

WOMEN'S AND MEN'S REASONS FOR GIVING IN TO SEXUAL INTERCOURSE  
WITHOUT A CONDOM EVEN THOUGH THEY WANTED TO USE ONE

BY

C2009  
Basak Efe

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Clinical 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: November 12, 2009

The Thesis Committee for Basak Efe certifies  
that this is the approved Version of the following thesis:

WOMEN'S AND MEN'S REASONS FOR GIVING IN TO  
SEXUAL INTERCOURSE WITHOUT  
A CONDOM EVEN THOUGH THEY WANTED TO USE ONE

Committee:

---

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D. (Chair)

Ray Higgins, Ph.D.

Sarah Kirk, Ph.D.

Date approved: November 12, 2009

I dedicate this thesis  
to all the women in my family

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all the people in my life who contributed to the preparation of this project with their support, assistance, guidance, and encouragement.

I would like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Charlene Muehlenhard, who had been a great inspiration for me with her enthusiasm for research and her devotion for perfectionism. Words are not enough to describe her dedication to her students and the guidance she provided me at every step of my research. I feel very lucky to be her student and I am very grateful for her contributions to my study and my life.

I also would like to thank my husband, Ricardo, for being there for me during all the good and the difficult moments of my journey at the graduate school.

## Abstract

### Men's and Women's Reasons for Not Using a Condom When They Wanted to Use One But Their Partner Didn't

Basak Efe. M.A.

University of Kansas

We explored men's and women's reasons for engaging in sexual intercourse without a condom, even though they wanted to use a condom. We explored the differences and similarities between the reasons men and women give for consenting to such intercourse. We examined situations in which individuals wanted to use a condom, and their partner refused or complained about using one, and they ended up either using a condom or having sexual intercourse without a condom. We focused on the role of power in these decisions. We analyzed both quantitative (participants' ratings of their and their partner's power) and qualitative data (participants' descriptions of their feelings, thoughts and behaviors in the situations).

## Table of Contents

	Page
Title Page	i
Approval	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Method	
Results	
Discussion	
References	
Appendix A: Questionnaire	
Appendix B: Consent Form	
Appendix C: Debriefing Form	
Appendix D: Overview of the Questionnaire	

## List of Tables

	Page
<u>Table 1</u>	30
Prevalence of Being in the No Condom Situation and/or the Condom Situation in the Sample of Participants Who Had PVI Experience	
<u>Table 2</u>	34
Numbers of Participants in Each Subgroup in the Final Sample	
<u>Table 3</u>	38
Relationship with the Partner	
<u>Table 4</u>	40
Reasons for Wanting to Use a Condom	
<u>Table 5</u>	41
Reasons for Wanting to Use a Condom - Gender	
<u>Table 6</u>	43
Reasons for Not Wanting to Use a Condom	
<u>Table 7</u>	44
Reasons for Not Wanting to Use a Condom – Gender	
<u>Table 8</u>	45
Ways of Communicating Their Wish to Use a Condom to Their Partner	
<u>Table 9</u>	46
Ways of Communicating Their Wish to Use a Condom to Their Partner - Gender	
<u>Table 10</u>	48
Reasons for Thinking That Their Partner Didn't Want to Use a Condom	
<u>Table 11</u>	49
Reasons for Thinking That Their Partner Didn't Want to Use a Condom - Gender	

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Table 12</u>	51
Feelings and Thoughts at the Time of the Situation	
<u>Table 13</u>	53
Feelings and Thoughts at the Time of the Situation - Gender	
<u>Table 14</u>	54
Feelings and Thoughts after the Situation	
<u>Table 15</u>	55
Feelings and Thoughts after the Situation - Gender	
<u>Table 16</u>	56
Alcohol Consumed by the Participants	
<u>Table 17</u>	56
Alcohol Consumed by the Participants - Gender	
<u>Table 18</u>	57
Alcohol Consumed by the Participants' Partners	
<u>Table 19</u>	59
Alcohol Consumed by the Participants' Partners - Gender	
<u>Table 20</u>	60
Presence of Condom	
<u>Table 21</u>	00
Reasons for Giving in to Sexual Intercourse Without a Condom in the No Condom Situation	
<u>Table 22</u>	00
What Did Partner Do to Convince to Have Sexual Intercourse Without a Condom in the No Condom Situation	

	Page
<u>Table 23</u>	00
Response to Partner in the No Condom Situation	
<u>Table 24</u>	00
Participants' Predictions of What Would Have Happened If They Had Insisted on Using a Condom in the No Condom Situation	
<u>Table 25</u>	00
Participants' Reports of How They Convinced Their Partners to Use a Condom in the Condom Situation	
<u>Table 26</u>	00
Correlations Among Perceived Power Variables in the No Condom and Condom Situations	

WOMEN'S AND MEN'S REASONS FOR GIVING IN TO SEXUAL INTERCOURSE  
WITHOUT A CONDOM EVEN THOUGH THEY WANTED TO USE ONE

Preventing the spread of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), including HIV and AIDS, has gained worldwide concern, especially targeting adolescents and young adults due to high levels of infection rates among these populations (Katz, Fortenberry, Zimet, Blythe, & Orr, 2000). According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there are more than 300 million individuals who get an STI each year, and a high percentage of those individuals with new infections are between the ages 15 and 30 (WHO, 2001). The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that there were 35,314 new HIV cases in 33 states in the USA in 2006. Fifteen percent of the new HIV cases were 13 to 24 years old and 26% were 25 to 24 years old (CDC, 2006). Considering these high prevalence rates, protection from STIs and HIV has become the main focus of public health campaigns, especially addressing adolescents and young adults (Hynie & Lydon, 1995).

Male latex condoms have been shown to be the most effective prevention method against STIs among the sexually active population (Shlay, McClung, Patnaik, & Douglas, 2004). Consistent condom use was found to be effective in preventing HIV (Davis & Weller, 1999) and nonviral STIs (Shlay, McClung, Patnaik, & Douglas, 2004). Although studies point to an increase in the frequency of condom use among high school (Warren et al., 1998) and college students (Murstein & Mercy, 1994) between the late 1980s and early 1990s, only 35% of the college students in Murstein and Mercy's study used condoms all the time. Additionally, based on the results of a national survey in the US, condom use was in the none (0%) to low (1 - 49%) range even among the majority of the sexually active heterosexuals who reported high HIV risk behaviors. Only 17% of the participants with two or more sexual partners, 13% of the participants with risky sexual partners (e.g., HIV+, non-monogamous), and 11% of participants who had received donor blood transfusion (but had not been tested)

reported using condoms all the time in the past 6 months (Catania et al., 1992). A more recent study conducted with sexually active adolescents also pointed out that 85% of the adolescents who reported having frequent sexual interactions (average once a week or more in the last six months) did not use condoms in their last sexual encounter (Dove, Rosengard, Morrow, & Stein, 2006). Therefore, despite the trend that shows an increase in condom use, rates of inconsistent condom use are still very high. This makes it important to examine the potential barriers to condom use among these populations, focusing particularly on women.

Previous research pointed out several factors that influence condom use. Some of these factors focus on self-related variables like self-esteem, self-efficacy, or attitudes toward condoms. Others focus on the effects of social determinants like the effect of gender roles, socioeconomic factors, or ethnicity on condom use. The more recent research, however, focuses on relational factors, considering the dyadic nature of condom use (Woolf & Maisto, 2008). The current study will investigate the interactions between the personal (e.g., reasons for condom use), social (e.g., gender), and relational factors (e.g., power) on condom use. The specific focus of the study will be to examine the reasons why men and women engage in sexual intercourse without a condom in situations when they wanted to use one but their partner refused or complained about using a condom.

### **Gender and Condom Use**

Sexual behaviors, like many other behaviors, are affected by social norms. Sexual scripts, which are defined as “abstractions about sexuality that most individuals in a particular culture would recognize” (Greene & Faulkner, 2005, p. 240), influence social norms regarding sexual behaviors. In terms of gender, they constitute different expectations for how men and women should behave in sexual contexts. Traditional sexual scripts usually imply double standards. Men are expected to initiate sex and to be more assertive, whereas women are expected to be passive and responsive to men’s needs (Greene & Faulkner, 2005).

Previous research has shown similar expectations to be valid for condom use. Hynie and Lydon (1995), for example, pointed out the existence of double standards for condom use. They ostensibly provided participants with the diary of a woman who was engaging in sexual intercourse with a man she had dated a few times. The researchers wanted to understand how the participants would perceive the man and the woman in the diary based on the presence of condom use and the person who provided the condom in the sexual encounter. The results indicated that the woman was rated as less “appropriate” and less “nice” when she provided the condom compared with when the man provided the condom. In addition, when the participants were asked to imagine how the woman and the man might have felt in those situations, they expected the woman to feel more negative about her behavior when she provided the condom compared with the situations when the man provided the condom or when they did not use a condom. The participants also expected the man to feel more negative about the woman when she provided the condom. The results of the study pointed out the double standard on the initiation of condom use; that is, men should be the initiators, and women should be passive responders.

Due to these traditional sexual scripts, women might anticipate being perceived as inappropriate upon initiation or negotiation of the use of condoms. Leary, Tchividijan, and Kraxberg (1999) found that, in general, adolescents’ failure to use condoms wasn’t because of lack of knowledge, but because of their “self presentational concerns” (p. 183). Using condoms and communication with the partner about protection might cause adolescent and adult women to worry about being seen as a person who is ready to have sex all the time, who is sexually promiscuous, or who has a sexually transmitted disease. Such concerns might prevent women from bringing up the issue of using condoms.

Self-presentational concerns were found to be positively related to the perceived importance of the relationships and the romantic feelings involved (Junichi & Ikuo, 2005).

Because condoms are the primary means of protection against STIs, negotiation of condom use might imply having a lack of trust in the partner, having other sexual relations or having an STI. Therefore, as the relationship becomes more important for the person, it might also become harder to initiate condom use due to the increased importance of self-presentational concerns. This phenomenon might be even more salient for women, not only because of sexual double standards regarding the initiation and negotiation of condom use, but also because of the greater significance of relationships for women compared with men (Miller, 1986, as cited in Logan, Cole, & Leukefeld, 2002). For example, women were found to report greater emotional reliance and to place greater emphasis on providing emotional support and care for their families than men did (Turner & Turner, 1999; Simon, 1995). In their meta-analysis of the social and contextual factors associated with HIV related behaviors among women, Logan, Cole, and Leukefeld (2002) concluded that the responsibility women feel toward maintaining a relationship affected their sexual behavior, including condom use. Sex might be used as a way to create and enhance the connection and intimacy between a woman and her partner. Therefore, women might consent to sexual activity without their will in order to please their partner and to protect the relationship. O'Sullivan and Allgeier (1998) found that significantly more women than men experienced consensual, undesired sexual activity in a two-week period prior to the study. The majority of the women cited promoting intimacy and satisfying their partners' needs as the reasons for their consent. If women engage in unwanted sexual behavior due to relational concerns, they might also risk unsafe sex if they believe that asking for or insisting on condom use might destroy their relationship.

Therefore, a woman's anticipation about her partner's reaction to condom use might be an important predictor of whether or not she will ask for their use (Logan, Cole, & Leukefeld, 2002). Tortu, McMahon, Hamid and Neaigus (2000) studied the reasons given by heterosexual drug-using women for not using a condom during their most recent unprotected

sex event (all including penile-vaginal intercourse). They found that in more than 50% of all unprotected sex events, the partner's refusal and unwillingness to use a condom was stated as the reason for not using a condom. Moreover, in 10% of the times women stated that they did not use a condom because using one would make their partner angry. Thus, expecting negative or aggressive reactions from their partners as well as concerns about intimacy influenced women's safe sex behavior.

Studies indicate that the presence or anticipation of psychological, verbal, or physical violence in relationships has a negative affect on the negotiation of condom use for women. It was found that women who were subject to physical violence were less likely to use appropriate means to protect themselves from STIs or HIV (Gielen, McDonnell, & O'Campo, 2002; Wingwood & DiClemente, 1997). In a study of African American women, Wingwood and DiClemente (1997) found that insisting on condom use was related to an increased likelihood of verbal and psychological abuse and threats of physical abuse. Therefore, to support safe sex behaviors, it is not enough to understand the intention and willingness to use condoms, but it is also crucial to investigate the reasons why individuals consent to sexual intercourse without a condom even though they want to use one.

Even though most of the studies conducted on the use or nonuse of condoms have focused on women, one of the few studies to examine both men's and women's responses to their partner's unwillingness to use condoms found that some men also report having had sex without a condom when they wanted to use one (Smith, 2003). Nearly half of the participants of the study reported having sex without a condom when they wanted to and their partner did not at least once since the age of 16, and more than one third of the participants reported unwanted condom nonuse with their current or last partners. Her study found no significant differences between men and women in terms of the frequencies of being in that situation. However, their reasons for giving in to sexual intercourse without a condom were not

investigated. Therefore, one purpose of the current study was to explore the reasons both men and women consented to sexual intercourse without a condom, even though they wanted to use a condom. We examined the similarities and differences in the reasons given by men and women.

### **Perceived Power and Condom Use**

One of the variables investigated in relation to consenting to sexual intercourse without a condom was power balance or imbalance in the relationships. Power at the interpersonal level is defined by Wingood and DiClemente (2000) as “having the power to act or change or having power over others” (p. 543). Therefore, being able to influence the behaviors of the other, as suggested by Wingood and DiClemente (2000), implies having power in the relationship. A related but different conceptualization of power is associated with the principle of least interest. Sprecher, Schmeckle, and Felmlee (2006) stated that, in romantic relationships, generally one partner is more emotionally invested and thus is more open to exploitation by the other partner. They found that in 75 % of the couples in their study, at least one member reported having an unequal emotional involvement in their relationship. Participants who perceived themselves to be relatively more emotionally involved perceived their partner to have more control. The less interested partner had less emotional investment and cared less about the relationship; therefore, he or she could dictate the conditions of the relationship.

