

THE DATING GAME: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN DATING SCRIPTS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Angela M. Bartoli
Department of Psychology
Shippensburg University
Shippensburg, PA 17257
(ambart@ship.edu)

M. Diane Clark
Gallaudet University

Prior studies found that men's and women's dating expectations include many similar activities. Here, two studies are reported focusing on activities included in scripts for a "typical date" using first a more qualitative method and then a more quantitative method. Results were highly consistent across method, showing many similarities across the three dating scenes presented (initiation/meeting, date activities, and date outcomes/conclusions). Consistent with the traditional view of dating, greater expectations for sexual activities on a date were found for men while expectations for limiting of sexual activities were found to be the responsibility of women. These findings were further explored to focus on the effects of prior sexual experience, college experience, and membership in a Greek social organization in Study 2. Clear differences are found with sexual experience and Greek membership across the three dating scenes. It is especially notable that membership in Greek organizations for men created dating scripts that were discrepant with both those of younger men as well as younger and older women regardless of Greek status. Understanding these differences in expectations becomes critical when older men date younger women, an event fairly typical in colleges and universities.

Simon and Gagnon (1986) proposed that in society there are cultural scenarios that guide "collective life." One type of scripted

Sexuality & Culture, Fall 2006, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 54–80.

cultural event is dating. Scripts relating to a date include role differentiation that is frequently gender-based. In dating, the man is typically described as the initiator of the date, the planner, and the economic provider while the woman is seen as the emotional facilitator (Levinger, 1982). Additionally, expectations regarding sexual interaction on a date include the notions that men are expected to initiate sexual interactions in contrast to women who are expected to limit sexual interactions (Korman & Leslie, 1982; LaPlante, 1980; McCormick, 1987). Most psychological research interested in dating has focused on the topic of if and how these roles play out in the dating process. Research has examined expectations for a first date, (Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993), a typical date, a bad date (Alksnis, Desmarais, & Wood, 1996) and a sexual assault in dating (Abbey, 1991; Muehlenhard, 1988).

Prior research investigated scripts for a hypothetical "first date" and for an "actual first date" by asking men and women to list activities related to five components: initiating a date, meeting for a date, engaging in date activities, ending a date, and concluding a date (Laner & Ventrone, 1998; Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993). The resulting scripts reflected traditional gender role expectations of an active man and a reactive woman. Women's and men's scripts included many overlapping activities, leading the researchers to conclude that their participants were "quite knowledgeable about opposite gender scripts" (Rose & Frieze, 1989: 265).

Important unanswered questions remain about dating from prior work. Many of the traditional dating roles have not been explicitly investigated. For example, relationship development, often seen as a gender-specific role for women, and sexual initiation, often seen as a gender-specific role for men have not been consistently examined in prior research. These activities were not listed in the first Rose and Frieze study (1989) but relationship development and sexual initiation were included in their later study (Rose & Frieze, 1993) when first-year students described an "actual" first date. This study found that both first-year women and men included "ask for another date" but only first-year men listed "initiate sexual contact." Later work by Laner and Ventrone (1998) had some hints of these activities, finding an expectation for sexual

contact and some listing of relationship development (“setting up another date”) reported by a group whose mean age was higher than that of the group in the Rose and Frieze work. Follow-up work by Laner and Ventrone (2000) found both men and women viewed men as the initiator of sexual contact. This later Laner and Ventrone work, unlike the Rose and Frieze work, included participants that were upperclassmen.

These traditional roles of sexual initiation, sexual limiting, and relationship development need to be examined further due to the critical implications that these activities have for dating outcomes. Research has not investigated the developmental changes related to leaving home and becoming independent, often achieved by entering a new culture such as college. It becomes important to evaluate whether college men and women enter the dating situation with the same set of expectations and whether or not the timing of expected date activities are synchronous. Finally, it would be expected that other factors besides gender shape these dating expectations. For example, what impact does achieved roles (such as college, sports, and social organizations) play in the development of dating expectations?

In the current article, Study 1 extends earlier work (Laner & Ventrone, 1998, 2000; Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993) by looking at men’s and women’s dating scripts for a “typical date.” As in the previous research, the respondents were given dating scenes and were asked to report what activities and events usually occurred in these scenes on a typical date. Additionally, both first-year and third-/fourth-year students were recruited to begin an investigation of the developmental course of dating scripts.

The influence of alcohol-related contexts on dating was also examined. Prior research has shown that when individuals are drinking, they are perceived to behave more sexually (Abbey, 2000). Abbey and Harnish (1995) found that drinking among mixed-sex dyads was perceived to be appropriate and that this situation was perceived as sexually charged. The most popular place to meet potential dating partners in college is at parties where alcohol consumption is encouraged (Abbey & Harnish). Therefore, because alcohol-related contexts appear to be strongly asso-

ciated with dating and sexuality for college students, activities that typically occur in these contexts were evaluated within dating scripts.

Several hypotheses were tested in Study 1. (1) Women were expected to: (a) include more references to relationship development and (b) include more references to limiting sexual advances. (2) Men were expected to include more references to sexual activities (including petting and sexual intercourse) than women. (3) Third- and fourth-year students were expected to include more sexual events. (4) Grade year by sex differences were predicted to occur for the expectation of sexual activities (e.g., older men were expected to include more sexual activities). (5) Expectations of sexual activity were predicted to occur in both the date activity and outcome scenes for men. (6) Third-/fourth-year students were expected to include more alcohol-related contexts for their activities.

Study 1

Method

Participants. A sample of 80 traditional-aged college students were included in this study: 20 first-year men (mean age, 18.4), 20 first-year women (mean age, 18.3), 20 third-/fourth-year men (mean age, 21.2), and 20 third-/fourth-year women (mean age, 21.0). Participants were explicitly selected to exclude second-year students as a pilot study had found that these students neither clearly demonstrated the characteristics of first-year students nor of third—and fourth-year students; rather their standard deviations were high obscuring results when compared with either the first-year or the older students. All students were of European American descent and attended a small regional public university in south central Pennsylvania.

As men are underrepresented in psychology classes, a convenience sample was recruited to obtain a more valid cross-section of students. First-year students were recruited from campus dormitories and third-/fourth-year students were recruited from the student union.

Materials. Participants were provided with three “dating scenes” and were instructed to list the activities or events that would occur during each of the three scenes or “parts of a typical date.” This three-scene script was used rather than the five-scene script used in earlier work. This change was based on pilot work where the participants often listed the same activities in the initiation and meeting scenes as well as in the outcome and conclusions scenes. Many of those in the pilot study specifically asked how the aforementioned scenes differed and some drew lines indicating that an activity that was part of initiation also belonged in the meeting scene and so forth. Scenes were described as follows: (a) initiation and meeting, “how does the couple get to know each other?” and “how does the date start?”; (b) date activities; “what would the couple do on the date?”; (c) date outcomes and conclusions; “what happens after the date activities?” and “how does the date end?” Space was allowed under each scene to record activities and/or events. To ensure anonymity on part of all respondents, all participants returned surveys to the psychology office.

