533) and that they would not contract any sexually transmitted diseases (e.g., “Wouldn’t catch an STD from her. Wouldn’t be ‘that guy’ who slept with a girl that sleeps with multiple guys a week,” M-572; “I wouldn’t catch anything,” M-525; “No herpes,” M-567).

Table 26

*Participants' Expected Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Expected positive consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
None	18	19	10	13	.09	1.27
Made me look good/gain respect of OP	6	6	3	4	.06	0.56
OP would understand/not mind	0	0	6	8	-.21	7.45*
We'd stay friends/relationship would stay the same	4	4	5	6	-.05	0.39
I wouldn't have regrets	5	5	3	4	.03	0.21
Relationship would improve	2	2	5	6	-.11	1.98
No STDs	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
I wouldn't cheat	4	4	0	0	.14	3.41
No pregnancy	3	3	2	3	.02	0.06
I'd feel good about myself	3	3	2	3	.02	0.06
Don't know/don't care	2	2	3	4	-.05	0.44
Avoided unwanted sex	2	2	1	1	.03	0.18
No attachment/commitment	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Make me look good/gain respect from Others (not OP)	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Get rid of OP/relationship would end	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
I'd keep my significant other	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
I'd feel in control	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
Make OP want sex more in the future	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Avoid sex with "slut" or "manwhore"	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
I'd avoid teasing from peers	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Alternative sexual activity	0	0	0	0		
Make OP have sex in future	0	0	0	0		
Avoid rape/physical harm	0	0	0	0		
Get rest/sleep	0	0	0	0		
I'd see true colors of OP	0	0	0	0		
I'd keep my virginity	0	0	0	0		
Other	5	5	6	6		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one expected positive consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any expected positive consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, both men and women often reported that they did not expect any positive consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 27). Men (0%) and women (7%) significantly differed on only one expected positive consequence -

that the relationship would improve (e.g., “[I expected to] grow from it together and for him to respect me,” W-110; “I thought it would have been better for our relationship if sex was not the basis of it,” W-140; “It would verify his love and respect for me,” W-161).

Common responses for men but not for women were that they expected to stay friends with the other person, that they would not cheat on their significant other, and that they would not get their partner pregnant (e.g., “I wouldn’t have a kid,” M-512; “I wasn’t going to get her pregnant,” M-527; “I wouldn’t have to worry about pregnancy or STDs by stopping,” M-554).

Common responses for women but not men were that the other person would not mind, that they would feel good about themselves afterwards (e.g., “I knew I would feel better about myself and my decisions,” W-170), and that they would look good or gain the respect of the other person (e.g., “[I expected] him to understand and wait and respect me,” W-149).

Table 27

*Participants’ Expected Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Expected positive consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
None	13	19	4	7	.18	4.16
We’d stay friends/relationship would stay the same	5	7	1	2	.13	2.25
OP would understand/not mind	1	1	5	8	-.16	3.43
No pregnancy	5	7	0	0	.19	4.52
I’d feel good about myself	1	1	4	7	-.13	2.34
Relationship would improve	0	0	4	7	-.19	4.75*
I’d keep my significant other	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
I wouldn’t cheat	3	4	0	0	.14	2.67
Make me look good/gain respect of OP	0	0	3	5	-.17	3.53

*Expected Positive Consequences, Continued...*

Get rid of OP/relationship would end	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
I wouldn't have regrets	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.50
I'd feel in control	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Don't know/don't care	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Alternative sexual activity	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Make OP want sex more in the future	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
No STDs	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
No attachment/commitment	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Get rest/sleep	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Make OP have sex in future	0	0	0	0		
Avoid sex with "slut" or "manwhore"	0	0	0	0		
Avoid rape/physical harm	0	0	0	0		
Avoided unwanted sex	0	0	0	0		
I'd see true colors of OP	0	0	0	0		
Make me look good/gain respect from others (not OP)	0	0	0	0		
I'd avoid teasing from peers	0	0	0	0		
Other	2	3	7	12		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one expected positive consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any expected positive consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

*Actual Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping*

Participants were asked what positive and negative consequences actually occurred related to not letting sex happen. Responses were coded as positive or negative based on participant's other responses. For Situation N, men and women most commonly reported that there were no actual positive consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 28). Those that did report positive consequences said that they stayed friends with the other person or the relationship did not change (e.g., "We stayed friends and hooked up a few more times after that," M-607; "[We] stayed friends. She respects me for who I am," M-595), that gatekeeping made them look good or gain the respect of the other person (e.g., "She came out after looking at me as a nice guy who didn't take advantage of her," M-591), that they

did not have regrets afterward (e.g., “If we would have had sex I would have felt guilty and she probably would have felt stupid and upset,” M-597), and that they did not contract sexually transmitted diseases (e.g., “I didn’t have a kid with an ugly chick, and I didn’t get any STDs,” M-505; “The positive consequences would definitely be not having a chance at getting STDs, as that girl seemed like she would have been with many guys,” M-627). Men and women did not significantly differ, except that more women (15%) than men (3%) reported that the other person understood or did not mind that they engaged in gatekeeping (e.g., “He was not upset and he did not try again,” W-146; “He just seemed to understand and go with it,” W-147).

Table 28

*Participants’ Actual Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation N*

Actual positive consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
None	17	18	11	14	.05	0.51
We stayed friends/relationship stayed the same	8	8	13	16	-.12	2.60
OP understood/didn’t mind	3	3	12	15	-.21	7.89*
Made me look good/gain respect of OP	10	10	3	4	.13	2.84
No STDs	7	7	2	3	.11	2.06
No regrets	5	5	4	5	.00	0.00
I felt good about myself	3	3	5	6	-.07	0.98
Relationship improved	5	5	2	3	.07	0.84
No pregnancy	4	4	2	3	.05	0.37
Got rid of OP/relationship ended	4	4	1	1	.09	1.34
Alternative sexual activity	0	0	3	4	-.14	3.66
Made OP have sex in the future	3	3	0	0	.12	2.54
I kept my virginity	1	1	2	3	-.06	0.55
I kept my significant other	2	2	1	1	.03	0.18
I didn’t cheat	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Made me look good/gain respect from others (not OP)	2	2	0	0	.10	1.69
Made OP want sex more in the future	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02

*Actual Positive Consequences, Continued...*

I felt in control	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
Avoided unwanted sex	1	1	1	1	-.01	0.02
Don't know/don't care	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Avoided sex with "slut" or "manwhore"	1	1	0	0	.07	0.84
Avoided rape/physical harm	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
Saw true colors of OP	0	0	1	1	-.08	1.21
No attachment/commitment	0	0	0	0		
Got rest/sleep	0	0	0	0		
Avoided teasing from peers	0	0	0	0		
Other	5	5	9	11		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all comparisons  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one actual positive consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any actual positive consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

In Situation H, significantly more men (20%) than women (3%) reported that there were no positive consequences of gatekeeping (see Table 29).

Significantly more women (15%) than men (3%) reported that the relationship improved because of their gatekeeping (e.g., "We talked about our relationship and what we both wanted," W-109; "Our relationship developed in a more mature manner," W-140). Significantly more women (8%) than men (0%) also reported feeling good about themselves after gatekeeping (e.g., "I had more confidence because I said no. It actually helped our relationship because we talk more now," W-170; "I had more dignity," W-172; "I felt awesome," W-190).

Of the men and women who reported other positive consequences of gatekeeping, commonly mentioned responses included the following: the other person understood or did not mind, the relationship stayed the same, and gatekeeping made the participant look good or gain the respect of the other person (e.g., "She respected me more," M-512; "She wasn't mad. In fact, she was

thankful we didn't have unprotected sex," M-607; "She has more respect for me," M-635).