Similar to the studies on use and nonuse of condoms, research on power has also focused on the relationship dynamics where women generally are the less powerful party due to gender roles. A recent study examined the relations between power, partner type (serious vs. casual), and difficulty of implementing condom use among men and women (Woolf & Maisto, 2008). Woolf and Maisto used hypothetical vignettes depicting situations in which a sexual encounter between the participant and the partner was highly likely. In the vignettes,

power and partner type were manipulated. The participants were asked to imagine themselves as having either less or more power than their potential sexual partner. Furthermore, they were asked to imagine that the relationship was either serious or casual. The researchers investigated the effect of the perceived power and the type of relationship on the difficulty of initiating a conversation on condom use, on the negotiation of condom use, and on the predicted use of condoms with their potential partner. Both men and women expected it to be harder to implement condom use when they had less power than their partner. However, when the participants imagined having equal power, men expected it to be more difficult to implement condom use than did women if the relationship was casual. That study points out the effects of gender, seriousness of the relationship, and power in the relationship on condom use. Therefore, the current study also addressed the relationship between perceived power in the relationship and individuals' decision making in situations where their suggestion to use condoms was refused by their partners.

In summary, the purpose of the current study was to understand why men and women consent to sexual intercourse without a condom even though they want to use one. We explored the differences and similarities between the reasons men and women give for consenting to such intercourse. Specifically, we investigated situations where individuals would have liked to use a condom and their partner refused or complained about using one, and they ended up either using a condom or having sexual intercourse without a condom. We focused on the role of power in these decisions.

## Method

### Participants

Initially, 289 individuals filled out the questionnaire. Of these, four were excluded for not following instructions, leaving a sample consisting of 285 individuals. We next eliminated participants who reported not having had any penile-vaginal sexual intercourse (PVI) experience, leaving a final sample composed of 221 undergraduate students (110 men, 111 women) from the University of Kansas. They participated in the study as one way to fulfill a requirement of their General Psychology course. The participants signed up for the study via the Psychology Department's website.

Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 31 with a mean of 19.03 years. Most of the participants ( $n = 189$ , 86%) identified as European American/White, while 7 (3%) identified as African American/Black, 6 (3%) identified as Asian American, 8 (4%) identified as Hispanic American/Latino/Latina, 1 (0.5%) identified as Native American/American Indian, 6 (3%) identified as biracial/multiracial, and 2 (1%) identified as international students.

The majority of the participants ( $n = 220$ , 99.5%) identified as heterosexual. One participant (0.5%) identified as bisexual. Their ages at their first sexual intercourse experience ranged from 14 to 20 with a mean of 16.59 years. When asked about their condom use during PVI, eight participants (3.6%) reported that they had never used condoms and 48 (22%) reported that they had used condoms every time.

### Measures

Participants completed a five-part questionnaire, with each part stapled separately (see Appendix A). The first part included general questions on demographics, sexual history, and condom-use history. The next four parts each asked about a different sexual situation.

**General questionnaire.** First, participants were asked to provide basic demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity/race, and sexual orientation.

Next, participants were asked if they have ever engaged in sexual intercourse (which was defined as “penile-vaginal sex”), their age of sexual initiation, and the number of partners with whom they had had they had sexual intercourse.

Last, participants were asked about their experience with condom use, if any. Their overall condom use was assessed by the following question: “Of the times that you have engaged in sexual intercourse, how often have you used a condom?” Participants were asked to mark their answer on a continuum from *never* to *every time*: *never (0%)*, *rarely (1-10%)*, *less than half of the time (10-40%)*, *about half of the time (40-60%)*, *more than half of the time (60-90%)*, *almost every time (90-99%)*, or *every time (100%)*.

Change in condom use was investigated in two different time frames: from the first time participants had had sexual intercourse until the present time and in their longest sexual relationship. Participants were asked if there has been a change in whether or not they had used condoms in these two contexts and were asked to explain their experience.

**The four situational questionnaires.** Each situational questionnaire was stapled separately and was given to the participants in a manila envelope together with an overview page. In the overview page, participants were given information about the format of the study and provided with summaries of each situation. In the overview of the questionnaire, participants were asked first to respond to the situations that they had been in, and then to respond to the other situations. If they had been in a situation more than once, they were asked to write about the one that stood out the most for them.

Participants were asked about their experiences, if any, in four different situations. In three of the situations, both the participant and his/her partner were willing to have sexual intercourse, and the participant wanted to use a condom, but his/her partner refused or complained about using one. (a) In the *no condom situation* (NC Situation), the participant and his/her partner ended up having intercourse without using a condom; (b) in the *condom*

*situation* (C Situation), they ended up having intercourse with a condom; and (c) in the *no sex situation* (NS Situation), they ended up not having intercourse. (d) In the *too uncomfortable* (TU Situation), both the participant and his/her partner were willing to have sexual intercourse, and the participant wanted to use a condom, but he or she was not able to bring up his or her wish to do so because he or she felt too uncomfortable to raise the issue.

For each of these situations, participants were asked to check one of the three response choices that applied to them: (a) I have been in this situation; (b) I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation; (c) I have never been in this situation or anything close to this. If the participants had been in any of those situations or any situation similar to them, they were asked to fill out the remaining questions based on their experiences. Our rationale for asking participants to write about situations similar to the ones described was to avoid false negatives—that is, participants who had been in those situations but did not think of their experience in the way we described them. If they had never been in that situation or anything close to that, they were asked to answer the remaining questions thinking about two made-up characters named Jane and David. Our rationale for this procedure was to protect the participants' privacy by assuring that everyone was writing, regardless of their experience.

For each situation, participants were asked to describe in detail what happened. They were then asked to provide their reasons for being willing to have sexual intercourse. Additionally, to acknowledge possible ambivalence they might have in relation to sexual intercourse, they were asked to give reasons, if any, for not wanting to have intercourse.

Their relationship with their partner was investigated through questions about how long they had known their partner, how long they had been having sexual intercourse with their partner, and how many times they had engaged in sexual intercourse with their partner prior to that situation.

Participants' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors regarding condom use were assessed. They were asked about their reasons for wanting to use a condom and how they communicated their wish to their partner (if they had done so). To understand the possible ambivalence they might have experienced regarding condom use, they were also asked to provide their reasons, if any, for not wanting to use a condom. In Situations NC, C and NS, participants had believed that their partners did not want to use a condom; in these situations participants were asked what made them think that their partners did not want to use a condom. They were also asked to indicate the frequency with which they had used a condom with that partner prior to that situation using a scale ranging from *never (0%)* to *every time (100%)*.

In addition to the questions common to all four situations, participants were asked questions specific to each situation. For the NC Situation, where they ended up having sexual intercourse without a condom, participants were asked about their reasons for going ahead with intercourse. They also were asked what they thought would have happened had they insisted on condom use. For the C Situation, where they ended up having intercourse with a condom, participants were asked about their reasons for insisting on condom use and what they thought was effective in convincing their partner. For the NS Situation, where they ended up not having sexual intercourse, participants were asked about their reasons for insisting on condom use and their reasons for not having intercourse. For the TU Situation, where they did not feel comfortable enough to raise the issue of condom use, participants were asked their reasons for not communicating their wish and what they thought would have happened if they had done so.

**Perceived power.** Perceived power balance and imbalance in the participants' relationships with their partners were investigated. Two domains were explored: relative interest in maintaining the relationship and in having sex, and decision making in the

relationship and in sexual encounters. To assess the relative interest of the participants and their partners in the relationship and in sex, they were asked the following questions: “Who do you think was more interested in maintaining the relationship?” and “Who do you think was more interested in having sex?” They responded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = *my partner was more interested* and 7 = *I was more interested*. Participants for whom maintaining the relationship was irrelevant (e.g., for one-night-stand situations) could check *Not Applicable (N/A)*. Decision making in their relationships was assessed by asking participants who makes the decisions about what the two of them do together in both sexual and nonsexual situations. They responded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = *I made most of the decisions* and 7 = *my partner made most of the decisions*.

### **Procedure**

Participants met in classrooms in groups of up to 20. They were seated in alternate seats to protect their privacy. Before completing the questionnaire, they were given a consent form to read (see Appendix B). They were informed that they were free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Those who chose to stay were asked to fill out the questionnaire. The questionnaire was completely anonymous and was structured so that all participants could complete it regardless of their level of sexual experience or condom use. Each participant was given a blank manila envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire. When participants were finished, they were given the debriefing form providing more information about the purpose of the study and information about how to contact the researchers, the Institutional Review Board, and local counseling and clinical resources in case the study raised issues that they wished to discuss. The session took about 30-40 minutes.

### **Results**

In the current study, we analyzed the narratives of the participants who had been in situations where they wanted to use a condom, their partner refused or complained about

using one, and they ended up having sexual intercourse either with or without a condom. Therefore, we focused our analysis on the NC and C Situations only.

We first provide prevalence data about being in NC or C Situations. Then, we describe how we selected the final sample of participants and how we categorized the final sample into four groups. Next, we provide prevalence data about these groups. We also compare the four groups on relevant variables like gender or age of the participants.

Next, we analyze the differences between the participants who had been in NC Situation and C Situation with regard to such variables as their reported interest in maintaining their relationship relative to their partner. We also analyze gender differences.

Lastly, we focus on such situation-specific variables as the reasons why participants gave in to sexual intercourse without a condom in the NC situation and how they convinced their partner to use a condom in the C situation. We analyze the gender differences with regard to those variables as well.

### **Prevalence of Being in the No Condom Situation or the Condom Situation in the Sample of Participants Who Had PVI Experience**

Table 1 summarizes the percentages of participants who reported having been in either the NC or C Situations. The table shows that fewer than half of the participants reported having been in the NC situation, whereas a little more than half reported having been in the C situation. Approximately one third of men and one third of women reported never having been in the NC or C Situations or anything similar to them.

To decide whether the categories participants checked fit our definitions of the situations, a group of research assistants and this author read the participants' narratives. We retained the categories participants checked unless their narratives clearly did not fit our definitions. The narrative descriptions of twenty-three percent ( $n = 19$ ) of the participants who reported experiencing the NC situation and 18 % ( $n = 21$ ) the participants who reported

experiencing the C situation were judged to not match our definitions (see Table 1). For example, some participants described situations in which their partner did not refuse or complain about using a condom, but they mutually decided not to use one (“He didn’t do anything, I didn’t want to use one either,” W-126). Some checked “Yes” in the NC situation, but described the C Situation (“I had been in this situation but we chose to use a condom,” M-501).

Of the participants who reported that they had never been in the NC situation but had been in *a similar situation*, we recoded 15% ( $n = 10$ ) as matching NC Situation, and of those who reported that they had never been in the C situation but had been in *a similar situation*, we recoded 19% ( $n = 6$ ) as matching C Situation. For example, in the C situation, one participant wrote, “I was about to have sex with my partner but didn’t have a condom so said we couldn’t. My partner still wanted to have sex anyways but I would not do it without one so I had to go out and borrow a condom from a friend” (M-556); we recoded his response to indicate that he had been in the C situation, even though he checked *similar situation* response.

Table 1

*Prevalence of Being in the No Condom Situation and/or the Condom Situation in the Sample of Participants Who Had PVI Experience*

	Participants' initial reports <sup>a</sup>			Our classifications <sup>b</sup>	
	Have been <i>n</i> (%)	Similar <i>n</i> (%)	Neither <i>n</i> (%)	Have been <i>n</i> (%)	Have not been <i>n</i> (%)
	No Condom Situation <sup>c</sup>				
Men	42 (38)	31 (28)	38 (34)	36 (32)	75 (68)
Women	41 (37)	35 (31)	36 (32)	38 (34)	74 (66)
	Condom Situation <sup>d</sup>				
Men	58 (53)	12 (11)	39 (36)	48 (44)	61 (56)
Women	61 (55)	20 (18)	31 (28)	55 (50)	56 (50)

*Note.* Percentages for women's initial reports and our classifications for C Situation do not sum to 100% because of rounding. <sup>a</sup>Numbers (and percentages) of participants' initial reports based on which response option they checked. <sup>b</sup>Our classifications based on their narratives; we recoded 8 women and 11 men in the NC Situation, and 8 women and 13 men in the C Situation, from *have been* to *have not been*, and 5 women and 5 men in the NC Situation, and 3 women and 3 men in the C Situation from *similar* to *have been*. One woman (W-192) who checked that she had been in the condom situation was dropped because she did not write a narrative for us to classify. <sup>c</sup>*N* = 111 men and 112 women. <sup>d</sup>*N* = 109 men and 112 women.

**Prevalence of Being in the No Condom Situation or the Condom Situation in the Final Sample of Participants**

We divided the final sample of participants into four groups: (a) the NC-only group—participants who had been in the NC situation but not the C situation (11% of the final sample), (b) the C-only group—participants who had been in the C situation but not the NC situation (24%), (c) NC/C group—participants who had been in both the NC Situation and C Situation (23%), and (d) Neither group—participants who had never been in any of the situations (43%, see Table 2).