Data Coding. Research assistants transcribed all listed activities onto a master sheet for each scene within each participant group. Two assistants transcribed each script. Each activity listed by a participant counted as a dating activity. Three types of responses were collapsed. A shared-interests category was created in both the initiation/meeting scene (i.e., meeting while engaged in a common activity such as a university club) and the activity scene (ice-skating or bowling). In the initiation/meeting scene, activities that included meeting at a public place were collapsed and included such activities as meet in a class, at church, or through mutual friends. In the outcomes/conclusions scene, all sexually related activities that were more than kissing and less than sexual intercourse were collapsed into the description of “petting.” These activities included both explicit, “lower body petting with/without clothes on” to more implicit items, “cuddle” and/or “kiss and more.” Inter-rater reliability for these collapsed items was 100.

Results

Dating Scripts

Overall, participants listed a total of 155 different activities. Those activities recorded by more than 20% of the participants in a group were included as part of the typical dating script. While prior research (Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993) used a criterion of 25% for inclusion of activities into their scripts, the present authors used a 20% criterion for inclusion as the groups of this study were broken down into four categories (two age categories within each gender). Thus, the scripts of first-year women, first-year men, third-/fourth-year women, and third-/fourth-year men were summed across the four participant groups into dating scripts listing those activities meeting the 20% requirement. Mann-Whitney U analyses were used to evaluate differences between sex (women versus men), grade year (first-year versus third-/fourth-year), and the differences of sex by grade year for each activity that obtained the 20% criteria for inclusion in the dating script. Using a Bonferroni correction to control for family-wise error, the alpha level was set at $p = .002$.

First-Year Women's Dating Scripts. The overall script included 18 activities. The initiation/meeting scene included seven activities while the dating activity scene included four activities. Their outcomes/conclusion scene included seven activities (see Table 1 for complete data).

First-Year Men's Dating Scripts. The overall script included 15 activities (see Table 1). Their initiation/meeting scene included six activities and the dating activity scene included three activities. Six scenes were included in the outcomes/conclusions scene.

Third-Fourth-Year Women's Dating Scripts. The overall script included 23 activities (see Table 1). Older college women's initiation/meeting scene included seven activities. Their dating activity scene included seven events. The final outcomes/conclusions scene included nine activities.

Table 1
Study 1—Scripted Events for a Typical Date

First Year Women's Dating Scripts	First Year Men's Dating Scripts
INITIATION	INITIATION
Talking (18)	Talking (15)
Meeting in Public (13)	Meeting in Public (5)
Shared Interest (12)	Shared Interest (11)
Meeting in Group (10)	Man Picks up Date (15)
Man Picks up Date (13)	Call (5)
Meet in a Common Place (9)	Casual Interaction (11)
Casual Interaction (8)	
ACTIVITIES	ACTIVITIES
Movies (18)	Movies (14)
Dinner (19)	Dinner (12)
Talking (4)	Shared Interest (12)
Shared Interest (10)	
OUTCOMES	OUTCOMES
Talking (13)	Talking (4)
Watching TV (4)	Go Back to the House (9)
Go Back to the House (8)	Kiss Goodnight (18)
Kiss Goodnight (17)	Go Home (9)
Go Home (10)	Relationship Development (14)
Relationship Development (10)	Take Date Home (14)
Take Date Home (8)	

(continued)

Third-/Fourth-Year Men's Dating Scripts. The overall script included 21 activities (see Table 1). The older college men had six types of activities in their initiation/meeting scene. Their dating activity scene included five activities while the final outcomes/conclusion scene included 10 activities.

Comparison of Sex, Grade Year, and Sex by Grade Year Differences.

As expected, many similarities were found across the three scenes elicited for a typical date (see Table 1 to view all responses). A total of seven significant differences were found. As may be seen by viewing Table 2, Hypothesis 1 concerning relationship

Table 1 (Continued)

3 rd /4 th Year Women's Dating Scripts	3 rd /4 th Year Men's Dating Scripts
INITIATION	INITIATION
Talking (17)	Talking (10)
Meeting in Public (5)	Meeting in Public (12)
Shared Interest (8)	Man Picks up Date (13)
Man Picks up Date (15)	Meet at a Common Place (8)
Meet at a Common Place (6)	Casual Interaction (7)
Casual Interactions (7)	Meet at a Bar/Party (9)
Meet at a Bar/Party (12)	
ACTIVITIES	ACTIVITIES
Movie (17)	Movie (12)
Dinner (19)	Dinner (14)
Talking (4)	Go to a Party (9)
Getting to Know Each Other (4)	Shared Interest (9)
Go to a Party (7)	Sexual Intercourse (6)
Shared Interest (7)	Dance (4)
OUTCOMES	OUTCOMES
Talking (6)	Talking (5)
Go Back to House (6)	Go Back to House (7)
Kiss Goodnight (16)	Kiss Goodnight (9)
Go Home (13)	Go Home (10)
Relationship Development (7)	Relationship Development (10)
Take Date Home (10)	Take Date Home (9)
Petting (6)	Petting (7)
Sex Limited by Woman (6)	Sex Limited by Woman (7)
Sexual Intercourse (9)	Sexual Intercourse (13)
	Negative Outcome of Date (8)

development and references to women limiting sexual advances was not supported as there were no significant differences in the frequency with which these themes were reported across groups. Hypothesis 2 was also not supported in that men were not found to have higher expectations for sexual intercourse than women. Grade year differences were found for sexual activities with third and fourth year students listing these activities (sexual intercourse and petting) more than first year students thereby supporting Hypothesis 3 but Hypothesis 4 was not supported as there were no

Table 2
Mann-Whitney U Results Comparing Themes for
Sex, Year in College, and their Interaction

Activity	Mann-Whitney U–Significance (2-tailed)	
Sex		
Activity—Dinner	560.00	$p = .001$
First-Year versus Third/Fourth Year		
Initiation—Shared Interest	500.00	$p = .001$
Initiation—Meet at Bar/Party	380.00	$p = .000$
Activity—Party	480.00	$p = .000$
Outcome—Petting	540.00	$p = .000$
Outcome—Sexual Limiting by Woman	540.00	$p = .000$
Outcome—Sexual Intercourse	360.00	$p = .000$

significant differences between sex and grade year for sexual activities. Hypothesis 5 showed no significant differences with the strict criteria used to control for family-wise error. Trends can be seen in the data as men did include sexual intercourse in the activity scene and it was only older men who listed this activity in the earlier activity scene rather than in the outcome scene where it was listed by both older women and men ($p = .01$). Older students reported alcohol-related contexts significantly more than did younger students, which supported Hypothesis 6.