Table 29

*Participants' Actual Positive Consequences of Gatekeeping in Situation H*

Actual positive consequences	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
None	14	20	2	3	.26	8.49*
Relationship improved	2	3	9	15	-.22	6.03*
OP understood/didn't mind	4	6	7	12	-.10	1.42
We stayed friends/relationship stayed the same	5	7	5	8	-.02	0.05
Made me look good/gain respect of OP	5	7	5	8	-.02	0.05
I felt good about myself	0	0	5	8	-.22	5.98*
I didn't cheat	5	7	0	0	.19	4.52
Got rid of OP/relationship ended	4	6	1	2	.12	1.47
I kept my significant other	4	6	0	0	.17	3.59
Got rest/sleep	2	3	2	3	-.01	0.02
No attachment/commitment	2	3	1	2	.04	0.21
I felt in control	0	0	2	3	-.13	2.34
No pregnancy	2	3	0	0	.12	1.77
No regrets	1	1	1	2	-.01	0.01
Made OP want sex more in the future	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Made OP have sex in the future	1	1	0	0	.08	0.88
Saw true colors of OP	0	0	1	2	-.09	1.16
Alternative sexual activity	0	0	0	0		
No STDs	0	0	0	0		
Avoided sex with "slut" or "manwhore"	0	0	0	0		
Avoided rape/physical harm	0	0	0	0		
Avoided unwanted sex	0	0	0	0		
Made me look good/gain respect from others (not OP)	0	0	0	0		
Avoided teasing from peers	0	0	0	0		
Other	4	6	10	17		

*Note.* Percentages in this table are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported more than one actual positive consequence of gatekeeping, and some did not report any actual positive consequences. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Because chi-square may not have been valid,  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. The abbreviation OP stands for "other person."

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

### *Participants' Alcohol Use*

Participants were asked if they were using alcohol at the time of gatekeeping, and, if so, what effect, if any, it had on the situation (see Table 30). In Situation N, 66% of men and 53% of women reported using alcohol at the time of gatekeeping. There was no significant gender difference in alcohol use in Situation N. Among those who said they were consuming alcohol, the following effects were reported: alcohol made it harder to say no to sex, alcohol made participants more “horny” or made participants want sex more, and made it difficult or impossible for participants to perform sexually.

In Situation H, significantly more men (33%) than women (14%) reported using alcohol. Among those who said they were consuming alcohol, the following effects were reported: alcohol made participants more “horny” or made participants want sex more, made it harder to say no to sex, and made participants tired.

### *Other Person's Alcohol Use*

Participants were asked if the other person was using alcohol at the time of gatekeeping, and, if so, what, if any, effect it had on the situation (see Table 30). In Situation N, 71% of men and 63% of women said that the other person was using alcohol at the time of gatekeeping. There was no significant gender difference in the other person's alcohol use in Situation N. Among those who said the other person was consuming alcohol, the following effects were reported: alcohol made the other person more free (more uninhibited, confident, or

comfortable) to say that they were interested in sex, made the other person “horny” or want sex more, and made the other person more “pushy” or aggressive.

In Situation H, significantly more men (38%) than women (21%) said that the other person was using alcohol at the time of gatekeeping. Among those who said the other person was consuming alcohol, the same effects as in Situation N were reported.

Table 30

*Participants' and Other Person's Alcohol Use*

Alcohol use of	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Situation N						
Participant	62	66	42	53	.13	2.93
Other person	67	71	49	63	.09	1.39
Situation H						
Participant	23	33	8	14	.23	6.52*
Other person	26	38	12	21	.18	4.34*

*Note.* Percentages in this table for Situation N are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all Situation N comparisons,  $N = 176$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 80). Percentages in this table for Situation H are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all Situation H comparisons  $N = 129$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 69,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. In these analyses,  $p$  was derived from chi-square.

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

*Regrets*

Participants were asked if they regretted not having sex with the other person after gatekeeping (see Table 31). In both Situation N and Situation H, significantly more men (21% and 21%, respectively) than women (6% and 5%)

reported that they regretted not having sex with the other person. Across situations, men regretted gatekeeping more than women. However, only about one-fifth of men reported that they regretted gatekeeping in each situation. Many men reported that they did not regret gatekeeping (e.g., “I felt more in control of the situation (usually she’s the one who controls sex or not) and I was able to show her I wouldn’t put up with everything,” M-580; “I was able to stand by my beliefs and practice self-control,” M-545; “Nope, ‘cause it showed my willpower. I can stop myself from having sex if needed,” M-515).

Table 31

*Participants’ Reports of Regretting Gatekeeping*

Regrets	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Situation N						
Yes	20	21	5	6	.21	7.58**
No	74	79	73	94		
Situation H						
Yes	14	21	3	5	.23	6.73**
No	54	79	57	95		

*Note.* Percentages in this table for Situation N are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all Situation N comparisons,  $N = 172$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 94,  $n$  for women = 78). Percentages in this table for Situation H are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all Situation H comparisons  $N = 128$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 68,  $n$  for women = 60). Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. In these analyses,  $p$  was derived from chi-square.

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

*Sex at a Later Date*

Participants were asked if they ever had sex with the other person in the gatekeeping situation at a later date (see Table 32). In Situation N, 18% of men

and 8% of women reported having sex with the other person at a later date (e.g., “I wanted to win my honor and dignity in manhood, so I fucked her. Pretty depressing isn’t it?” M-593). In contrast, in Situation H, most of men (67%) and women (61%) reported having sex with the other person at a later date. Sex at a later date was more common in situations in which the individuals had had sex previously.

Table 32

*Participants’ Reports of Sex at a Later Date With the Other Person*

Sex later	Men		Women		Phi	$\chi^2$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Situation N						
Yes	17	18	6	8	.15	3.76
No	79	82	72	93		
Situation H						
Yes	42	67	35	61	.05	0.36
No	21	33	22	39		

*Note.* Percentages in this table for Situation N are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation N. For all Situation N comparisons,  $N = 174$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 96,  $n$  for women = 78). Percentages in this table for Situation H are based on only those who reported gatekeeping in Situation H. For all Situation H comparisons  $N = 120$   $df = 1$  ( $n$  for men = 63,  $n$  for women = 57). Percentages do not add to 100% for women in Situation N because percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. In these analyses,  $p$  was derived from chi-square.

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

## Discussion

### *Prevalence and Incidence of Gatekeeping by Men and Women*

The current study challenges the stereotype that men never say no to sex, because the sexual behaviors of men and women were found to be similar in a number of important ways. Perhaps the most important finding of the current study is that men *do* say no to sex. In fact, the percentages of men and women reporting that they had engaged in gatekeeping (71% of men and 78% of women in Situation N, and 51% of men and 59% of women in Situation H) did not significantly differ in either situation. Gender differences were only found in Situation H when percentages were taken out of those individuals who reported having engaged in PVI, with significantly more women (84%) than men (64%) reporting gatekeeping. Though this gender difference is in the direction that would be predicted by the existing stereotype, it is still notable that 64% of men that had engaged in intercourse reported gatekeeping in Situation H. These results show that, contrary to popular belief, the majority of men report having engaged in gatekeeping in numerous situations.

One might assume that despite the general lack of gender differences in lifetime reports, or prevalence, of ever having engaged in gatekeeping, gender differences would exist in its incidence, or how often it occurs. However, this assumption was shown to be incorrect. Men and women who reported being in Situations N and H did not differ significantly in the number of times they reported gatekeeping in the past year. Therefore, not only do men say no to sex,

but those who say no do so just as often as women. In our sample of college-age individuals, the stereotype that men never say no to sex appears to be completely unfounded.