Table 2

*Numbers of Participants in Each Subgroup in the Final Sample*

		Condom (C) situation		Marginal totals			
		Yes	No				
No condom (NC) situation	Yes	NC/C Group		NC-only group		NC-ever group	
		Men	22	Men	14	Men	36
		Women	28	Women	10	Women	38
		Subtotal	50	Subtotal	24	Subtotal	74
	No	C-only group		Neither group		NC-never group <sup>a</sup>	
		Men	26	Men	48	Men	74
Women		27	Women	46	Women	73	
	Subtotal	53	Subtotal	94	Subtotal	147	
Marginal totals		C-ever group		C-never group <sup>b</sup>		Final sample	
		Men	48	Men	62	Men	110
		Women	55	Women	56	Women	111
	Subtotal	103	Subtotal	118	Subtotal	221	

*Note.* Participants in the final sample were those who reported engaging in penile-vaginal intercourse (PVI) and who had complete data. <sup>a</sup>One man (M-571) who was categorized as “haven’t been” in the no condom situation, was dropped out because he didn’t provide any data for condom situation for us to classify him in a subgroup.

<sup>b</sup>One man (M-513) who was categorized as “have been” in the no condom situation did not provide any narrative for the condom situation. However, considering that he has been in the condom situation, he was classified in the NC-only group.

### **Comparisons Among the Four Groups.**

We compared NC-only, C-only, NC/C, and Neither groups on certain variables such as gender, age. Chi-square analysis did not reveal any significant differences in the percentages of men and women in the four groups,  $\chi^2(3, N = 221) = 1.444, p = .695$ .

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that the four groups were not significantly different in age,  $F(3, 211) = 2.609, p = .348$ .

We used a one-way ANOVA test to compare the four groups on the participants' estimates of the percentage of PVI for which they used condoms. The results revealed a significant difference between the four groups in terms of their condom use histories,  $F(3, 219) = 6.197, p < .001$ . Post hoc analyses using the Bonferroni post hoc criterion for significance showed that the average percentage of PVI for which the participants used condoms was significantly higher in the C-only group ( $M = 83.11\%$ ,  $SD = 27.48$ ) compared to the NC-only group ( $M = 54.79\%$ ,  $SD = 32.69$ ), the NC/C group ( $M = 58.10\%$ ,  $SD = 32.89$ ), and the Neither group ( $M = 62.85\%$ ,  $SD = 39.75$ ).

### **Variables Relevant to Both the No Condom Situation and the Condom Situation**

In order to analyze the narratives of the participants, we discarded the Neither group because they had never been in either situation. We then read the remaining narratives to create the initial coding categories for the qualitative questions. We used the constant comparison method to create categories; that is, we constantly added new categories and deleted or combined old ones as we compared the participants' narratives to our initial categories (Henwood & Pidgeon, 2006). Using these categories, two research assistants coded each questionnaire. We resolved the inconsistencies between them through discussion.

In order to analyze the variables relevant to both the NC and the C Situations, we conducted between-subjects and within-subjects analyses. Between-subjects analyses were conducted to compare the experiences of the participants in the NC-only group with participants in the C-only group. Chi-square analyses were used to perform between-subjects comparisons. In cases where 25% or more of the cells had expected values of less than five, the results of chi-square analysis may not have been valid. Therefore, in those cases the  $p$  was derived from Fisher's exact test. For the NC/C group, we used McNemar's test to perform within-subjects analyses comparing their responses for the NC Situation with their responses for the C Situation.

We also compared men and women in both the NC Situation and the C Situation. To perform these comparisons, we also used chi-square analyses or Fisher's exact test.

Lastly, we analyzed the power variables. First, we calculated the correlations between the perceived power variables. Then, we conducted two-way between-subjects ANOVAs to evaluate gender and group differences.

#### **Participants' relationship with their partners.**

***Between-subjects.*** Chi-square analysis revealed that participants' relationships with their partners were not significantly different in the two groups (see Table 3). The majority of the participants in NC-only group (83%) and C-only group (81%) reported that their partners were their boyfriends/girlfriends. Friend was the second most frequently reported category. A few participants in both situations reported that their partners were "hook-ups" or acquaintances.

***Within-subjects.*** McNemar's test revealed no reliable differences between the NC and C Situations of those in the NC/C group (see Table 3). Similar to the NC-only and C-only groups, the majority of the participants in the NC/C group reported that their partner was their boyfriend/girlfriend in both the NC (72%) and C (68%) situations. Friend and hook-up were

the next most commonly reported partner types. A few participants reported that their partner was an ex-boyfriend/girlfriend. One participant in the NC situation reported that his partner was his “manager at work” (M-536).

Table 3  
*Relationship with the Partner*

Relationship	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only	C-only	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC	C	<i>p</i>
<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>			<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
Boy/Girlfriend	20 (83)	41 (81)	0.05	.545 <sup>d</sup>	36 (72)	34 (68)	.754
Friend	2 (8)	5 (9)	0.02	.623 <sup>d</sup>	6 (12)	5 (10)	1.000
Acquaintance	1 (4)	2 (4)	0.01	.680 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Hook up	1 (4)	1 (2)	0.34	.529 <sup>d</sup>	4 (8)	6 (12)	.687
Ex-boy/girlfriend	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	1 (2)	3 (6)	.500
Boss/TA	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	1 (2)	0 (0)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	0 (0)	2 (4)	0.93	.471 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	1.000
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	0 (1)	1 (2)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 24. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar’s test when *n* in one cell is less than 1, *p* was derived from an analysis conducted by SAS.

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

### **Participants’ reasons for wanting to use a condom.**

***Between- and within-subjects.*** Chi-square analyses and McNemar’s tests revealed no significant differences between the NC and C Situations. Most of the participants in the NC-only (58%), C-only (70%), and NC/C groups (70% in NC and 55% in C) reported wanting to use a condom for pregnancy prevention. Safety (with no explanation of the risk they were

avoiding) and prevention of STIs followed pregnancy prevention among the reasons provided in all groups (see Table 4).

Table 4  
*Reasons for Wanting to Use a Condom*

Reasons	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>p</i>
Pregnancy	14 (58)	37 (70)	0.97	.324	35 (70)	27 (55)	.077
STIs	7 (29)	9(17)	1.49	.179 <sup>d</sup>	12 (24)	10 (20)	.754
Safety	8 (38)	14 (26)	0.97	.325	12 (24)	17 (34)	.332
Always use one	1 (4)	5 (9)	0.64	.387 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	.50 <sup>e</sup>
Don't know partner well	0 (0)	2 (4)	0.93	.471 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	2 (4)	1.000
Vague	0 (0)	2 (4)	0.93	.471 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	2 (4)	1.000
Other	1 (4)	0 (0)	2.24	.312 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	3 (6)	.625

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 24. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar's test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

**Gender.** As presented in Table 5, there were no significant differences between men and women in reasons for wanting to use a condom.

Table 5

*Reasons for Wanting to Use a Condom - Gender*

Reasons	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
Pregnancy	25 (66)	24 (67)	0.01	.936	35 (64)	29 (60)	0.11	.737
STIs	9 (24)	10 (28)	0.16	.687	12 (22)	7 (15)	0.89	.345
Safety	13 (34)	8 (22)	1.31	.253	16 (29)	15 (31)	0.06	.812
Always use one	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	2 (4)	0.09	.565
Don't know partner well	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>e</sup>	1 (2)	3 (6)	1.35	.259 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>e</sup>	0 (0)	4 (8)	4.77*	.044
Other	0 (0)	2 (6)	2.17	.233 <sup>e</sup>	2 (4)	1 (1)	0.22	.551 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

**Participants' reasons for not wanting to use a condom.** This study is about situations in which the participants wanted to use a condom. Sometime, however, individuals are ambivalent; even though they want to use a condom, they might also have reasons for not wanting to use a condom. So, in addition to asking participants about reasons for wanting to use a condom, we also asked them about their reasons, if any, for not wanting to use a condom.

**Between-subjects.** As the results in Table 6 show, the majority of participants in the C-only group (77%) reported that they did *not* have a reason for *not* wanting to use a condom. This was significantly more common in the C-only group compared with the NC-only group. Participants in NC-only group reported having more pleasure without the condom as their major reason for not wanting to use one. This response was the second most frequently reported response by participants in C-only group. A few participants in both groups stated that their partner felt more pleasure without a condom and that was why they did not want to use a condom. One participant in NC-only group reported that she did not want to use a condom because she “did not want to turn [her partner] down” (W-131).

**Within-subjects.** As presented in Table 6, significantly more participants in the NC/C group reported no reasons for not wanting to use a condom when they were in the C situation compared with when they were in the NC situation. Similar to the NC-only group, feeling more pleasure without a condom was the most commonly reported reason by the NC/C group when they were in the NC situation. Some participants in the NC/C group reported not wanting to use a condom because they thought that using condoms was painful. Some other participants reported that because their partners rejected using condoms, they also didn’t want to use one.

**Gender.** The chi-square results indicated that significantly more women than men in both situations reported that they had no reasons for not wanting to use a condom. In the NC Situation, significantly more men than women reported that their reason for not wanting to use a condom was to get more pleasure. Additionally, more men than women gave vague responses in NC Situation, such as “Yes, feeling” (M-534, see Table 7).

Table 6

*Reasons for Not Wanting to Use a Condom*

Reasons	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC- only	C-only	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC	C	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>			<i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	
No reason	7 (29)	41 (77)	16.34***	<.001	14 (28)	23 (46)	.022*
More pleasure	11 (46)	8(15)	8.40**	.004 <sup>d</sup>	23 (46)	17 (34)	.109
More pleasure for the partner	2 (8)	1 (2)	1.83	.228 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Painful	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	4 (8)	1.000
Partner said “no”	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	3 (6)	2 (4)	1.000
Not to confront the partner	1 (4)	0 (0)	2.24	.312 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Vague	2 (8)	2 (4)	0.70	.368 <sup>d</sup>	5 (10)	3 (6)	.727
Other	4 (17)	1 (2)	5.94*	.031 <sup>d</sup>	7 (14)	2 (4)	.125

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 24. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar’s test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

Table 7

*Reasons for Not Wanting to Use a Condom - Gender*

Reasons	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
No reason	16 (42)	5 (14)	7.24**	.007	39 (71)	25 (52)	3.86*	.049
More pleasure	14 (37)	20 (56)	2.61	.106	8 (15)	17 (35)	6.07*	.014
More pleasure for the partner	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.01	.969 <sup>e</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	1.78	.283 <sup>e</sup>
Painful	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	2 (4)	0.09	.565 <sup>e</sup>
Partner said “no”	2 (5)	1 (3)	0.29	.521 <sup>e</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	0.01	.717 <sup>e</sup>
Not to confront the partner	1 (3)	0 (0)	0.96	.514 <sup>e</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Vague	1 (3)	6 (17)	4.25*	.046 <sup>e</sup>	4 (7)	1 (2)	1.49	.227 <sup>e</sup>
Other	7 (18)	3 (8)	1.61	.177 <sup>e</sup>	2 (4)	1 (1)	0.22	.551 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test.

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

### **How did participants communicate their wish to use a condom to their partner?**

***Between- and within-subjects.*** The results of chi-square analyses and McNemar’s tests did not reveal any significant differences between the NC and C situations.

Participants mainly used verbal means to communicate their wish to use a condom to their partners (see Table 8). Telling their partner that they wanted to use a condom was the most frequently reported answer by participants in both the NC and C Situations. Some of the participants in both situations asked their partners if they had a condom. Some participants in the C situation reported that they told their partners that they would not have sexual intercourse unless they used a condom. For example, one man reported saying, “With it or none without!” (M-583).

Other participants reported using nonverbal means to let their partner know about their wish to use a condom. Some participants reported that they got out a condom. For example, one woman wrote, “I carried one with me and got it out before we had sex” (W-150). A few men reported that they put the condom on. Some participants reported that they knew their partner and that condom use either was a part of their routine or had already been discussed. One woman reported, “I made him use them every time” (W-235).

**Gender.** As can be seen in Table 9, the results revealed that significantly more women than men asked their partners if they had a condom in the NC situation and told their partner that they wanted to use a condom in the C situation. On the other hand, significantly more men than women got out a condom to let their partner know that they want to use a condom in both situations.

Table 8

*Ways of Communicating Their Wish to Use a Condom to Their Partner*

Ways	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>p</i>
<b>Verbal</b>							
Told the partner	10 (44)	35 (66)	3.38	.066	30 (60)	35 (70)	.302
Asked if they had a condom	3 (13)	3 (6)	1.20	.254 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	1 (4)	1.000
Asked them to put one on	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	5 (10)	1 (2)	.125 <sup>d</sup>
No condom, no sex	0 (0)	6 (11)	2.83	.105 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	2 (4)	1.000
<b>Nonverbal</b>							
Already knew the partner	1 (4)	5 (9)	0.57	.407 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Got out a condom	3 (13)	4 (8)	0.58	.356 <sup>d</sup>	7 (14)	8 (16)	1.000
Put on a condom	1 (4)	3 (6)	0.06	.648 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	1 (2)	1.000
Vague	5 (21)	0 (0)	12.33**	.003 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	1.000
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	1 (2)	2 (4)	1.000

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 23. One participant in this group did not provide a narrative for this question. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50.

<sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar's test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

Table 9

*Ways of Communicating Their Wish to Use a Condom to Their Partner - Gender*

Ways	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
<b>Verbal</b>								
Told the partner	23 (61)	17 (47)	1.32	.251	42 (76)	28 (58)	3.83*	.050
Asked if they had a condom	5 (16)	0 (0)	6.19*	.015 <sup>e</sup>	4 (7)	1 (2)	1.49	.227 <sup>e</sup>
Asked them to put one on	4 (11)	1 (3)	1.76	.196 <sup>e</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	0.88	.534 <sup>e</sup>
No condom, no sex	1 (3)	0 (0)	0.96	.514 <sup>e</sup>	5 (9)	3 (6)	0.29	.437 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Nonverbal</b>								
Already knew the partner	1 (3)	0 (0)	0.96	.514 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	2 (4)	0.09	.565 <sup>e</sup>
Got out a condom	0 (0)	10 (28)	12.21***	<.001 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	9 (19)	4.40*	.036
Put on a condom	0 (0)	3 (8)	3.30	.110 <sup>e</sup>	0 (0)	4 (8)	4.77*	.044 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	3 (8)	3 (8)	0.01	.637 <sup>e</sup>	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.16	.466 <sup>e</sup>
Other	0 (0)	1 (3)	1.07	.486 <sup>e</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	1.78	.283 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

### **Reasons for thinking that their partner did not want to use a condom.**

***Between- and within-subjects.*** We asked participants what made them think their partner did not want to use a condom. Between- and within-subjects comparisons yielded no reliable differences between the NC and C situations.

Participants' narratives revealed that their partners mostly used verbal means to communicate their wish to not to use a condom. As can be seen from Table 10, the majority of participants in all groups reported that their partner told them that they did not want to use

a condom. The second most common reason presented by participants in the C-only group was that their partner asked them to have sexual intercourse without a condom. Some participants reported that their partner told them that it was more pleasurable to have sexual intercourse without a condom. For example, one woman wrote, “He told me it would feel more intimate without one” (W-198). Some participants reported that their partner complained about condom use. For example, one man wrote, “My partner really just wanted to have sex and was upset when I said no because I didn’t have a condom” (M-556).

In addition to verbal cues, a few participants reported nonverbal cues for thinking that their partner did not want to use a condom. Some reported that their partner tried to have sex with them without a condom. For example, one woman wrote, “He tried (not forcefully) w/o & I noticed and said no & he asked why” (W-139). A few women in NC-only group reported that their partner started to have sex with them without a condom. One man stated that his partner’s facial expression made him think that she did not want to use a condom.

**Gender.** As shown in Table 11, the results revealed that significantly more men than women in both situations reported that their partners told them that they did not want to use a condom. Moreover, significantly more women than men in the C situation reported that their partners asked them to have sex without a condom. There were no significant differences between men and women in either situation with regards to nonverbal reasons.

Table 10

*Reasons for Thinking That Their Partner Didn't Want to Use a Condom*

Reasons	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>P</i>
Verbal							
Told me	15 (65)	29 (55)	0.73	.394	31 (62)	31 (62)	1.000
Said it feels better w/o	0 (0)	3 (6)	1.36	.333 <sup>d</sup>	5 (10)	3 (6)	.625
Asked to have sex w/o	0 (0)	7 (13)	3.35	.071 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	4 (8)	1.000
Complained / got upset	0 (0)	3 (6)	1.36	.333 <sup>d</sup>	7 (14)	2 (4)	.063
Nonverbal							
Tried to have sex w/o	1 (4)	2 (4)	0.01	.667 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	6 (12)	.125
Started to have sex w/o	2 (9)	0 (0)	4.73	.089 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Facial expression	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.44	.697 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	.50 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	2 (9)	2 (4)	0.78	.352 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	2 (4)	1.000
Other	4 (17)	7 (13)	0.23	.439 <sup>d</sup>	6 (12)	4 (8)	0.745

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 23. One participant in this group did not provide a narrative for this question. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53.

<sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar's test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

Table 11

*Reasons for Thinking That Their Partner Didn't Want to Use a Condom - Gender*

Reasons	No Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Condom Situation		$X^2$	<i>P</i>
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>			Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>		
Verbal								
Told me	17 (45)	29 (81)	10.08**	.001	26 (47)	34 (71)	5.85*	.016
Said it feels better w/o	4 (11)	1 (3)	1.76	.196 <sup>e</sup>	5 (9)	1 (2)	2.29	.137 <sup>e</sup>
Asked to have sex w/o	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>e</sup>	9 (16)	2 (4)	3.40*	.046
Complained / got upset	5 (13)	2 (6)	1.25	.238 <sup>e</sup>	4 (7)	1 (2)	1.49	.227 <sup>e</sup>
Nonverbal								
Tried to have sex w/o	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	5 (10)	0.88	.284 <sup>e</sup>
Started to have sex w/o	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>e</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	0.88	.534 <sup>e</sup>
Facial expression	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>e</sup>	0 (0)	1 (1)	1.16	.466 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	2 (5)	1 (3)	0.29	.521 <sup>e</sup>	3 (6)	1 (2)	0.78	.362 <sup>e</sup>
Other	8 (21)	2 (6)	3.80	.052 <sup>e</sup>	7 (13)	4 (8)	0.52	.471

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

### **Feelings and thoughts at the time of the situation.**

***Between-subjects.*** As can be seen from Table 12, participants in the NC-only group were significantly more likely than participants in the C-only group to feel anxious or have mixed feelings. However, participants in the NC-only group were also significantly more likely than participants in C-only group to feel physically good. In addition, there were significantly more participants who reported being angry and wanting to be safe in the C-only

group compared with the NC-only group. For example, one woman in the C Situation wrote, “Annoyed he didn’t want to wear one at first” (W-153).

***Within-subjects.*** The results revealed that there were no reliable differences in participants’ negative or neutral feelings and thoughts in NC or C Situation. However, significantly more participants reported feeling happy, “OK,” or positive about themselves when they were in the C situation compared with when they were in the NC situation (see Table 12).

Table 12

*Feelings and Thoughts at the Time of the Situation*

	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC- only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>P</i>
Feelings and thoughts							
Negative							
Anxious	10 (42)	3 (6)	15.26***	<.001 <sup>d</sup>	10 (20)	4 (8)	.146
Angry / annoyed	0 (0)	9 (17)	4.62*	.027 <sup>d</sup>	4 (8)	5 (10)	1.000
Negative to partner	0 (0)	3 (6)	1.41	.320 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	1 (2)	1.000
Negative to self	2 (8)	1 (2)	1.83	.228 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Scared of the partner	1 (4)	0 (0)	2.24	.312 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Positive							
Happy	4 (17)	11 (21)	0.18	.467 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	14 (28)	.002**
Physically good	3 (13)	0 (0)	6.89*	.028 <sup>d</sup>	4 (8)	1 (2)	.250
Positive to partner	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	1.000
Positive to self	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	7 (14)	.016 <sup>e*</sup>
OK	2 (8)	3 (6)	0.19	.499 <sup>d</sup>	22 (44)	7 (14)	.001*
Neutral							
Wanted to be safe	0 (0)	9 (17)	4.62*	.027 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	4 (8)	.125 <sup>e</sup>
No condom no sex	1 (4)	2 (4)	0.01	.680 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	1.000
Mixed	6 (25)	2 (4)	7.80*	.010 <sup>d</sup>	6 (12)	3 (6)	.453
Horny	1 (4)	2 (4)	0.01	.680 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	2 (4)	1.000
Vague	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	2 (4)	1.000
Other	6 (25)	22 (42)	1.95	.163	2 (4)	7 (14)	.125

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 24. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

<sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar's test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

**Gender.** As presented in Table 13, women were more likely to be angry and annoyed than men in the C Situation. However, compared with women, men were more likely to be happy and to feel physically good in the NC situation.

Table 13

*Feelings and Thoughts at the Time of the Situation - Gender*

Feelings and thoughts	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
Negative								
Anxious	11 (29)	9 (25)	0.15	.702	5 (9)	2 (4)	0.98	.278 <sup>e</sup>
Angry/annoyed	2 (5)	2 (6)	0.00	.672	12 (22)	2 (4)	6.80**	.009
Negative to partner	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	1 (2)	0.78	.362 <sup>e</sup>
Negative to self	3 (8)	0 (0)	2.96	.130 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	0.88	.534 <sup>e</sup>
Scared of the partner	1 (3)	0 (0)	0.96	.514 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Positive								
Happy	0 (0)	6 (17)	6.89*	.011 <sup>d</sup>	16 (29)	9 (19)	1.49	.222
Physically good	1 (3)	6 (17)	4.25*	.046 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.16	.466 <sup>e</sup>
Positive to partner	1 (3)	0 (0)	0.96	.514 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	1.78	.283 <sup>e</sup>
Positive to self	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	6 (11)	2 (4)	1.63	.184 <sup>e</sup>
OK	15 (40)	9 (25)	1.77	.184	4 (7)	6 (13)	0.80	.287 <sup>e</sup>
Neutral								
Wanted to be safe	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	3 (6)	10 (21)	5.50*	.019
No condom no sex	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.00	.740 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	1 (2)	0.22	.551 <sup>e</sup>
Mixed	7 (18)	5 (14)	0.28	.597	3 (6)	2 (4)	0.09	.565 <sup>e</sup>
Horny	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	2 (4)	0.02	.638 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.00	.740 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	2 (4)	0.50	.449
Other	2 (5)	6 (17)	2.49	.114	8 (15)	21 (44)	10.81**	.001

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

### **Feelings and thoughts after the situation.**

***Between- and within-subjects.*** As can be seen in Table 14, both between- and within-subjects analyses revealed that participants who had sex without a condom were more likely than those who had sex with a condom to report feeling anxious and having negative thoughts about themselves (including regret). For example, one woman wrote, “I wanted to cry, felt like a slut, and I just wanted to be alone” (W-142). Conversely, participants who had sex with a condom were more likely to report feeling happy and positive about themselves. For example, one man wrote that he felt “relieved” (M-541), and another man wrote, “I’m glad I kept arguing until the smart decision was chosen” (M-574).

***Gender.*** There were no reliable differences between men’s and women’s reported feelings and thoughts after the situation (see Table 15).

Table 14

*Feelings and Thoughts after the Situation*

	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>p</i>
Feelings and thoughts							
Negative							
Anxious	9 (38)	0 (0)	22.51***	<.001 <sup>d</sup>	13 (26)	0 (0)	<.001 <sup>e***</sup>
Angry / annoyed	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	1 (2)	.500
Negative to partner	0 (0)	4 (8)	1.91	.216 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	.500 <sup>e</sup>
Negative to self	8 (33)	1 (2)	15.83***	<.001 <sup>d</sup>	16 (32)	6 (12)	.041*
Scared of the partner	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Positive							
Happy	1 (4)	28 (53)	16.66***	<.001	2 (4)	25 (50)	<.001***
Physically good	2 (8)	0 (0)	4.53	.094 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	0 (0)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Positive to partner	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.000 <sup>e</sup>
Positive to self	0 (0)	9 (17)	4.62*	.027 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	7 (14)	.015 <sup>e*</sup>
OK	3 (13)	6 (11)	0.02	.577 <sup>d</sup>	11 (22)	8 (16)	.549
Neutral							
Wanted to be safe	0 (0)	2 (4)	0.93	.471 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
No condom no sex	0 (0)	2 (4)	0.93	.471 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Mixed	3 (13)	0 (0)	6.89*	.028 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	0 (0)	.025 <sup>e</sup>
Horny	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.46	.688 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—
Vague	1 (4)	0 (0)	2.24	.312 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	2 (4)	1.000
Other	4 (17)	10 (19)	0.03	.565 <sup>d</sup>	5 (10)	6 (12)	1.000

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 24. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 50. <sup>d</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test. <sup>e</sup>Because SPSS does not conduct the McNemar's test when *n* in one category is less than 1, *p* was derived from analysis conducted by SAS.

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

Table 15

*Feelings and Thoughts after the Situation - Gender*

Feelings and thoughts	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
Negative								
Anxious	13 (34)	9 (25)	0.75	.386	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Angry / annoyed	3 (8)	0 (0)	2.96	.130 <sup>d</sup>	2 (4)	0 (0)	1.78	.283 <sup>e</sup>
Negative to partner	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>d</sup>	3 (6)	1 (2)	0.78	.362 <sup>e</sup>
Negative to self	12 (32)	12 (33)	0.03	.872	5 (9)	2 (4)	0.98	.279 <sup>e</sup>
Scared of the partner	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Positive								
Happy	0 (0)	3 (8)	3.33	.110 <sup>d</sup>	27 (49)	26 (54)	0.26	.607
Physically good	0 (0)	3 (8)	3.33	.110 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Positive to partner	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	0 (0)	2 (4)	2.34	.215 <sup>e</sup>
Positive to self	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	6 (11)	10 (21)	1.92	.165
OK	10 (26)	4 (11)	2.79	.095	8 (15)	6 (13)	0.09	.763 <sup>e</sup>
Neutral								
Wanted to be safe	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	1 (2)	1 (2)	0.01	.717 <sup>e</sup>
No condom no sex	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	1 (2)	1 (2)	0.01	.717 <sup>e</sup>
Mixed	3 (8)	3 (8)	0.01	.637 <sup>d</sup>	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—
Horny	0 (0)	0 (0)	—	—	0 (0)	1 (2)	1.16	.466 <sup>e</sup>
Vague	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.00	.740 <sup>d</sup>	1 (2)	1 (2)	0.01	.717 <sup>e</sup>
Other	3 (8)	6 (17)	1.33	.213 <sup>d</sup>	8 (15)	8 (17)	0.09	.767

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>e</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from

Fisher's exact test.