Discussion

As in prior studies (Laner & Ventrone, 1998, 2000; Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993), considerable overlap was obtained between women and men for dating expectations within each scene. Many of these activities are highly scripted within the popular culture, such as picking up the woman, going to a movie or dinner and taking the woman home with a kiss goodnight. These highly scripted activities were included across both sexes and grade year groups. In spite of these similarities, both sex and grade year differences were found in these dating scripts.

Results found that younger students' scripts included fewer overall themes: first-year women included 18 while older women

had 23 themes; first-year men's scripts included 15 themes while the older men listed 21 themes. Given the strict criteria set to control for family-wise error, no significant differences were found across sex except for the activity of going to dinner, where more women listed this activity than did men. Trends can be seen in that women focused more on how a date started (talking ($p = .01$) or shared interest ($p = .04$) were more likely to occur for women) or what activity was the focus on the date (talking ($p = .003$), dancing ($p = .04$), or getting to know each other ($p = .04$)) than did men. For men these trends occurred in the outcome scene where sexual intercourse ($p = .01$) and a negative outcome ($p = .003$) to the date were noted more often than in the women's scripts.

When focusing on year in college two major differences were found in the scripts. First was that alcohol-related contexts (meeting at a bar or party and going to a party as the date activity) occurred in the older students' but not the younger students' scripts. This expectation becomes potentially problematic, as in American society alcohol and sexuality are frequently linked (Abbey, 1991; Abbey & Harnish, 1995) and a double standard for alcohol consumption exists. Men consumers are viewed more positively while women consumers are viewed more negatively. In addition, when women are drinking they are perceived as being more sexually promiscuous (Crowe & George, 1989; George, Gournic, & McAfee, 1988) and at the same time men and women who drink together are perceived as having greater sexual intent (Abbey, 1991; Corcoran & Thomas, 1991). Additionally, past research found that on dates where alcohol was consumed the probability increased for the date to end in acquaintance sexual assault (Abbey, 2002).

The second group of significant grade year differences focused on sexual activity. Older students' scripts included sexually implicit (petting) and explicit (sexual intercourse) themes while their first year counterparts' scripts did not include sexual expectations. Given that first-year students were significantly less likely to include sexual activities in their scripts suggests that college experience increases ones' expectations regarding sexual play as part of a typical date.

Additionally, sexual limit setting was found to be significantly different in that older students, both women and men, listed this theme but it was not included in the first-year students' scripts. In addition, this sexual limiting was expected only of women. This finding is in contrast to the belief that dating scripts have become more egalitarian and rather supports the traditional cultural lore that women are to limit sexual activity while men are to initiate it (Korman & Leslie, 1982; Laner & Ventrone, 1998, 2000; LaPlante, 1980; Levinger, 1983; McCormick, 1987).

Unlike previous studies (Laner & Ventrone, 1998, 2000; Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993) here older students listed expectations for negative dating outcomes. Examples included "the door slams shut and hits her on the ass on the way out," "blah, is that what you look like? Turn the lights back off," "slap in the face," and "if lots of money was spent, the male drops off the female. If not, he boots her out and begins drinking with roommates." For older women, these responses were only reported in 15% of the questionnaires and included such comments as, "he kisses her and promises to call—not." These types of responses only reached criterion for third-/fourth-year men.

In summary, expectations of sexual intercourse on a typical date increased during the college years. When evaluating sexual intercourse, the overlap that occurred for all sexual expectations was more grade-year specific than sex specific with first-year students expecting no sexual activity in contrast to fairly high levels for third-/fourth-year students. Past research (Laner & Ventrone, 2000; Rose & Frieze 1989, 1993) concluded that both sexes understood the other's dating scripts. Missing from these analyses was the effect of college experience on these expectations. The results of Study 1 suggest that first-year students do not expect to either initiate or limit sexual activities in contrast to older students who expect both types of activities. This difference would not be problematic if all students dated similar-aged peers but may become so when younger women date older men.

Study 1 included only 20 members in the four groups which may limit the generalizability of these findings. In addition, the study did not evaluate the sexual experience of the participants.

Therefore, it is impossible to untangle the effects of increased experience within the college culture from the individual's own sexual experience. Another confound was that third-/fourth-year participants included both members and non-members of Greek social organizations. As noted in Nurius et al. (1996b), Greek men's scripts—especially when drinking—were found to be more sexualized. Given the mix of older participants in Study 1, it is possible that the Greek participants inflated some of the effects found for older men especially concerning higher expectations for sexual activities. Finally, methodologically—just as in Rose and Frieze (1989, 1993)—Study 1 used an open-ended format. Perhaps when explicitly asked to list activities, some activities might be seen as less common for a “typical date” or simply might be forgotten. In order to evaluate these types of confounds, a second study was designed to include these variables.

Study 2

Study 2 moved to a quantitative analysis of these scripts and included not only year in college but individual sexual experience. Personal sexual experience may contribute to the expectation of sexual activity as a part of a typical date. Study 1 found that older students were more likely to include sexual events within their dating scripts but the reason for this increase in sexual activities could not be accurately described from the earlier results. Two possible mechanisms may be operating—the effects of becoming more independent as a result of attending college as well as a more individual change in that older students may be more likely to have more personal sexual experiences. These two types of changes were addressed in Study 2.

Additionally, the effects of Greek membership were investigated as membership in Greek social organizations has been shown to promote more traditional gender role expectations in dating and greater expectations of sexual interaction when compared to their non-Greek peers (Nurius, Norris, & Dimeff, 1996a). Fraternity parties that are typically characterized by the large amount of alcohol consumed may also influence this interaction between

Greek social organizations and higher sexual expectations. These high levels of alcohol consumption have been found to lead the drinker to a greater expectation of sexual receptivity from women (Norris & Cubbins, 1992). Greek membership is therefore relevant to the expectations of and perceptions about dating.

To evaluate possible effects related to methodology, a Dating Questionnaire with a Likert scale format was used in Study 2. Laner and Ventrone (1998) used this methodology. The current study incorporated items from the dating scripts of Study 1 in order to check their generalizability. To balance these items, atypical events were also included to determine if individuals would reject possible activities that were not reported with a high probability in earlier work. These events were elicited by generating events not included in earlier scripts from research assistants who were undergraduate students.