This finding raises methodological issues. That is, in order for gatekeeping to occur, certain components must be present: one person must initiate sex, and another person must perceive that the other is initiating sex and prevent it from happening. Our findings are dependent on the perceptions of the participant. Given our data, it is difficult to determine if the other person was actually making a sexual advance. Rather, we only know that the respondent perceived that the other person was initiating sex. This methodology might be problematic if there were gender differences in the number of interactions that were perceived as sexual initiations. That is, men's gatekeeping prevalence may only be as high as it is because they perceived more situations as sexual initiations than did women. Indeed, there is a large body of research showing that men interpret situations more sexually than do women (e.g., Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin, & Harnish, 1987; Muehlenhard, 1988). This raises the question of whether or not men were over-interpreting the other person's intentions.

This over-interpretation is possible, however, our data suggest this might be unlikely, because most of the men reported that women were direct in their initiations. Many men reported that their female partners used fairly unambiguous cues such as specifically asking to have sex or saying that they were interested (40%), touching the participants in a sexual way (15%), undressing the

participants (11%) or themselves (13%), or touching the participants' genitals to show interest in sex (8%). Though these percentages cannot be added because the participants often reported that the other person showed more than one sign of interest in sex, it is clear that in the majority of cases, women's sexual initiations were direct and unambiguous. In addition, very few men reported that their scenario did not include any physical contact (5% in Situation N and 13% in Situation H). Therefore, it is still possible, but unlikely, that the prevalence and incidence of men's gatekeeping is artificially inflated due to their misinterpretations of the situations.

#### *Theoretical Implications*

There are two major theories that would predict gender differences in respect to gatekeeping. Social role theory purports that gender roles are socially constructed from the time of birth (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Men are generally socialized to be powerful, independent, assertive, dominant, sexually permissive and exploratory, and tough (Shearer, Hosterman, Gillen, & Lefkowitz, 2005). Women are generally socialized to be sexually passive or restrictive, dependent, responsible, communal, emotionally involved, and relationship and friendship-oriented (Bailey, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1987; Lottes, 1993). According to social role theory, violation of traditional gender roles results in societal punishment. For example, the sexual double standard, to the extent that it persists, says that when women violate their gender role and become sexually permissive (e.g., having many sex partners or initiating sex), they are punished by society, while

men are rewarded for engaging in the same behavior (Alexander & Fisher, 2003; Sprecher, McKinney, & Orbuch, 1987). Likewise, social role theorists suggest that when men take on feminine characteristics, such as engaging in sexual gatekeeping, they are punished by society by having their potency or sexual orientation questioned (Alexander & Fisher, 2003). Thus, social role theory supports the common stereotype that men do not say no to sex.

Evolutionary theory supports this stereotype, as well. Evolutionary theorists claim that gender differences in sexual behavior are adaptive strategies that ensure evolutionary fitness through reproductive success (i.e., the passing of one's genes to as many offspring as possible). Men are said to maximize their fitness by passing their genes to as many offspring as possible due to their comparatively greater number of sex cells (sperm) and lower physical investment per child (Trivers, 1972). Evolutionary theorists claim that this is why men have a generally more permissive and casual attitude toward sex. Women, on the other hand, maximize their fitness by investing heavily in a much smaller number of offspring to ensure their survival and passing of genes to the next generation. Women have fewer sex cells (eggs) and a significant physical investment in being the bearer of children. Women are limited in the number of offspring they are able to have in a lifetime. Therefore, evolutionary theorists claim that women are more sexually restrictive and careful about their choice of mates (Trivers, 1972). Evolutionary theory supports the stereotype that men never say no to sex because to do so would be contrary to the adaptive goal of maximizing one's fitness.

The purpose of the current study was not to find differential support for either of these theories or to explain the origins of gatekeeping behavior. Rather, it was designed to be descriptive and to assess if the data are consistent or inconsistent with these theories. Our data were both consistent and inconsistent with the theories. The most important inconsistency, that no gender differences were found in respect to the reported prevalence or incidence of gatekeeping, has already been discussed. Characteristics of the gatekeeping situations showed consistencies and inconsistencies with the theories, as well.

For example, though most men and women reported the same desired relationships with the other person (friends in Situation N and boyfriend/girlfriend in Situation H), more men than women reported that they desired a sexual relationship without commitment in both situations (14% versus 4% in Situation N, and 16% versus 3% in Situation H). This finding is consistent with theories on gender differences in that men are said to be more sexually permissive and spread resources/investment across many sexual relationships, whereas women are said to be more sexually restrictive and invest heavily in committed relationships. However, it should be noted that 4% of women in Situation N and 3% of women in Situation H desired a sexual relationship without commitment, so this desire is not exclusive to men.

In addition, though the most common behaviors reported by both men and women prior to gatekeeping were the same (kissing/making out and going almost all the way/everything but PVI), differences in behaviors that did exist prior to

gatekeeping were consistent with the theories on gender differences. More women (54%) than men (36%) reported that they stopped at kissing or “making out,” whereas more men (31%) than women (13%) reported that they went almost all the way. Therefore, it appears that men and women report the same common behaviors. However, when men and women differed in the level of physical contact in which they engaged prior to gatekeeping, their behavior was consistent with the expected gender roles of women being more conservative in their sexual behaviors and men being more permissive.

Women and men differed in many of their reasons for gatekeeping, and these differences were often consistent with the theories on gender differences. For example, women commonly reported that they engaged in gatekeeping because they did not know the other person long or well enough, they were virgins, they wanted to wait until marriage to have sex, they were not interested in a relationship with the other person, they had to be in a relationship to have sex, and they did not want to ruin their friendship with the other person. Significantly more women than men reported that they had to be in a relationship to have sex (9% versus 1%) and that they wanted to wait for marriage to have sex (11% versus 2%). These reasons are consistent with gender roles because they contain the overall themes of chastity, conservatism, traditionalism, desire for emotional closeness to precede intimacy, and emphasis on friendship and relationships, which are all stereotypical feminine characteristics. However, inconsistent with their gender roles, a few men reported these reasons for gatekeeping, as well.

Men also reported gatekeeping because they did not know the other person long or well enough, though more women (30%) reported this than did men (16%). Men also commonly reported gatekeeping because the other person was drunk, ugly/ physically unattractive, or a virgin, and because they did not have a condom. Significantly more men than women reported gatekeeping because the other person was drunk (23% versus 6%) and the other person was a virgin (7% versus 0%).

As men often reported engaging in gatekeeping because the other person was drunk, it appears that many men may have been aware that it is important not to have sex with a woman who is intoxicated and may not be able to give her consent. Men indicated that they were able to prevent sex from happening despite the fact that their intoxication made them more “horny” and their female partners more persistent or willing to initiate sex. This is inconsistent with the stereotype that men’s high sex drive makes it impossible for them to challenge their desires and prevent sex from happening, especially when they are also intoxicated. Very few women reported gatekeeping because the other person was drunk, suggesting that women might not feel the same responsibility to avoid sex with an individual who is intoxicated. In Situation N, these differences in reasons for gatekeeping are likely not due to gender differences in alcohol use because men and women did not differ (66% and 53%, respectively). Men and women did not differ in their reports of the other person using alcohol, either (71% or 63%, respectively). The prevalence of alcohol use in this situation is not surprising, given that most

Situation N scenarios occurred at a party. In Situation H, however, alcohol use was significantly more common among men (33%) than women (14%) and among men's partners (38%) than women's partners (21%). Therefore, it is likely that men commonly mentioned the other person's alcohol use as a reason for gatekeeping in Situation H, whereas women did not, because alcohol use was significantly more common in men's gatekeeping scenarios than it was in those of women. As mentioned before, men's sense of responsibility to not have sex with a woman who is intoxicated was likely another reason for this difference.