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

**Alcohol consumed by the participant.**

**Between-subjects.** Alcohol consumption was associated with not using a condom. Significantly more participants in the NC-only group (48%) than in the C-only group (23%) reported having used alcohol at the time of the situation (see Table 16).

**Within-subjects.** We did not find any difference between the alcohol consumption of participants in NC/C group when they were in the NC situation compared with when they were in the C situation (see Table 16).

Table 16

*Alcohol Consumed by the Participants*

Alcohol	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>N</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>p</i>
No	11 (52)	40 (77)	4.28*	0.039	33 (70)	40 (85)	0.118
Yes	10 (48)	12 (23)			14 (30)	7 (15)	

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 21. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 52. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 47.

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

**Gender.** In both situations, women were more likely than men to report that they did not consume any alcohol (see Table 17).

Table 17

*Alcohol Consumed by the Participants – Gender*

Alcohol	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
No	26 (77)	18 (53)	4.121*	.042	48 (89)	34 (71)	5.255*	.022
Yes	8 (24)	16 (47)			6 (11)	14 (29)		

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 34. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 34. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 54. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48.

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

**Alcohol consumed by the participants' partner.** The participants were asked to estimate the level of alcohol their partners consumed at the time of the situation.

**Between-subjects.** The results of chi-square analyses did not reveal any significant differences between NC-only and C-only groups in terms of whether participants' partners had alcohol or not (see Table 18). The majority of the participants in both groups reported that their partners did not have alcohol at the time of the situation.

**Within-subjects.** The results of McNemar's test did not reveal any significant differences between the consumption of alcohol by the participants' partners when the participants were in the NC Situation compared with when they were in the C Situation (see Table 18).

Table 18

*Alcohol Consumed by the Participants' Partners*

Alcohol	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	C-only <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	C <i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>p</i>
No	13 (62)	38 (72)	0.67	0.412	34 (72)	38 (81)	0.424
Yes	8 (38)	15 (28)			13 (28)	9 (19)	

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 21. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 47.

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

**Gender.** We did not find any difference between men and women in whether their partners consumed alcohol in either the NC Situation or the C Situation (see Table 19).

Table 19

*Alcohol Consumed by the Participants' Partners - Gender*

	No Condom Situation				Condom Situation			
	Women	Men	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Women	Men	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
Alcohol	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>			<i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>d</sup>		
No	25 (74)	22 (65)	0.62	.431	44 (80)	33 (69)	1.72	.190
Yes	9 (27)	12 (35)			11 (20)	15 (31)		

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 34. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 34. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>d</sup>*n* = 48. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Presence of condom.** We read the participants' narratives and coded whether there was a condom present in the situation or not. We coded those narratives as "not present" when a condom was not present initially, but the participant or his/her partner had gone to get one or had bought one later.

**Between--subjects.** As presented in Table 20, a condom was present in the majority of the C-only Situations and absent in the majority of the NC-only situations. The differences were significant. When there was no condom present initially, all the participants in the C-only group reported that they had bought one, whereas none of the participants in the NC-only group reported that they had done so.

**Within-subjects.** As presented in Table 20, a condom was more likely to be present when participants in the NC/C Group were in the C Situation compared with when they were in the NC Situation. One participant, who reported that a condom was not present initially, reported buying condoms when she was in the C Situation but not when she was in the NC Situation.

Table 20

*Presence of Condom*

Condom	Between-subjects analyses				Within-subject analyses		
	NC-only	C-only	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	NC	C	<i>p</i>
<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>			<i>n</i> (%) <sup>c</sup>		
No	10 (59)	8 (15)	12.89***	0.000	8 (31)	1 (4)	0.016*
Yes	7 (41)	45 (85)			18 (69)	25 (96)	

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 17. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 53. <sup>c</sup>*n* = 26.\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.**Variables Specific to the No Condom Situation**

We analyzed gender differences for variables specific to the NC Situation. We used chi-square analyses or Fisher's exact test to perform the gender comparisons. For variables specific to the NC situation, we analyzed the narratives of participants who had been in the NC situation, regardless of whether they had been in the C situation

**Reasons for giving in.** The results did not reveal any significant differences between men and women in their reasons for giving in to sexual intercourse without a condom (see Table 21). We categorized the reasons into three major groups: related to self, related to the partner, and related to the context. The modal reason why participants gave in to sexual intercourse without a condom was self-related: They reported that they gave in because they wanted to have sex. For example, one woman wrote, "I didn't really have a reason, I really wanted to have sex" (W-190). The second most reported reason was context-related: use of birth control. Participants reported that the use of alternative birth control eliminated their fear of pregnancy, thus leading them to give in to intercourse without a condom. For example, one man wrote, "We were getting ready for sex and I wanted to get a condom and she didn't want to slow down, so we had sex anyway because she was on the pill" (M-640). The third most commonly cited reasons were also context related: not wanting to interrupt the moment (e.g., "I was already having sex at that point & in the moment so it was hard to

stop,” W-127) and the man’s promise to pull out before ejaculating (e.g., “After dating my boyfriend for a while & having sex w/ condoms he expressed his opinion on how condoms were annoying...etc. and how I was on birth control so if he pulled out it shouldn’t be a big deal. I was hesitant but trusted him so we tried it,” W-139).

Some of the reasons participants reported were related to their partners. Some participants reported that they gave in to having sexual intercourse without a condom because they wanted to please their partners. One woman wrote, “I wanted him to be happy” (W-151), and one man wrote, “I was willing to do what she wanted” (M-550). Relatedly, two women reported that they gave in so that their partners would feel more pleasure if they did not use a condom. One woman wrote,

We were going to have sexual intercourse, and then I stopped and said let’s use a condom. I don’t want to get pregnant. Then he said, “yeah, but it’s too tight on me and I don’t feel comfortable, and I don’t feel pressure.” So, then him kissing me kinda made me not care.... Because I wanted him to be comfortable and I felt like if he wasn’t, it would ruin the moment. (W-143)

Two women also reported giving in because they liked their partner. For example, one of them wrote, “Because I really liked him and it was just one time so I thought it would be okay” (W-114). One woman and two men reported that because their partner said “No” to using condoms, they gave in. For example, one man wrote, “It was after a night of drinking, and my girlfriend insisted that we not use a condom because it feels better. I had not really had intercourse without a condom before, so I was skeptical about it. I finally gave in to the pressure but made sure I pulled out before I finished” (M-584).

Table 21

*Reasons for Giving in to Sexual Intercourse Without a Condom in the No Condom Situation*

Reasons	No Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
<b>Partner Related</b>				
Feels better for partner	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>c</sup>
Liked/loved the partner	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>c</sup>
To please the partner	2 (5)	3 (8)	0.28	.474 <sup>c</sup>
Partner said “No”	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>c</sup>
Partner don’t have STI	3 (8)	2 (6)	0.16	.526 <sup>c</sup>
<b>Self Related</b>				
Feels better for me	1 (3)	4 (11)	2.11	.162 <sup>c</sup>
Wanted to have sex	8 (21)	5 (14)	0.66	.418
<b>Context related</b>				
Not to interrupt the moment	3 (8)	4 (11)	0.22	.469 <sup>c</sup>
Have done it before	1 (3)	2 (6)	0.41	.479 <sup>c</sup>
Just for once	3 (8)	0 (0)	2.96	.130 <sup>c</sup>
Alcohol/ drug	3 (8)	1 (3)	0.95	.328 <sup>c</sup>
He/I would pull out	3 (8)	3 (8)	0.01	.637 <sup>c</sup>
She/I was on birth control	7 (18)	5 (14)	0.28	.597
Vague	3 (8)	1 (3)	0.95	.328 <sup>c</sup>
Other	6 (16)	9 (25)	0.97	.325

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test.

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

**What did their partner do to convince them to have sexual intercourse without a condom?** As presented in Table 22, more women than men reported that their partner pointed

out the possibility of pulling out. For example, one woman wrote, “At first he ignored me, another he said he’d pull out” (W-127). More men than women wrote that their partner urged them to have sexual intercourse without a condom. For example, one man wrote that his partner, “Kept insisting to ‘just do it’” (M-572).

***Emphasized positive outcomes.*** Many participants wrote that they gave in because their partner said or did something to emphasize the advantages of having sex without a condom. Six men and two women reported that their partners aroused them physically to convince them to have sexual intercourse without a condom. For example, one man wrote that his partner “blew in/nibbled my ear” (M-623), and another one wrote, “She just kept touching me, and persuading” (M-588). Some participants reported that their partner emphasized that sex is better without a condom. One woman wrote, “He said how good it was w/o one and mentioned how we don’t all the time anyway” (W-113). Some participants reported that their partner reassured them that everything would be fine (e.g., “Reassurance that is was fine,” M-573).

***Suggested another method.*** Some participants reported that their partners suggested or pointed out the use of another kind of birth control method. More women than men reported that their partners suggested pulling out before ejaculating. Additionally, seven men and four women said that their partners pointed out the use of birth control pills as a method of protection.

***Relational variables.*** Three women and one man reported that their partner pointed out that they were “clean” to convince them not to use a condom. Two women reported that their partner challenged their trust. For example, one wrote that her partner said, “I know when to stop and pull out. I’ve done this plenty of times to know” (W-142). Surprisingly, two men but no women reported that their partner got angry. One man wrote, “She said ‘Fuck it, just stop bitching & lets go’” (M-525). However, one woman reported that she was afraid that

her partner might get mad. She wrote, “I was messing around with a guy. We had done stuff before but I was still uncomfortable about having sex with him without a condom. He didn’t want to use one and I didn’t want to make him mad so we didn’t use one” (W-242).

Table 22

*What Did Partner Do to Convince to Have Sexual Intercourse Without a Condom in the No Condom Situation*

	No Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
What partner did				
Nothing	4 (11)	2 (6)	0.61	.363 <sup>c</sup>
Emphasized positive outcomes				
Aroused physically	3 (8)	6 (17)	1.33	.213 <sup>c</sup>
Emphasized good sex	5 (13)	1 (3)	2.67	.112 <sup>c</sup>
Said “it would be fine”	4 (11)	2 (6)	0.61	.363 <sup>c</sup>
Urged them	2 (5)	8 (22)	4.55*	.035 <sup>c</sup>
Suggested another method				
Pull Out	9 (24)	1 (3)	6.91**	.009 <sup>c</sup>
Birth control	4 (11)	7 (19)	1.16	.281
Relational variables				
Said he/she was clean	3 (8)	1 (3)	0.95	.328 <sup>c</sup>
Challenged trust	2 (5)	0 (0)	1.95	.260 <sup>c</sup>
Got angry	0 (0)	2 (6)	2.17	.233 <sup>c</sup>
Dispraised condoms	5 (13)	1 (3)	2.67	.112 <sup>c</sup>
Vague	4 (11)	2 (6)	0.61	.363 <sup>c</sup>
Other	7 (18)	5 (14)	0.28	.597

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test.

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

**Response to partner.** The majority of participants reported that they agreed with their partner about not using a condom (see Table 23). Some others stated that they agreed with their partner but did so reluctantly. For example, one woman wrote, “I said ok and rolled my eyes” (W-153), and one man wrote, “I was hesitant @ first, but eventually caved in” (M-588). Some participants reported that they were angry, upset, or shocked. Five men but no women reported that they were happy in response to their partner’s wish not to use a condom, a significant gender difference. Some examples of the men’s responses were, “Excitement” (M-578), “I said ok, sounds good to me” (M-619), and “It aroused me even more” (M-623).

Table 23

*Response to Partner in the No Condom Situation*

Response to partner	No Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
Agreed	17 (45)	18 (50)	0.21	.650
Agreed reluctantly	10 (26)	5 (14)	1.77	.184
Upset	3 (8)	0 (0)	2.96	.130 <sup>c</sup>
Shocked	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.002	.740 <sup>c</sup>
Angry	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.002	.740 <sup>c</sup>
Happy	0 (0)	5 (14)	5.66*	.023 <sup>c</sup>
Vague	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.002	.740 <sup>c</sup>
Other	6 (16)	3 (8)	0.96	.268

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher’s exact test.

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

**Participants’ predictions of what would have happened if they had insisted on using a condom.** We asked participants what they think would have happened if they had

insisted on using a condom. As can be seen in Table 24, the most commonly reported response was that they would have used a condom. The next most commonly reported response by women was that they wouldn't have had sex; this was reported by significantly more women than men. Some participants reported thinking that their partner would have gotten angry if they had insisted. For example, one woman wrote, "I would feel better but he would have been angry" (W-108).

Table 24

*Participants' Predictions of What Would Have Happened If They Had Insisted on Using a Condom in the No Condom Situation*

Predictions	No Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>P</i>
	Women <i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	Men <i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
Would have used a condom	17 (45)	18 (50)	0.21	.650
Wouldn't have had sex	11 (29)	3 (8)	5.12*	.024 <sup>c</sup>
Partner would have gotten angry	3 (8)	2 (6)	0.16	.526 <sup>c</sup>
Nothing	2 (5)	3 (8)	0.28	.474 <sup>c</sup>
Don't know	2 (5)	1 (3)	0.29	.521 <sup>c</sup>
Vague	2 (5)	4 (11)	0.85	.311 <sup>c</sup>
Other	2 (5)	6 (17)	2.49	.114 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 38. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 36. <sup>c</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

### **Variables Specific to the Condom Situation**

We analyzed the differences between men and women in terms of the variables specific to the C Situation. We used chi-square analyses or Fisher's exact test to perform the gender comparisons. For variables specific to the C situation, we analyzed the narratives of

participants who had been in the C situation, regardless of whether they had been in the NC situation.