Study Hypotheses. Three hypotheses were included in this study. The first hypothesis was that being more sexually experienced would lead to higher expectations for sexual activities in dating scripts, regardless of college experience. The second hypothesis was that membership within a Greek organization would increase (2a) interest in alcohol-related contexts and sexual activities within dating scripts with (2b) this increase expected to be higher for male than female Greek members. The final hypothesis was that the dating scripts from Study 1 would generalize across methods.

Method

Participants. Traditional aged college students were included in the six groups recruited for the study: 34 first-year men (mean age 18.5), 48 first-year women (mean age 18.2), 38 third-/fourth-year men (mean age 22.1), 30 third-/fourth-year women (mean age 21.3), 19 Greek men (mean age 22.3), and 13 Greek women (mean age 21.4). All students were of European American descent and attended the same small university as in Study 1. First-year students were recruited from psychology classes, third-/fourth-year students were recruited from psychology classes and

criminal justice classes. The Greek men and women were recruited from their fraternities or sororities. The Dean of Students office staff member responsible for oversight of Greek organizations recruited their members by requesting support for the project at a weekly Pan-Hellenic meeting attended by presidents of all Greek organizations.

Materials. Participants were provided with the Dating Questionnaire that included three “dating scenes for a typical date.” Within each scene, there was a list of activities or events to be rated as to whether or not they were likely to occur during that scene (e.g., meet through friends, go out to dinner, kiss goodnight). Filler items were events that were reported as, and later rated as not, being part of a typical date. These events were embedded within each scene to avoid a positive response bias. Participants were asked to respond on an 8-point Likert scale (0–7) as to the likelihood of the various listed activities/events occurring during that scene of the date.

Procedures. Members of an undergraduate research class distributed questionnaires. One student was of African/European American descent and all others were of European American descent. Confidentiality was maintained by having the non-Greek students return their surveys to the psychology office—no names or other identifying information appeared on the surveys. Greek participants who chose to complete the survey returned it to their president who then returned them during a later Pan-Hellenic meeting.

Data Scoring. Sexual experience was determined to be high if the participant reported sexual intercourse with more than five people in the past five years and low if reporting sexual intercourse with fewer than three people in that time. These cut points were determined by finding the median number of partners and selecting scores one standard deviation above or below this point as either highly sexually experienced or having low sexual experiences. Fifty-eight participants scored high in sexual experience

and 92 scored low in sexual experience. Additionally, scores for each date activity within the three dating scenes were summed for each participant group and reported as group averages (data can be seen in the Appendix).

Results

Between subject MANOVAs were performed for each of the three dating scenes (initiation, date activities, and outcomes). The between factors were Sex (women versus men), grade year (first—versus third-/fourth-year), Greek (Greek versus non-Greek), and sexual experience (low versus high). Given the large number of dependent measures, a conservative probability was used to control for family-wise error and therefore the significance level in this study was set at $p < .001$. Additional follow-up one-way ANOVAs were performed to clarify non-significant MANOVA differences when sex was used as a status variable rather than an independent measure. (Subject variables such as sex, race, and sexual orientation can be characterized as either independent variables or status variables.)

Similarities in Dating Scripts across Participant Groups

Considerable overlap was found in dating expectations within all three dating scenes across the participant groupings. For the initiation scene of the date—meeting in class, through mutual friends, through casual interactions, at a mutually agreed upon place, calling, talking, and engaging in common activities (either in public or in groups) were the most highly rated date initiation activities. Meeting through a computer dating service, at weddings, in church, and or at a class reunion were rated as unlikely. Many expectations for dating activities overlapped between the sexes as well as with grade year and experience. These likely activities included going to the movies, a bar, a party, a sports events, eating, talking, dancing, watching TV, going on walks, and drinking. Themes for common dating outcomes included goodnight kiss, hug, invite in for a drink/talk, set up another date, and take

date home. Unlikely outcomes themes were similar for most groups including go home separately, ditch date, leave without date, never see again, and handshake.

Differences in Dating Scripts across Participant Groups

Differences among the groups occurred in five areas; negative date outcomes, sexual limiting, alcohol-related contexts, sexual intercourse, and non-intercourse sexual activities. In addition, one group seemed to differ on the outcomes of “ditch date” and never seeing the date again. When the data was collapsed into a Sex by Greek comparison (collapsing across sexual experience and grade year), the expectation of ditching a date while low for all participants was significantly higher for Sex ($F(1,150) = 4.788, MS = 10.90, p < .03$: men $M = 1.32, SD = 1.72$; women $M = .97, SD = 1.38$) and for Greeks ($F(1, 150) = 3.992, MS = 9.09, p < .04$: non-Greek $M = .98, SD = 1.35$; Greek $M = 1.72, SD = 2.08$). These main effects may be interpreted in terms of the significant Sex by Greek interaction, $F(1,150) = 4.83, MS = 11.02, p < .02$ (non-Greek men $M = .98, SD = .21$; Greek men $M = 2.26, SD = .35$: non-Greek women $M = .99, SD = .19$; Greek women $M = .92, SD = .42$). A significant Sex by Greek interaction was also obtained for never seeing the date again, $F(1, 150) = 4.782, MS = 11.53, p < .03$ (non-Greek men $M = 1.91, SD = .21$; Greek men $M = 2.53, SD = .36$: non-Greek women $M = 2.14, SD = .19$; Greek women $M = 1.39, SD = .43$). The other major differences are now presented below.

Sexual Limiting. Only sexual experience appeared as a significant main effect for sexual limiting by the woman, with sexually experienced students ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.80$) more than sexually inexperienced students ($M = 3.76, SD = 2.27$) expecting women to engage in sexual limiting, $F(1, 150) = 10.84, MS = 48.09$.

Alcohol-Related Contexts. As expected there were alcohol-related context differences in both the initiation and the date activity scenes. In the initiation scene, sexual experience ($F(1,150) =$

13.271, $MS = 8.281$) and grade year ($F(1,150) = 10.395$, $MS = 45.32$, $p < .002$) were significant when considering meeting at a bar/party. Third-/fourth-year students ($M = 5.19$; $SD = 1.73$) were more likely than first-year students ($M = 4.09$; $SD = 2.34$) to select a bar/party as a meeting place. In addition, students reporting high levels of sexual experience ($M = 5.37$; $SD = 1.95$) were more likely than less sexually experienced students to meet at a bar/party ($M = 4.10$; $SD = 2.14$). Greek students ($M = 5.56$; $SD = 1.61$) also were more likely than non-Greek students ($M = 4.32$; $SD = 2.21$) to meet at a bar/party, $F(1, 150) = 8.865$, $MS = 39.027$, $p < .003$).