Another one of men's common reasons for gatekeeping in Situations N was that the other person was physically unattractive or "ugly." Significantly more men (14%) than women (3%) listed this reason for gatekeeping. This finding is consistent with theories on gender differences in mate selection, which posit that men value physical attractiveness and signs of youthfulness in their potential female partners more than women do in their potential male partners (Buss, 1989). Physical attractiveness was not cited by either men or women as an important reason for gatekeeping in Situation H. This is likely because men and women had already selected these partners as mates on the basis of physical attractiveness.

Men commonly listed not having a condom as a reason for gatekeeping in both situations. However in Situation H, significantly more men (12%) than women (2%) listed this reason. Very few women mentioned lack of a condom as a reason for gatekeeping. This could mean that in women's gatekeeping

experiences, condoms were always available. However, it may also point to the traditional sexual script that men are responsible for providing and using condoms. Some women avoid providing condoms due to the fear of being perceived by their male partners as promiscuous (Hynie & Lydon, 1995).

Men and women engaged in gatekeeping for many different reasons. In Situation N, significantly more women (31%) than men (15%) reported that they were not ambivalent about gatekeeping – they did not want to have sex for any reason. This is not surprising, given that many of women’s reasons for gatekeeping were principle-based (e.g., I want to wait until marriage to have sex). That is, women listing these types of reasons would not have sex on another occasion even if the circumstances were different (unless, of course, they were married). However, many of men’s reasons were situation-based (e.g., I did not have a condom or the other person was drunk). That is, if given the opportunity to have sex with the other person under different circumstances, the men might accept the initiation.

Men and women listed many reasons for wanting sex, even though they did not let it happen, and these reasons were often consistent with theories on gender differences. For example, in both Situations N and H, more men than women reported that they wanted to have sex with the other person because he or she was physically attractive (53% versus 28% in Situation N, and 36% versus 7% in Situation H). These findings are consistent with gender differences in emphasis on physical attractiveness in mate selection that were discussed

previously. Women's reasons for wanting sex were often consistent with their gender roles, as well. For example, in Situation H, significantly more women (7%) than men (0%) reported that they wanted to have sex because they thought it would bring them closer to the other person, and many women reported wanting to have sex because they love the other person. Very few men listed these reasons, which are consistent with the feminine stereotype that women tend to focus on emotional closeness. Though men's and women's reasons for wanting sex were often consistent with theories on gender differences, they were sometimes inconsistent, as well. For example, in Situation H, both men and women reported that they enjoy sex and wanted it for their own physical pleasure, which is stereotypically more of a masculine viewpoint.

Finally, men's greater ambivalence about gatekeeping than women's is also reflected in the finding that in both situations, significantly more men than women reported that they regretted gatekeeping (21% versus 6% in Situation N, and 21% versus 5% in Situation H). However, it is important to note that about only one fifth of men in each situation indicated that they had regrets, suggesting that the vast majority of men did not regret their gatekeeping decision.

Men's and women's expected and actual consequences of gatekeeping, as well as the other person's reactions, showed consistencies and inconsistencies with the theories on gender differences, as well. For example, in Situation N, men's most commonly reported expected negative consequence of gatekeeping was that there would be no negative consequences (though this constituted only

15% of men). Social role theory would suggest that men would experience more negative consequences, or societal punishment, for violating their gender role by gatekeeping. However, men reported that their most common actual negative consequence in Situation N was there were no negative consequences. This suggests that men might not experience stigma or societal punishment to the extent predicted by social role theory.

Findings were consistent with theories on gender differences, as well. For example, in Situation H, significantly more women (48%) than men (21%) reported that the reaction of other person was understanding and accepting of their gatekeeping. Significantly more women (15%) than men (3%) reported this as an actual positive consequence, as well. In addition, significantly more men (8%) than women (0%) reported that the other person was surprised that they engaged in gatekeeping. Taken together, these results suggest that women were more surprised and less accepting or understanding of their male partner's gatekeeping than were men of their female partners. This suggests that when women initiate sex, they do not expect their male partners to turn them down, given stereotypes that men never say no to sex. However, men do not have this same expectation because women are traditionally known as the gatekeepers.

### *Clinical Implications*

The finding that, in general, men and women were similar with respect to the reported prevalence or incidence of gatekeeping has important clinical implications. Since the stereotype exists that men always want to have sex,

problems can arise for both men and women who find this to be untrue. For example, if a female makes a sexual initiation and her male partner rejects her, she might think that this reflects something negative about herself or that her male partner does not like her. In some cases, this is true. For instance, in Situation N, 14% of men engaged in gatekeeping because they found the other person to be “ugly” or physically unattractive. However, in the majority of cases (about 85% in both Situations N and H), men were ambivalent about gatekeeping. They reported reasons for wanting sex even though they did not let it happen. In addition, as previously discussed, many of men’s reasons for gatekeeping were situation-dependent. That is, under other circumstances, they would be willing to have sex with the other person. So, in these cases, men’s reasons for gatekeeping have nothing or very little to do with their female partners, and it is likely that men would have sex with their female partners in the future when circumstances have changed. Therefore, from a clinical standpoint, women should be encouraged to think of the range of reasons why their male partners would reject a sexual initiation; both internal and external.

The stereotype that men always want sex can be harmful to men, as well. For example, if a man accepts this stereotype and does not want to have sex on a particular occasion, he might think that there is something wrong with him, or feel pressured to accept the sexual initiation. However, contrary to popular belief, one of the most common reasons for gatekeeping listed by men was that they were not in the mood for sex. Therefore, the information that this behavior is normative for

both men and women, when provided in a clinical setting, could prevent men from engaging in unwanted sex, and could prevent both men and women from experiencing the psychological distress that comes with feeling abnormal or deficient.

### *Social Implications*

A number of our findings have social implications related to sexual assault or sexual coercion. For example, women's most commonly reported expected negative consequence of gatekeeping in both situations was that their partners would react angrily to their denial of sex. Significantly more women than men reported this concern in both situations (25% versus 8% in Situation N and 32% versus 7% in Situation H). In Situation N, both men and women often reported that the other person reacted angrily to their gatekeeping, though there were no gender differences in this reaction. Gender differences were present in Situation H, however, with 38% of women and 16% of men reporting that their partner reacted angrily. In addition, in both situations, significantly more women than men reported that when they engaged in gatekeeping, the other person kept trying to have sex with them (16% versus 1% in Situation N, and 10% versus 0% in Situation H). The implications of these results are that while both women and men encounter anger from their partners as a result of gatekeeping, the situation has the potential to be more dangerous for women. Indeed, it has been found that women are more often the victims of rape than are men, and that rape is more

often committed among acquaintances than among strangers (Tjaden & Theonnes, 1998).

This danger likely impacts women's behavior in gatekeeping situations, as well. For example, as mentioned previously, though both men and women commonly reported kissing or "making out" with their partners or engaging in everything but PVI before they engaged in gatekeeping, in Situation N, more women than men reported that they stopped at kissing, whereas more men than women reported that they went "almost all the way" and engaged in everything but PVI before gatekeeping. It is possible that women were afraid to let the sexual encounter progress too far before gatekeeping because they feared that they would not be able to stop once they went beyond a certain point. It is also possible that women held the stereotype that if they let the sexual encounter progress too far without the intention of having sex, they would be "leading the men on," thereby justifying rape (Muehlenhard & MacNaughton, 1988).

The danger of rape likely impacts women's methods of gatekeeping, as well. Though men's and women's methods of gatekeeping were very similar, more women than men reported using the direct method of saying "no," saying that sex could not happen, or saying that they did not want to have sex in both situations (64% versus 33% in Situation N and 77% versus 36% in Situation H). However, in Situation N, more men (7%) than women (0%) sent a similar verbal message by saying that they did not think sex was a good idea. This message seems less firm than a forceful "no" and may not have been used by any women

because college students are taught that “no means no” and that a woman must send a clear message to protect herself from unwanted sex.