**How did participants convince their partner to use a condom?** As presented in Table 25, significantly more women than men told their partners that they would not have intercourse if they did not use a condom. More men than women reported that they talked to their partners to convince them. For example, one man described how he convinced his partner: “By explaining that we just met and that this is the safest way to do it” (M-502). Additionally, men also reported putting on a condom in order to convince their partners. Telling their partners that they wanted to use a condom was another method reported by the participants. Some participants described convincing their partners to use a condom by mentioning the possibility of pregnancy if they had sex without a condom. For example, one man wrote, “Telling her I don't want a kid yet” (M-610). A few participants reported seducing their partners to make them use a condom. One man wrote, “I continued in foreplay until she wanted sex so bad, she'd do anything to get my cock in her” (M-520).

Table 25

*Participants' Reports of How They Convinced Their Partners to Use a Condom in the Condom Situation*

	Condom Situation		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	Women	Men		
Ways to convince	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i> (%) <sup>b</sup>		
No condom, no sex	25 (46)	12 (25)	4.66*	.031
Told them that they wanted to use one	9 (19)	7 (13)	0.71	.400
Mentioned pregnancy	5 (10)	8 (15)	0.40	.529
Talked to them	2 (4)	8 (17)	4.96*	.028 <sup>c</sup>
Put on a condom	0 (0)	5 (10)	6.02*	.020 <sup>c</sup>
Seduced them	1 (2)	2 (4)	0.50	.449 <sup>c</sup>
No birth control	2 (4)	0 (0)	1.78	.283 <sup>c</sup>
Vague	4 (7)	5 (10)	0.32	.413 <sup>c</sup>
Other	8 (15)	5 (10)	0.40	.529

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 55. <sup>b</sup>*n* = 48. <sup>c</sup>Because chi-square may not have been valid, *p* was derived from Fisher's exact test.

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

### Perceived Power

***Correlations among perceived power variables.*** We calculated the correlations among power variables for men and women in the NC and C situations. As shown in Table 26, for both men and women who had been in the NC situation, making decisions about when and whether to have sex was positively correlated with making decisions during sexual situations. For women, making decisions during sexual situations was also positively correlated with making decisions during nonsexual situations.

As shown in Table 26, for both women and men who had been in the C situation, similar to the NC situation, making decisions about when and whether to have sex was

positively correlated with making decisions during sexual situations. For men, making decisions about when and whether to have sex was also positively correlated with making decisions in nonsexual situations. Additionally, for women, interest in maintaining the relationship was negatively correlated with making decisions in nonsexual situations, with making decisions about when and whether to have sex, and with making decisions in sexual situations.

Table 26  
*Correlations Among Perceived Power Variables in the No Condom and Condom Situations*

Variable	Women <sup>a</sup>				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Interest in the relationship	1	.01	-.30	-.22	-.29
2. Interest in sex	-.17	1	.10	.28	.02
3. Decisions in nonsexual situations <sup>b</sup>	-.41**	.01	1	.20	.38*
4. Decisions whether/when to have sex	-.29*	.13	.22	1	.43**
5. Decisions during sexual situations	-.35**	-.02	.16	.60**	1
Variable	Men <sup>b</sup>				
Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Interest in the relationship	1	-.07	.10	.01	-.09
2. Interest in sex	-.04	1	-.14	.28	.30
3. Decisions in nonsexual situation	-.04	-.15	1	.06	-.22
4. Decisions whether/when to have sex	-.24	-.13	.34*	1	.49**
5. Decisions during sexual situations	-.10	0.3	.19	.53**	1

<sup>a</sup> $n = 48$ . <sup>b</sup> $n = 55$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Note. The values above the diagonal line are from the NC Situation and the values below the diagonal line are from the C Situation.

### **Gender, situation, and perceived power.**

**Between-subjects.** To evaluate whether men and women in the NC-only group or the C-only group differed in terms of their power scores, we conducted five two-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs). The independent variables were group (NC-only and C-only) and gender. The dependent variables were the participants' reported power

relative to their partner on five different measures, ranging from 1 to 7. The results revealed a main effect for gender, such that in both situations men reported being more interested in sex,  $F(1, 73) = 7.768, p < .01$ , and made more of the decisions in sexual situations,  $F(1, 73) = 9.460, p < .01$ , compared with women. There was no significant interaction effect.

***Within-subjects.*** To evaluate whether power scores of participants in the NC/C groups differed when they were in the NC situation compared with when they were in the C situation, we conducted five paired-samples *t* tests. There were no reliable differences.

## **Discussion**

This study explored situations in which men and women wanted to use a condom but their partner refused or complained about using one. Of the participants who had PVI experience, approximately 56% of the men and 59% of the women had been in a situation where they wanted to use a condom but their partner refused or complained about using one. Of those whose partner refused or complained about condom use, 42% convinced their partners to use a condom and ended up having sex with a condom, 19% gave in and ended up having sex without a condom, and the remaining 42% had experienced both results.

One interesting finding was that many men wanted to use a condom, and men were as likely as women to have been in all these situations. This finding contrasts with the stereotype that describes women as pursuers of condom use and men as avoiders. For example, DeBro, Campbell, & Peplau, (1994) investigated college students' perspectives aimed at persuading a partner to use or not to use condoms. They found that both men and women rated strategies aimed at encouraging condom use as more "feminine" and rated strategies aimed at discouraging condom use as more "masculine." Our findings suggest that many men and women want to use condoms during sex.

One explanation for why women and men were equally likely to be in these situations might be changing gender roles in American culture (Woolf & Maisto, 2008). For example, a study conducted in the late 1990s showed that attitudes toward women's roles had become more liberal compared with attitudes in 1970s, and the gap between male and female gender roles had narrowed (Loo & Thorpe, 1998). O'Sullivan and Byers (1993) investigated changing gender roles in the area of sexual desire. They asked college students if "they had been in a situation within the past year in which a female partner desired more intimate level of sexual activity than did her male partner" (p.275), and half of their sample responded affirmatively. Their results pointed to a change in the stereotypes of women who were expected to have less sexual desire than men and who were expected to be followers of desires of men rather than pursuers of desires of their own. Their results document that women have sexual desires and can pursue them rather than only following the desires of men. It may be that, in comparison with previous generations, women are now taking more "active" roles in sexuality and voicing their wishes and expectations more frequently, including rejecting or complaining about condom use. In addition to a possible change in attitudes toward women's roles, studies point to changing attitudes toward men's roles as well. Pitt and Borland (2008) found a relationship between living independently and holding less traditional beliefs about gender roles. Considering that our sample was composed of college students who usually live away from their families, men in our study might have less traditional attitudes about gender roles, thus might be more inclined to pursue using condoms. Moreover, Tiegs, Perrin, Kaly, Heesacker (2007) found that men and women showed more similarities than differences in their beliefs about sex in intimate relationships compared with their beliefs about sex in casual relationships. That is, men and women showed less gender-stereotyped beliefs about sexuality in a romantic relationship. The majority of our sample reported having experienced these situations in the context of a dating relationship, which

may have contributed to lessened gaps between men and women in terms of wanting to use a condom or rejecting to use one.

Another reason men were as likely as women to have been in those situations could be related their concerns about pregnancy. Men might be as concerned as women about pregnancy due to possible negative consequences such as 18 years of child support payments. Men might be concerned about pregnancy due to possible negative consequences for them and/or for their partners. For example, an unplanned pregnancy that results in being a mother at a young age might interfere with the educational and career goals of the woman.

Although the men in our study reported wanting to use a condom, their definition of “wanting” might be different than that of the women. Peterson and Muehlenhard (2007) pointed out that previous research on sexual experiences has conceptualized “wanting” as unidimensional and dichotomous where the person was considered as either wanting or not wanting a sexual experience. They criticized this model because it does not allow for ambivalence. They conceptualized wanting as multidimensional and argued that individuals can both want and not want a given sexual experience. In our study, significantly more men than women reported being happy when their partner complained about or rejected condom use, suggesting that many of them were ambivalent about condom use; that is, they had reasons for both wanting and for not wanting to use condoms. For example, in the C situation more women than men reported that they did not have reasons for not wanting to use a condom, whereas more men than women reported not wanting to use a condom because they feel more pleasure without one. Therefore, men may want to use a condom to protect from pregnancy or STIs but simultaneously not want to use one because sex is then more pleasurable. Consequently, even though both men and women reported wanting to use a condom, men might be more ambivalent in comparison with women.

One source of men's ambivalence may be their reasons for wanting to use condoms. In our study, 65% of both men and women reported wanting to use condoms to prevent pregnancy, but only 29% of men and 24% of women reported wanting protection from STIs. Previous researchers have reported finding that both girls and boys rated the chances of pregnancy to be higher than the chances of getting an STI (Widdice & Halpern-Felsher, 2006). Considering that only women get pregnant, men might think that if their partner does not insist on using a condom, then she must have already taken measures to prevent pregnancy. For that reason, men might be more likely to respond positively to their partner's rejection of condoms. In fact, 50% of the men who reported being happy in response to their partner's rejection of condoms mentioned the use of another birth control method by their partners. For example, one man wrote, "My partner the complained about the condom hurting about half way through intercourse so it was removed. It didn't seem like a problem at the time, she was on birth control and we had been dating for 8 months" (M-555).

Relatedly, the majority of both men and women reported that they experienced these situations with their boyfriends or girlfriends. This finding is partially consistent with previous research indicating lower levels of condom use in dating relationships compared with casual ones. For example, one study using a nationwide sample found that condom use was not related to having a previous or current partner with an STI, but was related to the length of the relationship. That is, participants in long-term relationships used condoms less frequently in the past month whether or not they had a previous or current partner with an STI (Man, Deeter, Benton, Evans, & Burroughs, 2003). In the present study, one of the reasons participants' partners complained about or rejected condom use might be because the majority were in dating relationships. Despite this, however, more than half of our participants (68.8 %) who were in dating relationship and whose partners complained about or rejected condom use ended up using a condom. Although being in a long-term relationship

may be associated with lower levels of condom use in many couples, it is not the case for all couples. In future research, it might be useful to investigate the dyadic factors that act as barriers to or promote condom use.

We hypothesized perceived power in relationships to either facilitate or inhibit condom use when a partner rejects using a condom. We conceptualized power as a relative interest and control over decision making in both sexual and nonsexual situations. Our study failed to find any differences between those in C-only group and NC-only group in terms of the perceived power scores. One possible explanation is the low variability in participants' scores. In each situation, the modal response for all items, except for one (decision making in nonsexual situations in NC-only group), was 4 (7-point scale), suggesting that our participants perceived their partners as being equally interested in or as having equal control over decision making. This might also be related to a change in traditional gender roles where men and women believe they have equal power in their relationship or in their sexual relations as suggested above. This might also be related to a change in the traditional gender roles. The new construction of gender roles might suggest that women and men have equal power in their relationship or in their sexual relations as suggested above.

If it was not power, what factors did influence participants' condom use? One salient factor may have been whether or not alcohol was involved. In comparison with participants in NC-only group, participants in the C-only group were more likely to report not drinking at the time of the situation. When asked about the effects of having used alcohol or drugs, one woman in NC-only group wrote "alcohol, it made me not care as much" (W-131), and one man wrote, "increased desire, lessened worries" (M-506). This finding is compatible with previous research that points out the relation between higher rates on alcohol consumption and risky sexual behaviors. For example, the Keiser Family Foundation (2002) conducted a national survey with 998 young individuals (15-24 years old) on their attitudes and

experiences with substance use and sexual activity. Half of their sample reported drinking or taking drugs before having sex “a lot,” and 73% reported thinking that their peers did not use condoms when they consumed alcohol or use drugs.

Another factor that might have affected participants’ condom use was their attitudes toward condoms. Participants in the NC-only group were more likely to have been ambivalent about condom use than those in the C-only group. More than three fourths of the participants in the C-only group reported having no reasons for not wanting to use a condom compared with less than one third of the NC-only group. Significantly more participants in NC-only group than the C-only group reported that they didn’t want to use a condom because sex is more pleasurable without one. Additionally, participants in the NC-only group reported mixed feelings significantly more often than those in C-only group. Participants in the NC-only group also were more likely to be anxious than those in the C-only group; however, they reported feeling more physical pleasure as well. Consistent with these results, MacDonald and Hynie (2008) found a relation between ambivalence and decreased condom use. They found that “participants who were ambivalent about sexual activity were more likely to engage in unplanned sexual activity than were participants who were not ambivalent” (p. 1101) and that unplanned sexual activity was associated with decreased condom use. It could be that the NC-only group’s ambivalence contributed to their not using condoms. Of the participants whose narratives clearly stated whether or not a condom had been present in the situation, most (59%) of those in the NC-only group said that no condom had been present. It may be that because participants in NC-only group were more ambivalent about condom use, they were less likely to plan on using them and to have them available. MacDonald and Hynie (2008) also suggested that ambivalence can “increase the likelihood that attitudes will polarize in response to salient cues in the environment” (p. 1093). This might explain why participants in the C-only group went to buy condoms when they did not have one, whereas

participants in NC-only group didn't. Perhaps because those in the NC-only group were ambivalent about condom use, they used the cues in the environment, which in this case was absence of condoms, to reach a decision about how to solve their ambivalence.