Some activities in the date activity scene differed on the basis of Sex, Greek affiliation, grade year, and sexual experience. Drinking as a dating activity was expected more by men ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 2.17$) than women ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 3.27$; $F(1, 150) = 8.482$, $MS = 44.10$, $p < .004$), and more by Greeks ($M = 4.88$, $SD = .76$) than non-Greeks ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 2.38$; $F(1, 150) = 10.765$, $MS = 55.176$). Both older students and more highly sexual experienced students also were more likely to report drinking as a date activity ($F_s(1, 150) = 15.50$, $MS = 77.14$ and 20.84 , $MS = 100.42$: first-year students ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 2.48$) and third-/fourth year students ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 1.89$); experienced ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 2.13$) and inexperienced students ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 2.23$).

Sexual Intercourse. MANOVA main effects for sexual intercourse as both an activity and as an outcome were obtained for Sex and sexual experience. As may be seen from the means in the Appendix, sexual intercourse was more frequently cited as both a dating activity ($F(1,150) = 28.74$, $MS = 82.73$) and as an outcome ($F(1,150) = 30.75$, $MS = 81.41$) by men than by women. More highly experienced participants also were more likely to report sexual intercourse as both an activity ($F(1,150) = 24.99$, $MS = 71.92$) and an outcome ($F(1, 150) = 21.93$, $MS = 58.05$).

Next one-way ANOVAs were performed to evaluate the effects of grade year and Greek status, separately by sex, for sexual intercourse as both a date activity and an outcome. Significant one-

way effects for grade year were found for men on both themes ((intercourse as a date activity for men— $F(1,70) = 12.47$, $MS = 54.52$; M first-year = 2.44, $SD = 2.00$; M third-/fourth-year = 4.18, $SD = 2.17$) (intercourse as an outcome for men— $F(1,70) = 20.29$, $MS = 73.23$; M first-year = 2.06, $SD = 1.67$; M third-/fourth-year = 4.08, $SD = 2.08$)). Significant one-way effects were found for Greek versus non-Greek men on both activities ((intercourse as a date activity— $F(1,70) = 11.97$, $MS = 52.66$; M Greek = 4.79, $SD = 2.18$; M non-Greek = 2.85, $SD = 2.07$) (intercourse as an outcome— $F(1,70) = 15.34$, $MS = 58.59$; M Greek = 4.63, $SD = 1.89$; M non-Greek = 2.58, $SD = 1.98$)). These effects were not found to be significantly different for women.

Non-Intercourse Sexual Activities. Significant main MANOVA effects for Sex were found for all four non-intercourse sexual activities in the date activity scene. As seen in Table 3, men had higher expectations for non-intercourse sexual activities than women. One-way ANOVAs were performed to evaluate the effects of Greek status, grade year, and sexual experience separately by Sex for non-intercourse sexual activity as a date activity. In terms of Greek status, Greek men were significantly more likely to expect upper body petting without clothes as well as both types of lower body petting (see Table 3). Significant effects also were found for third-/fourth-year men and more sexually experienced men on all four types of non-intercourse sexual activities.

Regarding the non-intercourse sexual activities in the outcome scene, MANOVAs found that men expected more of these activities than did women. One additional MANOVA effect was that more experienced participants expected upper body petting without clothes. More specifically, ANOVAs found that Greek men, third-/fourth-year men, and more sexually experienced men expected more non-intercourse sexual activity on a “typical” date. With respect to sexual experience, women high in sexual experience expected upper and lower body petting without clothes (see Table 3).

Table 3
Significant MANOVA and ANOVA Effects Related to Non-Sexual Intercourse
Sexual Activities in the Date Activities and Date Outcomes Scenes ($p < .001$)

Activity	<i>F</i>	<i>MS</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Mean (<i>SD</i>)
Date Activity Scene MANOVAs				
Sex $df(1,150)$				
UB Pet w/c	13.53	48.52	Men 5.0(1.7)	Wm 3.6(2.1)
UB Pet wo/c	18.53	68.04	Men 4.2(2.0)	Wm 3.2(2.2)
LB Pet w/c	24.54	84.87	Men 4.2(1.9)	Wm 3.3(2.8)
LB Pet wo/c	27.38	87.17	Men 3.6(2.2)	Wm 2.5(2.2)
Date Activity Scene ANOVAs Split by Participant Sex				
Greek (men) $df(1,70)$				
UB Pet wo/c	7.03	19.53	Greek 5.3(1.6)	nonGreek 3.8(2.0)
LB Pet w/c	8.39	30.25	Greek 5.5(1.1)	nonGreek 3.8(1.9)
LB Pet wo/c	10.86	46.09	Greek 4.9(1.8)	nonGreek 3.1(2.1)
Grade year (men) $df(1,70)$				
UB Pet w/c	15.04	37.83	$3/4$ yr 5.7(1.3)	1st yr 4.2(1.9)
UB Pet wo/c	9.97	35.22	$3/4$ yr 4.8(1.8)	1st yr 3.4(1.9)
LB Pet w/c	12.33	39.30	$3/4$ yr 4.9(1.7)	1st yr 3.4(1.9)
LB Pet wo/c	11.78	49.41	$3/4$ yr 4.4(2.2)	1st yr 2.7(1.8)
Sexual Experience (men) $df(1,70)$				
UB Pet w/c	11.12	29.33	hi ex 5.7(1.5)	lo ex 4.4(1.7)
UB Pet wo/c	11.60	40.20	hi ex 5.0(1.9)	lo ex 3.5(1.8)
LB Pet w/c	21.80	62.33	hi ex 5.2(1.6)	lo ex 3.3(1.8)
LB Pet wo/c	18.96	73.12	hi ex 4.7(2.1)	lo ex 2.7(1.9)
Outcome Scene MANOVAs				
Sex $df(1,150)$				
UB Pet w/c	9.15	35.34	men 4.6(1.9)	wm 3.4(2.2)
UB Pet wo/c	15.35	54.85	men 3.9(2.0)	wm 2.1(2.1)
LB Pet w/c	16.28	58.78	men 4.0(2.0)	wm 2.4(2.1)
LB Pet wo/c	24.53	72.15	men 3.4(2.0)	wm 1.5(1.8)
Sexual Experience $df(1,150)$				
UB Pet wo/c	7.68	27.46	hi ex 4.1(2.1)	lo ex 2.2(2.0)
Outcome Scene ANOVAs Split by Participant Sex				
Greek men $df(1,70)$				
UB Pet wo/c	8.37	29.68	Greek 5.0(1.8)	nonGreek 3.5(1.9)
LB Pet w/c	11.52	40.28	Greek 5.3(1.5)	nonGreek 3.6(2.0)
LB Pet wo/c	12.81	46.69	Greek 4.8(1.9)	nonGreek 2.7(1.9)
Grade year men $df(1,70)$				
UB Pet w/c	11.47	34.21	$3/4$ yr 5.3(1.5)	1st yr 3.9(2.0)
UB Pet wo/c	12.79	42.91	$3/4$ yr 4.6(1.7)	1st yr 3.1(1.9)
LB Pet w/c	11.12	39.05	$3/4$ yr 4.7(1.7)	1st yr 3.2(2.1)
LB Pet wo/c	16.46	57.46	$3/4$ yr 4.3(1.9)	1st yr 2.5(1.8)

(continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

Activity	<i>F</i>	<i>MS</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Mean (<i>SD</i>)
Sexual Experience men <i>df</i> (1,70)				
UB Pet w/c	11.95	35.45	hi ex 5.4(1.5)	lo ex 3.9(1.9)
UB Pet wo/c	17.05	54.42	hi ex 4.8(1.7)	lo ex 3.1(1.9)
LB Pet w/c	22.94	70.34	hi ex 5.1(1.5)	lo ex 3.1(2.0)
LB Pet wo/c	20.30	67.83	hi ex 4.5(1.8)	lo ex 2.5(1.9)
Sexual Experience women <i>df</i> (1,76)				
UB Pet wo/c	10.76	43.13	hi ex 3.2(2.2)	lo ex 1.6(1.9)
LB Pet wo/c	7.78	22.44	hi ex 2.3(2.0)	lo ex 1.1(1.6)

KEY:

Pet Petting

UB Upper Body

LB Lower Body

w/c with clothes on

wo/c without clothes on

Discussion

All three Study 2 hypotheses were confirmed: sexual experience predicted high expectations for sexual activity on a typical date regardless of year in college; Greek students endorsed more alcohol-related contexts, alcohol consumption, and sexual activities than did non-Greek students and these effects were higher for Greek men than women; and the quantitative methodology of this study confirmed the findings of Study 1, thereby increasing the generalizability of the findings. These findings help triangulate earlier results and support the findings that men have higher expectations for sexual activity than women and that this effect increases with experience.

Study 2 set out to clarify whether experience was more related to the independence associated with college life or individual sexual experiences. Findings support that the most important component of this “experience” was greater individual sexual experience. Sexually experienced participants were more likely to expect sexual intercourse and other sexual activities on a “typical date.” The proportion of sexually experienced first-year men and women was approximately equal whereas by the third-/fourth-year, men were more experienced than were women and Greek men were

more experienced than non-Greek men. Additional investigation of these findings will help to clarify whether it is joining a social fraternity itself that increases this expectation for sexual activities on a date or more individual sexual experiences.

Another effect of experience was that sexual intercourse was expected earlier in the dating script—as a dating activity—for third-/fourth-year men (especially Greek men) and those with more sexual experience. As in Study 1, third-/fourth-year women expected sexual activity to occur later, during the outcome/conclusion scenes of the date. It seems that the focus of some older male students is on sex as a dating activity whereas the focus for older female students is on sex as a dating outcome.

Another important rationale behind Study 2 was to understand how the Greek experience impacted dating scripts. Results are consistent with prior research and showed that Greeks endorsed sexual activity significantly more than non-Greeks. These findings are qualified in that it appears that Greek women do not endorse these items at a significantly higher level than non-Greek women. These findings support the conclusions of Nurius et al., (1996b) where it seems that Greek men, even those without personal sexual experience, have a greater expectation of sexual activity as part of the “typical date.”

Consistent with the Nurius et al. (1996b) findings that Greek women have low expectations of sexual activity on a date in a familiar Greek sponsored activity, we found that Greek women had lower expectations of having to limit sexual behavior than did non-Greek women. Therefore, even though sexual limiting was found to be part of the woman’s role, it seems that experience impacts this role. Younger, less sexually experienced women even when explicitly provided with sexual limiting as a dating activity did not perceive their role to be that of sexual limiter. The Greek women did not follow this pattern and future research should look at what factors reduce their expectations regarding sexual limiting. The mean age of these Greek women suggests that they are older students but it is possible that the group includes younger students who shift the mean for this item. A larger sample size of Greek women would help to uncover more about these effects.

In conclusion, similarities in dating scripts of men and women were expected and found for all dating scenes of a “typical date.” While confirming evidence was found for considerable overlap in dating expectations in the two studies, Study 2 helps to clarify alcohol-related items as these items were more directly investigated here. Third-/fourth-year students, students with greater sexual experience and Greek students expected to meet at a bar/party. Drinking as a dating activity was also more expected among men, older students, more sexually experienced students, and Greek men.

General Discussion

When engaged in a “typical” dating scenario, young men and women seem to be operating on the basis of similar expectations regarding much of the date (many initiation activities, dating activities, and outcomes). In Study 1, only one sex differences were found among the themes when one looked within grade year. Both studies suggest that with greater immersion into the university culture, students’ dating scripts become more like those cited by McCormick (1987). The current studies and those of Rose and Frieze (1989; 1993) and Laner and Ventrone (1998, 2000) found a stronger emphasis on traditional gender roles with increased dating experience. Further, as suggested by Nurius et al (1996b), the male Greek subculture seems to most reflect the more traditional gender role scripts for dating where men initiate date activities and women monitor and limit sexual activities.

The greater expectation of sexually related behaviors among more sexually experienced individuals, especially among Greek men, differs from the expectations for these activities by younger women and men with less previous sexual experience. While Study 1 found that third-/fourth-year students had greater expectations of sex, Study 2—when looking specifically at sexual experience found that this variable overrode effects of grade year and sex. This finding is qualified in that proportionally more men than women were sexually experienced at the upper grade levels. Interestingly Greek men, with or without high levels of sexual ex-

perience, expected sexual activity to be part of a date. These differences in expectations are important and potentially problematic when older men date younger women, when experienced men date inexperienced women, or when women date fraternity men, all fairly typical situations.

Further, sexual limiting is perceived as a woman's responsibility. Neither men nor women expected that men would engage in sexual limiting on a "typical date." Importantly, those women least likely to expect to limit sexual behaviors were female members of Greek organizations. Moreover, more sexually experienced students who did include sexual activity as an expectation for a typical date, expected women to limit sexual activity on a date. It seems that experience teaches this limiting expectation. Not expecting sexual activities in conjunction with not expecting to have to limit sexual advances may produce a dangerous combination of social ineptitude in many college-dating scenarios and, in particular, the college fraternity party scene.