#### *Limitations and Future Research*

This study is exploratory in nature in that we wanted to investigate numerous aspects of gatekeeping, and we wanted to provide a detailed picture of men’s gatekeeping, in particular, so we created many categories and conducted many statistical tests. The number of comparisons conducted could have increased experiment wise alpha, or the probability that some results would be significant due to chance alone. Also, because we wanted to adequately represent the variability in responses, we derived a large number of categories from the data, which resulted in smaller numbers of men and women involved in each comparison, thus limiting statistical power. It is possible that if we combined existing categories into broader categories, this would have yielded significant results.

The sample consisted of mostly young, European American/White, undergraduates at a large public school in the Midwestern United States. Therefore, these findings may not generalize to populations of other ages, cultures, or races/ethnicities. For example, gatekeeping may be less common among men and women in more patriarchal cultures where it is less acceptable for women to initiate sex or to reject a partner’s advances. In addition, though the current study did not exclude same-sex gatekeeping experiences, participants did not report any experiences of this nature. Therefore, the findings may not

generalize to gatekeeping experiences among individuals identifying as non-heterosexual.

The technique of using self-report measures, though efficient and anonymous, has limitations, particularly with sensitive subject matter such as sexual experiences. Alexander and Fisher (2003) found that gender differences with self-report measures may reflect false accommodation to gender role norms. That is, men and women sometimes distort their answers to meet cultural expectations. However this finding was most common when individuals thought that another student might see their questionnaire. In the current study, measures were taken to ensure that this would not happen, though the presence of research assistants of a similar age as the participants might have biased responding. This limitation does not challenge the existing findings on gender similarities, but it might suggest that even larger numbers of men engage in gatekeeping, and that more gender similarities might exist in characteristics of gatekeeping experiences.

We derived the coding categories that were created for this study from the participants' narratives. However, a different experimenter might have come up with a different set of categories. Therefore, the categories that were used in this study should by no means be considered exhaustive or "correct." Future experimenters are encouraged to code their own categories from their participants' narratives. However, future researchers are also encouraged to use our categories to create questionnaires for quantitative studies on gatekeeping.

Future analyses could be conducted to examine within-subjects differences in gatekeeping behavior between Situations N and H, as this was beyond the scope of the current study. Gatekeeping is likely to be qualitatively different when it occurs in the context of different types of relationships. In addition, it is likely that within Situation H, individuals' gatekeeping experiences may differ in respect to whether they are gatekeeping within a current committed relationship or with someone with whom they had previously had sex, but were not currently dating. Also, differences in gatekeeping experiences might exist between individuals who have engaged in PVI before and those who have not. These studies would be interesting to conduct in order to paint a more detailed picture of gatekeeping for men and women and of how features of gatekeeping experiences might vary depending on variables such as relationship with the other person, previous sexual experience with the other person, or previous sexual experience in general. Also, a study could be conducted on those who said they had never been in a gatekeeping situation, because these individuals would likely split into two groups, those who have never perceived that another person was initiating sex with them, and those who have never turned down an opportunity to have sex. These groups would likely be dissimilar from each other.

The current study could also be replicated with different samples (e.g., different races/ethnicities, ages, sexualities). These studies would be important in determining the generalizability of the current findings. Perhaps older men do not engage in gatekeeping as often as older women because they no longer have the

frequency of gatekeeping opportunities that they once had while they were in college. Perhaps, as I mentioned previously, in cultures where chastity and purity are considered important, the prevalence of gatekeeping is lower because women do not initiate sex or reject sexual advances. Finally, perhaps among homosexual couples, characteristics of gatekeeping situations are completely different from those in the current study because traditional gender roles no longer apply to same-sex couples. These types of questions could be explored if gatekeeping were studied with other samples.

### *Conclusion*

The purpose of the current study was to question the stereotype that men never say no to sex and that women are the sole sexual gatekeepers. Our most important finding was that the majority of men do say no to sex in various situations, and that men and women were often similar in their reported prevalence of gatekeeping. In addition, the men that engage in gatekeeping do so just as often as women. This finding supports the case made by others regarding the importance of studying gender similarities, as well as differences (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995). The gender differences that were found regarding characteristics of gatekeeping experiences were often, but not always, consistent with cultural expectations of traditional gender roles. Therefore, while men and women behave more similarly than would be suggested by common stereotypes, when they differ, their behavior is occasionally consistent with traditional cultural expectations.

## References

- Abbey, A., Cozzarelli, C., McLaughlin, K., & Harnish, R.J. (1987). The effects of clothing and dyad sex composition on perceptions of sexual interest: Do women and men evaluate these cues differently. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17*, 108-126.
- Alexander, M.G., & Fisher, T.D. (2003). Truth and consequences: Using the bogus pipeline to examine sex differences in self-reported sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 27-35.
- Allgeier, E. R., & Royster, B. J. T. (1991). New approaches to dating and sexuality. In E. Grauerholz & M. Koralewski (Eds.), *Sexual coercion* (pp. 133-147). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bailey, W.C., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S.S. (1987). Relation of sex and gender role to love, sexual attitudes, and self-esteem. *Sex Roles, 16*, 637-648.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Gender differences in erotic plasticity: The female sex drive as socially flexible and responsive. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 347-374.
- Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-49.
- Byers, E. S., & Heinlein, L. (1989). Predicting initiations and refusals of sexual activities in married and cohabiting heterosexual couples. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 210-231.
- Clark, R. D., III., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2*, 39-55.

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1995). Gender differences and similarities in sex and love. *Personal Relationships, 2*, 55-65.
- Hynie, M. & Lydon, J.E. (1995). Women's perceptions of female contraceptive behavior: Experimental evidence of the sexual double standard. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 563-581.
- Kiefer, A. K., & Sanchez, D. T. (2007). Scripting sexual passivity: A gender role perspective. *Personal Relationships, 14*, 269-290.
- Lottes, I. L. (1993). Nontraditional gender roles and the sexual experiences of heterosexual college students. *Sex Roles, 29*, 645-670.
- McCormick, N. B. (1979). Come-ons and put-offs: Unmarried students' strategies for having and avoiding sexual intercourse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4*, 194-211.
- Muehlenhard, C.L. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6*, 20-37.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Cook, S. W. (1988). Men's self-reports of unwanted sexual activity. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 58-72.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & MacNaughton, J.S. (1988). Women's beliefs about women who "lead men on." *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7*, 65-79.

- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Rodgers, C. S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspectives on an old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 443-463.
- O'Sullivan, L. F., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). Feigning sexual desire: Consenting to unwanted sexual activity in heterosexual dating relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research, 35*, 234-243.
- O'Sullivan, L. F., & Byers, E. S. (1992). College students' incorporation of initiator and restrictor roles in sexual dating interactions. *The Journal of Sex Research, 29*, 435-446.
- Parry, K. W. (2004). Constant comparison. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods* (pp. 180-181). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. T. (1977). Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 33*, 86-109.
- Shearer, C.L., Hosterman, S.J., Gillen, M.M., & Lefkowitz, E.S. (2005). Are traditional gender role attitudes associated with risky sexual behavior and condom-related beliefs? *Sex Roles, 52*, 311-324.
- Sirin, S. R., McCreary, D. R., & Mahalik, J. R. (2004). Differential reactions to men and women's gender role transgressions: Perceptions of social status, sexual orientation, and value dissimilarity. *Journal of Men's Studies, 12*, 119-132.