What reasons did the participants provide for proceeding with sexual intercourse without a condom when they wanted to use one? Wanting to have sex was the modal reason reported by both men and women. Wright (1998) stated that the trend in safe-sex research, especially research dominated by the health belief model, is to assume that sex is a *rational* process where there is a clear causal relation between information and the end behavior. However, he suggested that “when one is wanting to have sex, the ability to make reasoned decisions is only *one* of various influences on a person's behavior, and often not the primary one” (p. 10). Therefore, as stated by Gavey and McPhillips (1999), being in the pressure of a stimulating sexual moment might prevent individuals from acting in “rational” ways. For example, one man in our study wrote, “It was 3 weeks after she started the pill, and she really wanted to try without a condom. I was uncomfortable with it, but horny, so I went along” (M-641). The second most commonly reported reason was the use of another type of birth control by either the participants or their partners. This goes hand-in-hand with participants' reports that they wanted to use a condom for pregnancy related reasons. Because participants wanted to use condoms mainly for pregnancy prevention when they or their partners were using another type of birth control, their fear of pregnancy is likely to reduce greatly. This can be a facilitating factor in their rejection. Other participants reported “giving in” because they get more pleasure without a condom. The relationship between perceiving condoms as barriers to pleasure and their reduced use has been shown consistently by previous research (e.g., Viseer & Smith, 2001). Some other responses were related to their partners. For example, some women reported that they gave in because they loved their partner. Although the connection between loving their partner and giving in was not clear from the analyses of the narratives, it

might be due to women's wish to avoid negative consequences in their relationships. Consistent with this possibility, Afifi (1999) found that when people have high desire for relationship maintenance, they are less likely to use condoms if they believe that suggesting their use will have negative consequences for the relationship. Research has shown that people usually associate condom use in an intimate relationship with violation of trust. Proposing or insisting on using a condom "can imply that one is oneself, or (more likely) that one thinks one's partner might be, bisexual, promiscuous, an intra-venous drug user, the previous partner of any of these people or a carrier of some STD other than HIV" (Wight, 1992, p.12). Therefore, the women in our study might have feared being perceived as "promiscuous," "unfaithful," or "suspicious" if they insisted on condom use. Additionally, some other participants reported that they gave in because they wanted to please their partner. Although there is little research on consenting to not using a condom when people want to use one, previous research on unwanted consensual sex suggests the partner's satisfaction is one of the main reasons people consent (O'Sullivan & Allgeier, 1998).

When their partners rejected or complained about using a condom, some participants convinced their partners to use a condom. When asked what they thought helped to convince their partners, almost half of the women reported telling their partners that they wouldn't have sex unless they used a condom. DeBro et al. (1994) also found withholding sex to be the main strategy used by the women in their study. Gavey and McPhillips (1999) suggested that withholding sex unless a condom is used requires women to have two contradictory embodiments of femininity: One is the traditional gatekeeper, and the other is the strong and assertive femininity who can openly voice her requirements for sex (1999). Although the present participants found withholding sex to be a useful strategy, Gavey and McPhillips (1999) proposed that it also can be paralyzing for women at certain times due to its pressure on women to embody contradicting styles and to its disregard for the men's contribution to

sexual situations. Men, though significantly less than women, also used the “no condom, no sex” strategy. The second most commonly reported response by women was simply telling their partner that they wanted to use a condom. This finding is important in its illustration of the value of women’s assertively voicing their wishes in a direct way. The second most frequent response that men reported was talking to their partners and reported by significantly more men than women.. It is not surprising that both men and women in the C situation found verbally expressing their expectations to use a condom to be an effective strategy considering that verbal and direct approaches to be more effective in influencing partners to use a condom (Lam, Mak, Lindsay, & Russell, 2004).

### **Social Implications**

One of the social implications of the current study is that public health campaigns that specifically address women should also focus on men (Hynie & Lydon, 1995). Considering that many men expressed ambivalence regarding condoms, more emphasis should be placed on resolving their ambivalence and enhancing their motivation to use condoms. In the current study, preventing pregnancy was the most reported reason for wanting to use a condom. However, condoms are the primary means of STI prevention, and even though pregnancy can be prevented using other means, STIs cannot. Besides, considering the fact that pregnancy is mainly a concern for women, focusing primarily on pregnancy prevention in health campaigns may not really attract men but instead can increase their unwillingness by placing the motive by the women. Therefore, health campaigns that emphasize STI prevention as well as pregnancy prevention would be more effective in enhancing the motivation of men.

Another factor that may have contributed to the greater ambivalence of men regarding condom use might be the perception of condoms as barriers to physical pleasure. More men than women in the condom situation reported that they didn’t want to use a condom because they felt more pleasure without one. Additionally, men who wanted to use condoms but

ended up not using them reported more frequently that they felt physically good compared with women who were in the same situation. Therefore, safe sex campaigns should promote condoms more positively by combining safety and pleasure (Brown & Minichiello, 1994). Condoms should be associated with fun sex rather than just responsibility in order to increase men's motivation to use condoms.

Relatedly, in the current study "wanting to have sex" was the modal response given by both men and women for proceeding to have sexual intercourse without a condom. Thus, the perception of condoms as barriers to sex should be transformed. They should be promoted as a part of the sexual flow rather than an additional factor that may kill the excitement

Availability of condoms is another important factor. Significantly more individuals in the no condom situation reported that they did not have a condom compared with those in the condom situation. Therefore, easy access to condoms should be promoted and individuals, especially sexually active young adults, should be encouraged to carry condoms with them at all times.

### **Limitations of the Current Study and Suggestions For Future Research**

One of the limitations of the current study is that the sample was primarily White, heterosexual college students. Thus, our results may not generalize to other populations. The norms regarding condom use, the power dynamics in relationship, and the expectations of how men and women should behave in sexual relationships might be different in samples of individuals who are non-White, homosexual, or not students. For example, the majority of our sample used a direct verbal style of communication regarding their wish to use a condom. Communication styles in sexual situations might be different for individuals from different ethnic or cultural groups. It would be intriguing to investigate the similar topic with diverse populations. The majority of our sample reported having experienced these situations in dating relationships. More research investigating the reasons for giving in to sexual

intercourse without condom in different relational contexts such as marriages or hook-ups is also needed.

Another limitation of the current study involves the measures used to assess perceived power. As mentioned before, even though the items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale, the modal response for the majority of the items were 4. Thus, many of the participants reported that they and their partners were equally interested in maintaining their relationship or had equal power in making decisions in their relationship. Therefore, use of different measures of perceived power in the relationship might be necessary to evaluate its effect on the negotiation of condom use.

### **Summary**

The men and women in the present sample were equally likely to report experiencing situations where they wanted to use a condom and their partner didn't. Contrary to stereotypical expectations, men can be pursuers of condom use, whereas women can be resistant to it. This study highlighted some of the factors that might influence whether individuals will end up using a condom or not when their partners complain about or reject using one. Unavailability of condoms and being intoxicated were found to be associated with not using a condom even though individuals wanted to use one. Use of another birth control method, wanting to have sex, and not wanting to interrupt the moment were the most commonly reported reasons given by the participants about why they gave in to sexual intercourse without a condom. Emphasizing STI prevention in addition to pregnancy prevention and presenting condoms more positively might be more effective in enhancing individuals' motivation to use condoms more frequently.

## References

- Afifi, W. A. (1999). Harming the one we love: relational attachment and perceived consequences as predictors of safe-sex behavior. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 198-206.
- Catania, J. A., Canchola, J., Binson, D., Dolcini, M. M., Paul, J. P., Fisher, L., et al. (2001). National trends in condom use among at-risk heterosexuals in the United States. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 27*, 176-182.
- Catania, J. A., Coates, T. J., Stall, R., Turner, H., Peterson, J. Hearst, N., et al. (1992). Prevalence of AIDS-related risk factors and condom use in United States. *Science, 258*, 1101-1106.
- Center for Disease Control Prevention (2006). HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report, 2006, (18). Atlanta: U.S.
- DeVisser, R. O. & Smith, A. M. A. (2001). Inconsistent users of condoms: A challenge to traditional models of health behavior. *Psychology, Health, & Medicine, 6*, 41-46.
- Dove, D. C., Rosengard, C., Morrow, K., & Stein, M. D. (2006). Understanding reasons for condom-use among adolescents based on sexual frequency: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 38*, 93-164.
- Gavey, N., & McPhillips, K. (1999). Subject to romance: heterosexual passivity as an obstacle to women initiating condom use. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 349-367.
- Gielen, A. C., McDonnell, K. A., & O'Campo, P. J. (2002). Intimate partner violence, HIV status, and sexual risk reduction. *AIDS and Behavior, 6*, 107-116(10).
- Greene, K., & Faulkner, S. L. (2005). Gender, belief in the sexual double standard, and sexual talk in heterosexual dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 53*, 239-251.

- Gupta, G. R. (1998). Claiming the future. *The Progress of Nations* (pp. 20-27). Retrieved October 10, 2009, from <http://www.unicef.org/pon98>
- Henwood, K., & Pidgeon, N. (2006). Grounded theory. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J.A. Smith (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 342-364). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heterosexual transmission of HIV-29 states, 1999-2002. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 2004, 53 (6). Retrieved April 26, 2009, from <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr>
- 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.
- Junichi, T., & Ikuo, D. (2005). Examination of self-presentation motives in close relationships with opposite-sex partners. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 13-24.
- Katz, B. P., Fortenberry, J. D., Zimet, G. D., Blythe, M. J., & Orr, D. P. (2000). Partner-specific relationship characteristics and condom use among young people with sexually transmitted diseases. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 37, 69-75.
- Lam, A. G., Mak, A., Lindsay, P. D., & Russell, S. T. (2004). What really works? An exploratory study of condom negotiation strategies. *Aids Education and Prevention*, 16, 160-171.
- Leary, M. R., Tchividjian, L. R., & Kraxberger, B. E. (1999). Self-presentation can be hazardous to your health: Impression management and health risk. In R. F. Baumesiter (Ed.), *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp.182-194). Philadelphia, Taylor and Francis Group.

- Logan, T. K., Cole, J., & Leukefeld, C. (2002). Women, sex, and HIV: Social and contextual factors, meta-analysis of published interventions, and implications for practice and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 851-885.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (1998). Attitudes toward women's roles in society: A replication after 20 years. *Sex Roles*, *39*, 903-912.
- Man, C. Y., Deeter, R. G., Benton, M., & Burroughs, S. M. (2003). Low condom use among sexually active adults in the United States [abstract L-1076]. *Proceedings of the 43rd Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy; Chicago (IL)*. Retrieved October 10, 2009, from <http://gateway.nlm.nih.gov/MeetingAbstracts/ma?f=102266304.html>
- Murstein, B. I., & Mercy, T. (1994). Sex, drugs, relationships, contraception, and fears of disease on a college campus over 17 years. *Adolescence*, *29*, 303-322.
- O' Sullivan, L. F., & Byers, E. S. (1993). Eroding stereotypes: college women's attempts to influence reluctant male sexual partners. *Journal of Sex Research*, *30*, 270-282.
- O'Sullivan, L. F., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). Feigning social desire: Consenting to unwanted sexual activity in heterosexual dating relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *35*, 234-243.
- Pitt, R. N. & Borland, E. (2008). Bachelorhood and men's attitudes about gender roles. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *16*, 140-158.
- Shlay, J. C., McClung, M. W., Patnaik, J. L., & Douglas, J. M. Jr. (2004). Comparison of sexually transmitted disease prevalence by reported level of condom use among patients attending an urban sexually transmitted disease clinic. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, *31*, 154-160.
- Simon, R. W. (1995). Gender, multiple roles, role meaning, and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *36*, 182-194.

- Smith, L. A. (2003). Partner influence on noncondom use: Gender and ethnic differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 346-350.
- Sprecher, S., Schmeeckle, M., & Felmlee, D. (2006). The principle of least interest: Inequality in emotional involvement in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*, 1255-1280.
- Tiegs, T. J., Perrin, P. B., Kay, P. W., & Heesacker, M. (2007). My place or yours? An inductive approach to sexuality and gender role conformity. *Sex Roles, 56*, 449-456.
- The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (2002). *Substance abuse and risky behavior: attitudes and practices among adolescents and young adults. Survey Snapshot*. Retrieved October 20, 2009, from <http://www.kff.org/youthhivstds/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=14907>
- Tortu, S., McMahon, J., Hamid, R., & Neaigus, A. (2000). Drug-using women's sexual risk: An event analysis. *AIDS and Behavior, 4*, 329-340.
- Turner, H. A., & Turner, R. J. (1999). Gender, social status, and emotional reliance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 40*, 360-373.
- Warren, C. W., Santelli, J. S., Everett, S. A., Kann, L., Collins, J. L., Cassell, C., et al. (1998). Sexual behavior among U.S. high school students, 1990-1995. *Family Planning Perspectives, 30*, 170-172&200.
- Weinstock, H., Berman, S., & Cates, W. (2004). Sexually transmitted diseases among American youth. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 36*, 6-10.
- Widdice, L. E. & Halpern, B. L. (2006). Do teens care more about STI/HVI? *Journal of Adolescent Health, 38*, 93-164.
- Wight, D. (1992). Impediments to safer heterosexual sex: A review of research with young people. *AIDS Care, 4*, 1-24.

- Wingwood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (1997). The effects of an abusive primary partner on the condom use and sexual negotiation practices of African-American women. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*, 1016-1018.
- Woolf, S. E., & Maisto, S. A. (2008). Gender differences in condom use behavior? The roles of power and partner-type. *Sex Roles, 58*, 689-701.
- World Health Organization (2001). Sexually Transmitted Infections: Briefing Kit for Teachers. Retrieved December 15, 2008, from [http://www.wpro.who.int/internet/resources.ashx/HSI/docs/STI\\_Briefing\\_Kit\\_for\\_Teachers\\_2001.pdf](http://www.wpro.who.int/internet/resources.ashx/HSI/docs/STI_Briefing_Kit_for_Teachers_2001.pdf)
- Wright, M. T. (1988). Beyond Risk Factors: Trends in European safer sex research. In M. T. Wright, B. R. S. Rosser, & O. deZwart (Eds.). *New International Directions in HIV Prevention for Gay and Bisexual Men* (pp. 7-18). Binghamton, New York: Haworth Press.