Several issues limit the generalizability of these studies. In the second study, one sees many significant findings in the MANOVAs/ANOVAs regarding non-sexual intercourse sexual activities which should be further explored. Future research should investigate how these forms of petting are integrated into one's view of dating and how they then seem to cross over into one's view of coercive sex, forced sex, and rape. Finally, Study 2 gives interesting data on how the effect of one's own sexual experience influences dating expectations and additional research would elucidate this effect.

In conclusion as noted by Simon and Gagnon (1986), cultural scenarios guide "collective life." These scripts give insight regarding which roles within a date are shared by both sexes and which roles need to be made more explicit to both. The ascribed roles and the achieved roles of dating converge leading to a complete dating script. These dating scripts guide behaviors on dates and while men and women share much of the script, there are some differences. Differences in sexual expectations were found relating to membership in fraternities, the individual's own sexual experience, and development through the college experience. Sexual

experience seems to fill in the dating scripts of both men and women, moving them into traditional roles where she learns to limit sex and he learns to initiate sex. However, these expectations in combination with alcohol-related contexts (more likely to be part of the scripts of older and Greek students) may lead from something anticipated to be a pleasant experience into a negative experience and maybe even date rape.

Many researchers (e.g., Abbey, 2000; Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Nurius et al., 1996a) have written on issues of sexual aggression between acquaintances and the failure to assess risk within a familiar or expected “safe” context. Our studies take a step back to look more specifically at social expectations in what is inherently viewed as a “safe” context, a date. College-aged students’ dating scripts were found to be consistent across methodologies, whether the script was elicited through more qualitative methods (list what you expect to happen on a date) or through more quantitative methods (how likely are these activities to occur on a date). Future research should connect “typical” dating scripts more closely to problematic outcomes such as acquaintance rape. In addition, this research could be important in the development of classroom-based curricula to prevent relationship violence. Understanding how women and men view the world of dating provides information about how gender is conceptualized and enacted leading to either positive outcomes, such as relationship development, or more negative outcomes, such as “ditch date” or an acquaintance rape.

Appendix

Part Group	1st yr wn		1st yr men		3/4 yr wm LE		3/4 yr wm HE		3/4 yr mn LE		3/4 yr mn HE	
	LE	HE	LE	HE	GLE	NLE	GHE	NHE	GLE	NLE	GHE	NHE
Scenes												
Initiation/Meeting												
Talk	6.37	6.20	6.15	6.57	6.88	5.75	6.40	7.00	6.25	6.00	6.40	5.27
Wedding	1.66	1.60	1.00	0.71	1.88	0.88	0.60	1.56	1.25	1.86	1.27	1.64
Common Interest	5.47	5.30	5.33	5.86	4.50	4.38	5.40	6.00	5.50	4.56	5.07	5.09
Group in Public	5.39	5.60	5.07	5.71	4.50	3.63	6.40	5.44	4.25	5.43	5.07	5.09
Church	2.84	2.20	2.22	0.71	1.50	1.13	0.60	2.11	1.00	1.71	1.40	1.55
Class	4.82	5.50	4.96	4.86	5.00	2.88	4.60	3.44	4.25	3.86	4.13	5.55
Computer Dating	1.29	1.10	0.59	0.71	0.63	0.38	0.20	1.33	0.00	1.00	0.27	0.36
Mutual Friends	5.71	5.60	5.07	5.57	5.00	4.88	6.00	5.56	6.50	5.43	5.40	4.91
Blind Date	2.29	2.10	1.00	1.14	2.25	2.38	2.20	2.22	2.25	1.86	2.00	0.91
Casual Interaction	4.74	4.80	3.93	4.71	5.25	4.25	5.20	4.33	5.50	4.29	5.13	4.82
Agreed upon Place	4.61	4.90	3.22	5.29	3.75	4.88	5.80	4.00	5.75	4.29	4.00	3.82
Bar	2.03	2.40	1.56	1.57	3.13	2.38	3.80	4.56	4.00	3.14	4.07	4.18
Party	4.44	5.30	4.33	4.71	4.88	3.25	5.80	4.22	6.00	4.29	6.00	5.55
Call	4.39	5.00	4.74	5.86	4.88	4.25	5.80	4.33	5.50	4.29	4.87	4.36
Family Members	3.03	2.30	1.81	2.29	2.63	1.38	2.60	1.89	2.75	1.71	2.60	1.64
Female Picks Up	2.68	3.60	2.63	3.43	2.63	3.50	3.60	3.33	3.25	2.43	3.87	3.00
Male Picks Up	5.95	5.80	5.63	5.86	4.63	5.13	6.00	6.11	5.50	4.29	5.60	5.45
Class Reunion	2.42	2.30	1.78	1.29	2.63	2.25	1.60	1.78	1.25	0.86	1.40	1.36
Activities												
Movies	6.11	6.00	5.89	4.29	6.00	5.88	5.40	6.33	5.25	6.00	5.27	6.18
Eat/Dinner	6.32	6.50	5.81	5.43	6.50	6.00	6.00	6.56	6.25	6.00	5.73	5.73
Talk	6.45	6.80	6.52	6.14	6.63	6.13	6.80	6.67	7.00	6.43	6.07	6.09
Bar/Party	3.76	4.90	4.00	5.00	5.38	2.88	6.00	5.78	5.75	5.29	5.47	5.27
Dance	4.37	4.70	3.52	3.57	5.38	2.75	6.00	5.22	2.25	3.14	5.00	4.45
Sexual Intercourse	0.76	2.00	2.15	3.57	0.88	0.63	3.20	2.33	3.75	1.57	5.07	4.64
Watch TV	4.89	4.10	4.74	3.43	3.75	3.13	5.40	4.00	4.75	2.71	3.73	4.82
Walks	5.24	4.80	4.74	3.57	4.38	4.13	5.00	4.89	4.50	3.86	3.87	4.36
Beach	4.32	3.20	3.37	4.43	3.50	2.38	2.80	4.33	3.50	2.14	4.13	4.45
Sporting Events	4.97	3.90	4.85	4.57	4.50	3.88	4.60	4.44	4.00	2.29	4.40	4.64
Wedding	1.92	1.70	1.11	1.00	2.75	1.00	2.20	2.89	1.75	0.86	1.93	2.00
Picnic	3.95	3.70	3.04	2.57	3.63	3.63	3.60	4.22	4.00	2.86	3.80	3.18
Drinking	2.47	4.60	3.15	3.71	4.13	2.13	4.80	3.89	5.25	4.57	5.20	5.64
UB Pet w C	3.37	3.90	4.04	4.86	3.63	3.63	3.80	4.33	5.75	4.86	5.85	5.87
UB Pet w/o C	1.89	3.10	3.37	3.71	2.25	2.25	3.00	3.33	5.00	3.00	5.33	5.18
LB Pet w C	1.92	3.10	3.19	4.43	2.38	2.63	3.07	2.60	5.25	2.86	5.60	5.09
LB Pet w/o C	1.08	2.00	2.67	3.00	1.75	1.25	2.20	2.33	4.25	1.71	5.13	5.00
Outcomes/Conclusions												
Kiss Goodnight	5.74	6.00	5.78	6.43	6.00	5.50	6.40	6.67	6.00	5.14	6.20	5.91
Set up Another Date	5.63	5.80	5.78	5.86	5.63	5.00	6.00	6.56	6.00	4.86	5.67	5.91
Plan See Again	4.97	6.20	5.04	5.57	5.37	5.13	5.60	4.78	4.75	4.00	6.00	5.82
Sexual Intercourse	0.42	2.30	1.89	2.71	0.75	0.38	2.00	2.44	3.50	1.71	4.93	4.55
Sex Lim by Woman	3.79	5.40	4.07	4.43	3.00	2.88	2.00	5.56	5.00	3.57	4.60	6.09
Sex Lim by Man	2.00	2.50	2.70	2.43	0.75	1.50	1.20	2.11	2.00	1.86	2.40	2.18
Neg End to Date	3.18	3.60	2.78	2.57	1.63	2.38	2.20	2.67	2.50	3.71	2.00	2.64
Go Home Separately	3.29	3.20	3.04	2.14	3.75	4.00	4.20	4.11	2.00	4.86	2.47	3.09
Take Date Home	3.58	3.60	5.00	5.86	2.25	2.63	3.00	3.67	5.25	4.00	5.07	5.45
Date Takes Home	5.61	5.60	2.44	4.29	4.63	3.75	4.20	4.11	2.00	2.71	3.87	3.36
UB Pet w C	2.97	3.60	3.70	4.57	3.63	3.02	3.40	4.16	5.00	4.29	5.53	5.64
UB Pet w/o C	1.26	3.20	2.93	3.57	2.37	2.13	2.80	3.33	4.50	2.71	5.07	5.18
LB Pet w C	1.84	3.10	2.96	4.29	2.75	2.50	2.60	3.56	4.75	2.57	5.40	5.09
LB Pet w/o C	0.89	2.00	2.37	3.00	2.25	1.13	2.20	2.67	4.25	2.14	4.93	4.82
Handshake	1.71	1.70	1.04	1.00	1.25	0.63	0.60	1.22	0.75	0.86	0.87	1.45
Hug	4.89	4.80	4.52	4.71	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.11	3.75	4.57	4.07	4.36
Invite in Drink/Talk	4.39	4.40	4.63	5.43	4.88	3.50	5.00	4.11	4.75	4.00	5.27	5.00
Never See Again	2.11	2.30	1.70	2.29	1.38	2.13	1.40	2.11	1.75	2.14	2.73	1.91
Leave without Date	1.50	0.90	1.78	1.43	0.88	1.13	2.20	1.89	2.25	1.57	2.33	1.45
Ditch Date	0.92	0.90	0.63	1.29	0.88	0.88	1.00	1.44	1.25	1.29	2.53	1.18