- Sprecher, S., McKinney, K., & Orbuch, T.L. (1987). Has the double standard disappeared? An experimental test. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 24-31.
- Tiegs, T. J., Perrin, P. B., Kaly, P. W., & Heesacker, M. (2007). My place or yours? An inductive approach to sexuality and gender role conformity. *Sex Roles*, 56, 449-456.
- Tjaden, P., & Theonnes, N. (1998). Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NCJ 172837). Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Trivers, R.L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp.136-179). Chicago: Aldine.
- Vogel, D. L., Wester, S. R., Heesacker, M., & Madon, S. (1999). Confirming gender stereotypes: A social role perspective. *Sex Roles*, 48, 519-528.
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A.H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 699-727.
- Zilbergeld, B. (1999). *The new male sexuality* (rev. ed.). New York: Bantam Books.





12. What were your reasons for not letting sex happen?

13. Sometimes people have mixed feelings; they might have reasons for wanting and not wanting to do something. What were your reasons, if any, for wanting to have sex with him, even though you did not let it happen?

14. What would have needed to be different in order for you to have let sex happen?

15. How did he react when you did not let sex happen?

16. What positive or negative consequences did you expect related to not letting sex happen?

17. What positive or negative consequences actually occurred related to not letting sex happen?

18. Had you been using alcohol or drugs in Situation N? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
19. Had the guy been using alcohol or drugs in Situation N? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
20. Afterward, did you regret not having sex with him? Why or why not?
21. Did you ever have sex with him at a later date?
22. If you did have sex with him at a later date, why did you let it happen then when you did not before?
23. Just to clarify, the situation you just described:
- is real and actually happened to you
  - is real and happened to someone you know
  - is not real and is completely made up
24. Is there anything else that would help us understand this situation?
25. If Situation N has happened to you more than once, what are some of the other things that you did so that sex would not happen?





13. What were your reasons for not letting sex happen?

14. Sometimes people have mixed feelings; they might have reasons for wanting and not wanting to do something. What were your reasons, if any, for wanting to have sex with him, even though you did not let it happen?

15. What would have needed to be different in order for you to have let sex happen?

16. How did he react when you did not let sex happen?

17. What positive or negative consequences did you expect related to not letting sex happen?

18. What positive or negative consequences actually occurred related to not letting sex happen?

19. Had you been using alcohol or drugs in situation H? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
20. Had the guy been using alcohol or drugs in situation H? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
21. Afterward, did you regret not having sex with him? Why or why not?
22. Did you ever have sex with him at a later date?
23. If you did have sex with him at a later date, why did you let it happen then when you did not before?
24. Just to clarify, the situation you just described:
- \_\_\_ is real and actually happened to you
  - \_\_\_ is real and happened to someone you know
  - \_\_\_ is not real and is completely made up
25. Is there anything else that would help us understand this situation?
26. If Situation H has happened to you more than once, what are some of the other things that you did so that sex would not happen?

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

What is your sex?  Female  Male

What is your sexual orientation? (check one)

- Straight (Heterosexual)  
 Gay (Homosexual)  
 Bisexual  
 Unsure  
 Other (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

What is your race/ethnicity?

- African American / Black  
 Asian American  
 European American / White  
 Hispanic American / Latino / Latina  
 Native American / American Indian  
 Biracial / Multiracial  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you an international student?

- Yes  
 No

What best describes your current relationship(s)? (check one)

- never dated anyone  
 not dating anyone now  
 dating one person casually (i.e., with no agreement to be exclusive)  
 dating more than one person casually (i.e., with no agreement to be exclusive)  
 dating one person exclusively  
 engaged  
 other: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever done the following:

- No  Yes  Kissing  
 No  Yes  Having someone stimulate your genitals  
 No  Yes  Stimulating someone's genitals  
 No  Yes  Performing oral sex  
 No  Yes  Receiving oral sex  
 No  Yes  Sexual intercourse  
 No  Yes  Anal sex  
 No  Yes  Masturbation  
 No  Yes  Having an orgasm with another person  
 No  Yes  Having an orgasm by yourself through masturbation

With how many partners have you had sexual intercourse? \_\_\_\_\_





12. What were your reasons for not letting sex happen?

13. Sometimes people have mixed feelings; they might have reasons for wanting and not wanting to do something. What were your reasons, if any, for wanting to have sex with her, even though you did not let it happen?

14. What would have needed to be different in order for you to have let sex happen?

15. How did she react when you did not let sex happen?

16. What positive or negative consequences did you expect related to not letting sex happen?

17. What positive or negative consequences actually occurred related to not letting sex happen?

18. Had you been using alcohol or drugs in Situation N? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
19. Had the girl been using alcohol or drugs in Situation N? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
20. Afterward, did you regret not having sex with her? Why or why not?
21. Did you ever have sex with her at a later date?
22. If you did have sex with her at a later date, why did you let it happen then when you did not before?
23. Just to clarify, the situation you just described:
- \_\_\_ is real and actually happened to you
  - \_\_\_ is real and happened to someone you know
  - \_\_\_ is not real and is completely made up
24. Is there anything else that would help us understand this situation?
25. If Situation N has happened to you more than once, what are some of the other things that you did so that sex would not happen?





13. What were your reasons for not letting sex happen?

14. Sometimes people have mixed feelings; they might have reasons for wanting and not wanting to do something. What were your reasons, if any, for wanting to have sex with her, even though you did not let it happen?

15. What would have needed to be different in order for you to have let sex happen?

16. How did she react when you did not let sex happen?

17. What positive or negative consequences did you expect related to not letting sex happen?

18. What positive or negative consequences actually occurred related to not letting sex happen?

19. Had you been using alcohol or drugs in situation H? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
20. Had the girl been using alcohol or drugs in situation H? If so, what effect, if any, did this have on the situation?
21. Afterward, did you regret not having sex with her? Why or why not?
22. Did you ever have sex with her at a later date?
23. If you did have sex with her at a later date, why did you let it happen then when you did not before?
24. Just to clarify, the situation you just described:
- is real and actually happened to you
  - is real and happened to someone you know
  - is not real and is completely made up
25. Is there anything else that would help us understand this situation?
26. If Situation H has happened to you more than once, what are some of the other things that you did so that sex would not happen?

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

What is your sex? \_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_ Male

What is your sexual orientation? (check one)

- Straight (Heterosexual)  
 Gay (Homosexual)  
 Bisexual  
 Unsure  
 Other (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

What is your race/ethnicity?

- African American / Black  
 Asian American  
 European American / White  
 Hispanic American / Latino / Latina  
 Native American / American Indian  
 Biracial / Multiracial  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you an international student?

- Yes  
 No

What best describes your current relationship(s)? (check one)

- never dated anyone  
 not dating anyone now  
 dating one person casually (i.e., with no agreement to be exclusive)  
 dating more than one person casually (i.e., with no agreement to be exclusive)  
 dating one person exclusively  
 engaged  
 other: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever done the following:

- No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Kissing  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Having someone stimulate your genitals  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Stimulating someone's genitals  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Performing oral sex  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Receiving oral sex  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Sexual intercourse  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Anal sex  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Masturbation  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Having an orgasm with another person  
 No \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ Having an orgasm by yourself through masturbation

With how many partners have you had sexual intercourse? \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

*Data Collection Session Script*Introducing the Study:

**1. Hello! My name is [YOUR NAME] and this is [THE OTHER RA'S NAME]. We're members of the research team for this study. We'd like to thank you for being here and for participating in this study.**

**2. Please be sure that your cell phones are off.**

**3. On your desk is a consent form which explains what we'll be asking you to do for this study. Please read it over. (Pause.)**

**We appreciate your being here and participating in our research. For this research project we will be giving you a questionnaire and asking you to answer some questions. We promise that all of your responses to this questionnaire will remain completely anonymous. We will give you more information about the study when you have completed the questionnaire.**

**4. Has everyone had a chance to read the consent form? (Pause and wait for people who look like they're reading to finish.) Are there any questions about it? (Pause.)**

**5. Okay, if you've decided to participate in this study, remain in your seat.** (People can choose to withdraw and still get credits if they want. If anyone wants to leave, ask them to wait briefly while you finish introducing the study, or, if convenient, the other RA can talk with them. Put a mark beside their name on the sign-up sheet so that we know to give them only one credit.)