APPENDIX A : Questionnaire

Do not put your name or KU ID on this questionnaire

Gender: \_\_\_Female \_\_\_Male

Age \_\_\_\_\_

**Race/Ethnicity: (check one)**

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

**Sexual orientation: (check one)**

- \_\_\_ Heterosexual (straight)
- \_\_\_ Homosexual (gay/lesbian)
- \_\_\_ Bisexual
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Has your sexual behavior been: (check one)**

- \_\_\_ Only with males
- \_\_\_ Mostly with males
- \_\_\_ Equally with males and females
- \_\_\_ Mostly with females
- \_\_\_ Only with females
- \_\_\_ Not applicable/no sexual experience
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

We would like to understand your experience(s) with sexual intercourse and/or condom use. In this questionnaire, sexual intercourse refers to penile-vaginal sex.

1. **Have you ever engaged in sexual intercourse (penile-vaginal sex)?** Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
  
2. **With how many partners have you engaged in sexual intercourse?** \_\_\_\_\_
  - If you cannot recall the exact number, please estimate it.
  - If you have not had sexual intercourse, write N/A for not applicable.
  
3. **How old were you when you first had sexual intercourse?** \_\_\_\_\_
  - If you cannot recall the exact age, please estimate it.
  - If you have not had sexual intercourse, write N/A for not applicable.

4. **Of all the times that you have engaged in sexual intercourse, how often have you used a condom?** (Check the box that best represents your answer)

N/A	0%	1-10%	10-40%	40-60%	60-90%	90-99%	100%
no sexual intercourse	never	rarely	less than half the time	about half the time	more than half the time	almost every time	every time

5. If you have used a condom sometimes but not every time, what has influenced whether or not you used a condom? Please explain.

- If you have not had sexual intercourse, write N/A for not applicable.

6. In your longest sexual relationship, has there been a change in whether or not you used condoms? Please explain.

- If you have not had sexual intercourse, write N/A for not applicable.

Next, complete the four short questionnaires:

If you have been in *some but not all* of the four situations, first do the questionnaires about the situations you have been in. Then do the rest.

If you have been in *all or none* of the four situations, do the questionnaires in any order.

### Situation A

Have you ever been in a situation where

- you and your partner were both willing to have sexual intercourse, and
- you wanted to use a condom, but your partner refused or complained about using a condom, and
- you had sexual intercourse without a condom?

\_\_\_\_\_ I have been in this situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation. If you have been in this situation more than once, choose the time that stands out most in your mind.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation or anything close to this.

DIRECTIONS: Make up a situation like this using characters named "Jane" and "David." Then answer the questions writing about Jane and David. The purpose is to protect everyone's privacy by assuring that everyone is writing, regardless of their experience.

### Questions

1) Describe the situation in detail; what happened in the situation?

2) How long had you known your partner (at the time)?

3) What was your relationship with him/her?

4) Prior to that situation, about how many times, if any, had you engaged in sexual intercourse with that person? \_\_\_\_\_

5) How long had you been having sexual intercourse with that person (at the time)?

6) What were your reasons for being willing to have sexual intercourse?

7) Even though you were willing to have sexual intercourse, did you have any reasons for not wanting to have sexual intercourse?

8) What were your reasons for wanting to use a condom?

9) Even though you wanted to use a condom, did you have any reasons for not wanting to use a condom?

10) How did you let your partner know that you wanted to use a condom?

11) What made you think that your partner did not want to use a condom?

12) What, if anything, did your partner do or say to get you to have sexual intercourse without a condom?

3) What was your response to what your partner did or said?

14) What were your reasons for going ahead with sexual intercourse without the condom?

15) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation at the time?

16) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation later?

17) What do you think would have happened if you had insisted on using a condom?

18) Had you been using alcohol and/or drugs at the time? If so, what effect (if any) do you think it had?



27) If you have been in another situation besides this one, please answer the following questions by circling Yes or No. If you have not been in the situations stated below, circle N/A for not applicable.

a- Was your partner in this situation the same person as in Situation B (sex with a condom)?

Yes    No    N/A

b- Was your partner in this situation the same person as in Situation C (no sexual intercourse)?

Yes    No    N/A

c- Was your partner in this situation the same person as in Situation D (not bringing it up)?

Yes    No    N/A

28) Is there anything else you want to add that might help us to understand the situation better?

### **Situation B**

Have you ever been in a situation where

- you and your partner were both willing to have sexual intercourse, and
- you wanted to use a condom but your partner refused or complained about using a condom, and
- you had sexual intercourse with a condom?

\_\_\_\_\_ I have been in this situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation. If you have been in this situation more than once, choose the time that stands out most in your mind.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation or anything close to this.

DIRECTIONS: Make up a situation like this using characters named "Jane" and "David." Then answer the questions writing about Jane and David. The purpose is to protect everyone's privacy by assuring that everyone is writing, regardless of their experience.

### **Questions**

1) Describe the situation in detail; what happened in the situation?

2) How long had you known your partner (at the time)?

3) What was your relationship with him/her?

4) Prior to that situation about how many times, if any, had you engaged in sexual intercourse with that person? \_\_\_\_\_

5) How long had you been having sexual intercourse with that person (at the time)?

6) What were your reasons for being willing to have sexual intercourse?

7) Even though you were willing to have sexual intercourse, did you have any reasons for not wanting to have sexual intercourse?

8) What were your reasons for wanting to use a condom?

9) Even though you wanted to use a condom, did you have any reasons for not wanting to use a condom?

10) How did you let your partner know that you wanted to use a condom?

11) What made you think that your partner did not want to use a condom?

12) What do you think was effective in convincing your partner to use a condom?

13) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation at the time?

14) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation later?

15) Had you been using alcohol and/or drugs at the time? If so, what effect (if any) do you think it had?

16) Had your partner been using alcohol and/or drugs at the time? If so, what effect (if any) do you think it had?

17) Were you or your partner using any form of birth control or protection other than condoms at that time?

No     Yes     Don't remember     Don't Know

If yes, what were you or your partner using? \_\_\_\_\_

18) Prior to that situation, of all the times you engaged in sexual intercourse with that person, how often had you used a condom? (Check the box that best represents your answer)

N/A	0%	1-10%	10-40%	40-60%	60-90%	90-99%	100%
no prior sexual intercourse	never	rarely	less than half the time	about half of the time	more than half the time	almost every time	every time



25) Just to clarify, please check the most accurate item:

The situation that you just described

- is real and happened to you \_\_\_\_\_
- is real and happened to someone you know \_\_\_\_\_
- is hypothetical/fictional that you just made up \_\_\_\_\_

### Situation C

Have you ever been in a situation where

- you and your partner were both willing to have sexual intercourse, and
- you wanted to use a condom but your partner refused or complained about using a condom, and
- as a result you did not have sexual intercourse?

\_\_\_\_\_ I have been in this situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation. If you have been in this situation more than once, choose the time that stands out most in your mind.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation or anything close to this.

DIRECTIONS: Make up a situation like this using characters named "Jane" and "David." Then answer the questions writing about Jane and David. The purpose is to protect everyone's privacy by assuring that everyone is writing, regardless of their experience.

### Questions

1) Describe the situation in detail; what happened in the situation?

2) How long had you known your partner (at the time)?

3) What was your relationship with him/her?

4) Prior to that situation about how many times, if any, had you engaged in sexual intercourse with that person? \_\_\_\_\_

5) How long had you been having sexual intercourse with that person (at the time)?

6) What were your reasons for being willing to have sexual intercourse?

7) Even though you were willing to have sexual intercourse, did you have any reasons for not wanting to have sexual intercourse?

8) What were your reasons for wanting to use a condom?

9) Even though you wanted to use a condom, did you have any reasons for not wanting to use a condom?

10) How did you let your partner know that you wanted to use a condom?

11) What made you think that your partner did not want to use a condom?

12) What, if anything, did your partner do or say to try to get you to have sexual intercourse?

13) What were your reasons for not having sexual intercourse?

14) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation at the time?

15) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation later?

16) Had you been using alcohol and/or drugs at the time? If so, what effect (if any) do you think it had?

17) Had your partner been using alcohol and/or drugs at the time? If so, what effect (if any) do you think it had?

18) Were you or your partner using any form of birth control or protection other than condoms at that time?

No       Yes       Don't remember       Don't Know

If yes, what were you or your partner using? \_\_\_\_\_



26) Is there anything else you want to add that might help us to understand the situation better?

27) Just to clarify, please check the most accurate item:

The situation that you just described

- is real and happened to you \_\_\_\_\_
- is real and happened to someone you know \_\_\_\_\_
- is hypothetical/fictional that you just made up \_\_\_\_\_

### Situation D

Have you ever been in a situation where

- you and your partner were both willing to have sexual intercourse, and
- you wanted to use a condom but did not bring up your wish to do so because you were not comfortable raising the issue, and
- you had sexual intercourse without a condom?

\_\_\_\_\_ I have been in this situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation. If you had been in this situation more than once, choose the time that stands out most in your mind.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation, but I have been in a similar situation.

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions thinking about that situation.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have never been in this situation or anything close to this.

DIRECTIONS: Make up a situation like this using characters named "Jane" and "David." Then answer the questions writing about Jane and David. The purpose is to protect everyone's privacy by assuring that everyone is writing, regardless of their experience.

### Questions

1) Describe the situation in detail; what happened in the situation?

2) How long had you known your partner (at the time)?

3) What was your relationship with him/her?

4) Prior to that situation about how many times, if any, had you engaged in sexual intercourse with that person? \_\_\_\_\_

5) How long had you been having sexual intercourse with that person (at the time)?

6) What were your reasons for being willing to have sexual intercourse?

7) Even though you were willing to have sexual intercourse, did you have any reasons for not wanting to have sexual intercourse?

8) What were your reasons for wanting to use a condom?

9) Even though you wanted to use a condom, did you have any reasons for not wanting to use a condom?

10) What were your reasons for not bringing up the issue that you wanted to use a condom?

11) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation at the time?

12) What were your feelings and thoughts about the situation later?





## Appendix B: Consent Form

Information Sheet

**Approved by the Human Subjects Committee University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus (HSCL). Approval expires one year from 4/25/2008**

**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 to 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 what happens if one partner wants to use a condom and the other does not.

**PROCEDURES 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 students' behaviors and attitudes about condoms.

**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 Basak Efe, Professor Charlene Muehlenhard, and Professor Muehlenhard's students to better understand the reasons for condom non-use.

**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 [dhann@ku.edu](mailto:dhann@ku.edu) or [mdenning@ku.edu](mailto:mdenning@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

Basak Efe, M.A.  
Principal Investigator  
Clinical Psychology Graduate Student  
[basakefe@ku.edu](mailto:basakefe@ku.edu)

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

## Appendix C: Debriefing Form

### Debriefing Form

The goal of this study is to better understand what happens if one partner wants to use a condom and the other does not. In general, condom use is the most preferred method to protect against sexually transmitted infections. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors contributing to the use of condoms.

There is evidence that some people feel comfortable asking a sexual partner to use a condom, but others do not feel comfortable. Some people—both women and men—have reported going along with sex without a condom, even though they would have preferred to use one. Researchers know some things about such incidents, but there is still much that needs to be investigated.

In this study, we asked participants if they have been in situations in which they and their partners were both willing to have sex, and in which they wanted to use a condom but their partner did not want to. We asked about four situations:

- situations in which they ended up having sexual intercourse without a condom
- situations in which they ended up having sexual intercourse with a condom
- situations in which they ended up not having sexual intercourse
- situations in which they never brought up their wish to use a condom

We asked about all four situations because we think that the dynamics of these situations are likely to differ.

We will analyze the percentages of men and women who have experienced each of these situations. We will also analyze self-, partner-, and context-related factors in the decision making process of whether or not to use a condom. We will compare characteristics of these different situations to gain insights into participants' thoughts and feelings about these situations.

**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:

Basak Efe  
Email: [basakefe@ku.edu](mailto:basakefe@ku.edu)

The faculty advisor for this study:

Charlene Muehlenhard, Ph.D.  
Phone: (785) 864-9860  
Email: [charlene@ku.edu](mailto: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, for any concern, free: (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](mailto:dhann@ku.edu), or Mary Denning, [maryad@ku.edu](mailto:maryad@ku.edu)

## OVERVIEW

All four short questionnaires ask if you have been in a situation in which

- you were willing to engage in sexual intercourse, AND
- you wanted to use a condom.

The four short questionnaires ask about four versions of this situation:  
They ask about situations in which ...

- ... you did not feel comfortable enough to bring up the issue of using a condom.
- ... your partner refused or complained about using a condom, and you had sex without a condom.
- ... your partner refused or complained about using a condom, but you had sex with a condom.
- ... your partner refused or complained about using a condom, as a result you did not have sex.

If you have been in *some* but not all of the situations, first do the questionnaires about the situations you have been in; then do the rest.

If you have been in *all* or *none* of these situations, do the questionnaires in any order.

In this study, “sex” or “sexual intercourse” refers to penile vaginal intercourse.