Notes.

HE High Sexual Experience

LE Low Sexual Experience

Notes

Special thanks to all of the participants who through the 1990s not only provided data but gave us insights into this work. Thanks to the professional staff in the Dean of Students office who helped in recruiting participants as well as to faculty in Criminal Justice who allowed extra credit for participation. This work derives from the authors' philosophy that research is an integral part of an undergraduate education. The initial data came from students in a Human Development course taught by the second author. The line of research continued due to the energy sparked from this project. Therefore, we sincerely thank all of the students who have worked on the various studies that make up this body of research; Tony Amadure, Tammy Bower, Jennifer Gallagher, Faith Herr, Andrea Hollister, Tara Keaffer, Johann Kisamme, Judd Kulas, Heather Reed, Deanna Moser, Jared Riester, and Bernadette Spece. Parts of this paper have been presented at undergraduate research conferences. We would like to thank earlier reviewers for useful suggestions.

References

- Abbey, A. (1991). Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? *Journal of American College Health, 39*, 165–169.
- Abbey, A. (2000). Alcohol's effects on sexual perception. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 61*, 688–697.
- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 14*, 118–128.
- Abbey, A. & Harnish, R.J. (1995). Perceptions of sexual intent: The role of gender, alcohol consumption, and rape supportive attitudes. *Sex Roles, 32*, 297–313.
- Alksnis, C., Desmarais, S., & Wood, E (1996). Gender differences in scripts for different types of dates. *Sex Roles, 34*, 499–509.
- Corcoran, K.J. & Thomas, L.R. (1991). The influence of observed alcohol consumption on perceptions of initiation of sexual activity in a college dating situation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 500–507.
- Crowe, L.C. & George, W.H. (1989). Alcohol and human sexuality: Review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 374–386.
- George, W.H., Gournic, S.J., & McAfee, M.P. (1988). Perceptions of post-drinking female sexuality: Effects of gender, beverage choice, and drink payment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 500–507.
- Korman, S.K., & Leslie, G.R. (1982). The relationship of feminist ideology and date expense sharing to perceptions of sexual aggression. *The Journal of Sex Research, 18*, 114–129.
- Laner, M.R., & Ventrone, N.A. (1998). Egalitarian daters/traditionalist dates. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*, 468–477.

- Laner, M.R., & Ventrone, N.A. (2000). Dating scripts revisited. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 488–500.
- LaPlante, M.N. (1980). Living the sexual script: College students' views of influence in sexual encounters. *Journal of Sex Research, 16*(4), 338–355.
- Levinger, G. (1982, August). *A systems perspective on the development of close relationships*. Presented at the Annual American Psychological Association Meeting, Washington, DC.
- McCormick, N.B. (1987). Sexual scripts: Social and therapeutic implications. *Sexual and Marital Therapy, 2*, 3–27.
- Muehlenhard, C.L. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6*, 20–37.
- Norris, J., & Cubbins, L.A. (1992). Dating, drinking, and rape: Effect of victim's and assailant's alcohol consumption on judgments of their behaviors and traits. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*, 179–191.
- Nurius, P.S., Norris, J., & Dimeff, L.A. (1996a). Through her eyes: Factors affecting women's perception of resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 123–145.
- Nurius, P.S., Norris, J., Dimeff, L.A., & Graham, T.L. (1996b). Expectations regarding acquaintance sexual aggression among sorority and fraternity members. *Sex Roles, 35*, 427–444.
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I.H. (1989). Young singles' scripts for a first date. *Gender and Society, 3*, 258–268.
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I.H. (1993). Young singles' contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles, 28*, 499–509.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J.H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97–120.