**6. Pass Out Questionnaires**

**We'll pass out the questionnaires now.** (Pass out questionnaires. Make sure you give the right forms to men and women.)

**7. We're asking you not to put your name or KUID number anywhere on the questionnaires. We haven't asked any questions that could identify you.**

**Does anyone have any questions?**

**Please take your time filling out the questionnaire; you will have until \_\_:50 to complete it. When you are finished, put it in the envelope and turn it in to us. You do not have to seal the envelope, but you may do so if you wish. Do not take out any other materials after you have completed the questionnaire.**

**Please pick up a debriefing form on your way out.**

**In this questionnaire, you will be asked if you have been in situations in which**

- **it seemed like someone wanted to have sex with you, but**
- **you did NOT let it happen.**

[pause, and repeat]

**The questionnaire has two sections:**

**In one section, you will be asked about situations in which you were with someone you had NEVER had sex with before, and it seemed like he or she wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen.** [pause]

**In the other section you will be asked about situations in which you were with someone you HAD had sex with before, and it seemed like he or she wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen.** [pause]

**For this questionnaire, by SEX we mean sexual intercourse—that is, penile vaginal intercourse.**

**For both of these sections we will ask you to check**

- **whether you HAVE been in this situation, or**
- **whether you have not been in this exact situation, but you have been in a SIMILAR situation, or**
- **whether you have NEVER been in this situation or anything close to it.**

[pause and repeat; maybe point out where it says this on the questionnaire]

**Everyone will be able to answer all the questions, regardless of your experience. If you have been in this situation or a similar situation, we will ask you to write about it.**

**If you have NEVER been in this situation or a similar situation, we will ask you to write about how you think someone in this situation would react.**

**Therefore, regardless of whether or not you have ever had sex or been in these situations, everyone will be responding to the questions. We have done this to protect your privacy and to ensure that no one in the testing session will be able to tell who has or has not been in these situations based on who is writing.**

**Please be sure to complete all parts of the questionnaire.**

**Again, make sure that your cell phones are turned off.**

**Does anyone have any questions? [pause] If you have questions once you start, come up to the front, and we'll try to answer them.**

**OK, you can begin.**

To Do While Students Are Completing Questionnaires:

1. If a participant arrives a little late (5-10 minutes late) and you think that they might have time to finish, one RA can give them the consent form and explain the questionnaire quietly in a corner of the room or in the hallway.

If a participant arrives very little late (more than 10 minutes late), let them know they can sign up for a new time within one week without penalty. If there is another session scheduled immediately after, offer them the opportunity to begin late and finish up during the next session.

2. Try to keep busy (e.g., read a book or do homework) during the session so that participants do not feel self-conscious. Do not stare at them or glance at their answers. Keep discussion with the other RA to a minimum, and if you need to talk to each other, do so quietly.
3. When students have finished with the study, write their finish time on the sign-in sheet. Hand participants debriefing forms on their way out. Be sure to write the date, number of credits to be awarded, and your initials on the debriefing form. Each student who completes the study will get two credits.
4. If there is no clock in the room, at \_\_\_:40 tell the participants when there are 10 minutes left to complete the questionnaire. At \_\_\_:45 tell the participants when there are 5 minutes left to complete the questionnaire. With 5 minutes left, tell any remaining students to finish up.
5. At \_\_\_:50 when the time is up, ask any remaining participants to place their questionnaires in the envelopes and turn them in to you.]

## Appendix C

### *Informed Consent*

#### **Information Sheet**

**INTRODUCTION:** The Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You are free to decide whether or not participate in this study. Even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. If you do withdraw from this study, it will not affect the credit you received up to that point.

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:** The purpose of this study is to investigate men's and women's reasons for and methods of not letting sex happen in situations in which someone wants to have sex with them.

**PROCEDURE and INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED:** This study involves a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be anonymous and will take no more than an hour of your time. The questionnaire will ask you to describe various experiences with sexual situations and to answer questions about the situations you describe.

**ANONYMITY:** The questionnaire is completely anonymous. Nowhere on the questionnaire do we ask for your name or KUID, and we have avoided asking questions that might identify you indirectly. Everyone will be able to fill out this questionnaire, whether or not he or she has ever had the experiences we ask about.

**RISKS and BENEFITS:** We do not anticipate that participating in this study will cause any risks. If you are uncomfortable with any of the questions, you may skip them.

Regarding benefits to society, we hope that this study will help us gain a better understanding of gender roles in sexual situations.

**PAYMENTS:** Although you will not receive financial compensation for your time and effort in your participation, you will receive one credit toward your research requirement for every half hour or portion thereof that you participate.

**USE OF THE DATA:** The data collected in this study will be used by graduate student Lauren Brian, Professor Charlene Muehlenhard, and Professor Muehlenhard's students to better understand gender roles in sexual situations.

**QUESTIONS ABOUT PARTICIPATION:** Questions about procedures can be directed to the research assistants conducting the session, to the researchers listed below, and/or to the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (see next section).

**PARTICIPANT CERTIFICATION:** I have read this Information Sheet. I have had the opportunity to ask, and I have received answers to, any questions I had regarding the study. I understand that if I have any additional questions about my rights as a research participant, I may call (785) 864-7429 or (785) 864-7385 or write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, email [ghann@ku.edu](mailto:ghann@ku.edu) or [mdennino@ku.edu](mailto:mdennino@ku.edu).

Completion of the questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this project and that you are at least 18 years old.

#### **Researcher Contact Information**

Lauren Brian, B.A.  
Principal Investigator  
Clinical Psychology Graduate Student  
[lbrian@ku.edu](mailto:lbrian@ku.edu)

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D.  
Faculty Supervisor  
Department of Psychology  
(785) 864-9860  
[charlene@ku.edu](mailto:charlene@ku.edu)

## Appendix D

### *Debriefing Form*

#### Debriefing Form

The goal of this study is to better understand whether—and if so, why and how—men and women act as “sexual gatekeepers.” In general, a gatekeeper can be defined as someone who tends or guards a gate or as a person who controls access to something. Psychologists sometimes use the term “sexual gatekeeping” to refer to making decisions about whom to have sex with, including resisting opportunities to engage in sex.

The stereotype is that women engage in sexual gate keeping but that men do not. In this stereotype, women are always the ones to limit sex and that “real men” never turn down opportunities to have sex. There is evidence, however, that many women do try to initiate sex, and there is evidence that sometimes men decline the opportunity to have sex. This topic has received little research attention, however. The purpose of this study is to investigate this topic further. We are investigating women’s and men’s reasons for, and methods of, not letting sex happen in various situations.

The questionnaire you received included items about situations in which you thought that someone wanted to have sex with you, but you did not let it happen. Some of the questions were about a situation in which you had never had sex with the person before, and some were about a situation in which you had had sex with the person before. We asked about both types of situations because we think that the dynamics of these two situations are likely to differ. There were questions about your reasons for not letting sex happen, your methods for not letting sex happen, and expectations for and consequences of not letting sex happen.

We will analyze the percentages of men and women who have experienced these situations. We will also analyze gender differences and gender similarities in men’s and women’s reasons for, and methods of, not letting sex happen.

Thank you for your participation in this study!

Because of the personal nature of this research topic, you may have questions or issues that you would like to discuss further. We have provided information about how to contact us in case you would like to talk about your feelings concerning your participation in this study. We have also listed the phone numbers of some organizations on campus and in Lawrence that provide counseling services.

The graduate student conducting this study:

Lauren Britan  
Email: lbritan@ku.edu

The faculty advisor for this study:

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D.  
Phone: (785) 864-9860  
Email: charlene@ku.edu

Counseling services:

- KU Psychological Clinic, 340 Fraser Hall, (785) 864-4121. Small fee per session.
- Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), Watkins Health Center, (785) 864-2277. Small fee per session.
- Headquarters Counseling Center, available by phone 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, free, for any concern: (785) 841-2345.
- American Association of Sexuality Educators, Counselors, and Therapists, [www.aasect.org](http://www.aasect.org), to find a therapist in your area who specializes in issues pertaining to sexuality.

To discuss your rights as a research participant:

Human Subjects Committee Lawrence, (785) 864-7429  
David Hann, dhann@ku.edu

## Appendix E

*HSCL Application*

1/2007

HSCL # \_\_\_\_\_  
(to be assigned)UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
Human Subjects Committee Lawrence  
Application for Project Approval

1. Name of Investigator(s) Lauren Brian, B.A. and Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D.
2. Department Affiliation: Department of Psychology
3. Campus or Home Mailing Address: Lauren Brian, 8000 Clinton Parkway #1317, Lawrence, KS 66047  
or Clinical Program, Dept. of Psychology, Campus Mall  
Charlene Muehlenhard, Dept. of Psychology, Campus Mall
- a. Email address: Lauren Brian: lbrian@ku.edu  
Charlene Muehlenhard: charlene@ku.edu
- Phone Number(s): Lauren Brian: Cell: (610)217-6868  
Charlene Muehlenhard: KU: (785)864-9660 Home: (785)842-2309
5. Name of Faculty Member Responsible for Project: Charlene Muehlenhard

HSCL must receive faculty approval via hard copy signature or email notification before a student application may be processed.

- a. Email address of Faculty Member: charlene@ku.edu

6. Type of Investigator and nature of activity. (Check appropriate categories)

Faculty or staff of University of Kansas

Project to be submitted for extramural funding; Agency:

KU/KUCR project number: \_\_\_\_\_

(HSCL must compare all protocols in grant applications with the protocols in the corresponding HSCL application)

Project to be submitted for intramural funding; Source:

X Project unfunded

Other:

X Student at University of Kansas: X Graduate (Master's Thesis) Undergraduate Special  
Class project (number & title of class):

Independent study (name of faculty supervisor):

Other (please explain):

Investigators not from the Lawrence campus but using subjects obtained  
through the University of Kansas

- 7.a. Title of Investigation: Men's and Women's Reasons for and Methods of Sexual Gatekeeping

- 7.b. Title of sponsored project, if different from above: N/A

8. Individuals other than faculty, staff, or students at Kansas University.

Please identify investigators and research group: N/A

9. Certifications: By submitting this application via email or hard copy I am certifying that I have read, understand, and will comply with the policies and procedures of the University of Kansas regarding human subjects in research. I subscribe to the standards and will adhere to the policies and procedures of the HSCL, and I am familiar with the published guidelines for the ethical treatment of subjects associated with my particular field of study.

Date: 04/10/08

Signature: Lauren Brian  
First Investigator

Date: 04/10/08

Signature: Charlene Muehlenhard  
Faculty Supervisor

HBOL #: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: Lauren Brian and Charlene Muehlenhard

Project Title: Men's and Women's Reasons for and Methods of Sexual Gatekeeping

10. Please answer the following questions with regard to the research activity proposed:  
(Please write "Yes" or "No.")

Does the research involve:

- No a. drugs or other controlled substances?
- No b. payment of subjects for participation?
- No c. access to subjects through a cooperating institution?
- No d. substances taken internally by or applied externally to the subjects?
- No e. mechanical or electrical devices (e.g., electrodes) applied to the subjects?
- No f. fluids (e.g., blood) or tissues removed from the subjects?
- No g. subjects experiencing stress (physiological or psychological)?
- No h. deception of subjects concerning any aspect of purposes or procedures (misleading or withheld information)?
- No i. subjects who could be judged to have limited freedom of consent (e.g., minors, developmentally delayed persons, or those institutionalized)?
- No j. any procedure or activities that might place the subjects at risk (psychological, physical, or social)?
- Yes k. use of interviews, focus groups, X questionnaires, audio or video recordings? (check all that apply)
- No l. data collection over a period greater than one year?
- Yes m. a written consent form will be used? Note: HBOL makes the final determination on waiver of consent form.
- No n. will the research involve receiving, accessing, collecting, compiling and/or maintaining information that relates to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual, the provision of health care to an individual, or the past, present, or future payment for the provision of health care to an individual?

11. Approximate number of subjects to be involved in the research: 350 or fewer

Complete the following questions on this page. Please do not use continuation sheets.

12. Project Purpose(s):

The purpose of this study is to examine the "sexual gatekeeping" behaviors of men and women. Specifically, we wish to look at men's and women's reasons for and methods of not letting sex happen in situations in which someone wants to have sex with them. Though women are stereotypically thought to be the sexual gatekeepers (i.e., the partner that limits sex), we plan to investigate whether men also engage in gatekeeping behaviors. This study will provide insight into gender roles in sexual situations.

13. Describe the proposed subjects (age, sex, race, or other special characteristics). If there is a physical or mental health condition that characterizes the subjects to be included in the study, please indicate this here as well.

Participants will be approximately 200 male and 150 female students from KU's Psychology Research Participant Pool who are over the age of 18.

14. Describe how the subjects are to be selected. Please indicate how you will gain access to, and recruit these subjects for participation in the project. That is, will you recruit participants through word-of-mouth, fliers or poster, newspaper ads, public or private membership or employee lists, etc. (if subjects are to be recruited from a cooperating institution, such as a clinic or other service organization be aware that subjects' names and other private information, such as medical diagnosis, may not be obtained without the subjects' written permission.)

This study will be posted on the Psychology department's SONA website. Students can sign up for participation in the study via this website.

15. Abstract of the proposed procedures in the project (must be complete on this page). (The abstract should be a succinct overview of the project without jargon, unexplained abbreviations, or technical terminology. Here is where you must provide details about Yes answers to items under question 10.a through 10.n of the application: drugs, cooperating institutions, medical information requested, security measures and post-project plans for tapes, questionnaires, surveys, and other data, and detailed debriefing procedures for deception projects.)

Participants will meet in classrooms in groups of up to 20. They will be seated in alternate seats to protect their privacy. They will be given a consent form to read (and sign, if required by the HSCL). They will be informed that they are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Those who choose to stay will be asked to fill out a survey about their experiences in situations in which they did not let sex happen with someone who wanted to have sex with them. The questionnaire will be structured so that everyone can complete it, regardless of their level of sexual experience. Each participant will be given a blank manila envelope in which to return his or her completed questionnaire. When participants are finished, they will be given the debriefing form included in this application. The session will take about 50-60 minutes.

Based on past experience with similar survey research projects, we do not expect participants to experience stress. We still intend to have measures in place for the unlikely possibility that participants do experience stress. Participants will be reminded that they are free to skip questions and to withdraw without penalty. There will be two research assistants present at each session so that, in the event a participant becomes distressed, one research assistant can talk with the distressed student while the other research assistant finishes the data collection session. When they leave the data collection session, participants will receive a debriefing sheet that includes information about counseling resources.

Submit one complete application and supporting documents with your application. Supporting documents may include consent forms, information statement, oral consent procedures, assent procedures, questionnaires/surveys/research measures, advertisements recruiting participants e.g. fliers, classified ads, debriefing procedures. You may send all materials via email attachment to dhann@ku.edu; Campus Mail to HSCL Youngberg Hall; or U.S. Mail to HSCL, Youngberg Hall, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, KS 66045-7563.