



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Token Resistance to Sexual Intercourse and Consent to Unwanted Sexual Intercourse: College Students' Dating Experiences in Three Countries

Author(s): Susan Sprecher, Elaine Hatfield, Anthony Cortese, Elena Potapova and Anna Levitskaya

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (1994), pp. 125-132

Published by: [Taylor & Francis, Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3812753>

Accessed: 08/02/2013 16:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Sex Research*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Token Resistance to Sexual Intercourse and Consent to Unwanted Sexual Intercourse: College Students' Dating Experiences in Three Countries

Susan Sprecher

Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Illinois State University

Elaine Hatfield

Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii

Anthony Cortese

Department of Sociology, Southern Methodist University

Elena Potapova and Anna Levitskaya

Department of Sociology, Vladimir Poly-Technical Institute, Russia

The purposes of this study were to extend the research conducted by Muehlenhard and her colleagues (e.g., Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988) on token resistance to sex and to consider a second form of sexual miscommunication, consent to unwanted sex. We examined the incidence of these forms of sexual miscommunication among both women and men and in three different cultures: the United States, Russia, and Japan. Survey data were collected from 1,519 unmarried college students (970 from the U.S., 327 from Russia, and 222 from Japan). Contrary to the stereotype that only women engage in token resistance to sex, men also reported that they had been in situations in which they had said no to sex while desiring it. In the U.S. only, a greater proportion of men than women have engaged in token resistance to sex. Rates for consent to unwanted sex also varied by gender and culture. American women had the highest rate of consent to unwanted sex. The importance of collecting cross-cultural data on sexuality and intimacy is discussed.

Researchers on premarital sexual attitudes and behavior have generally surveyed young adults from the United States or other modern, Western, industrialized societies (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993). In any study, data have rarely been collected from more than one country. Yet most social scientists agree that cross-cultural research is critically important (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992). This study was conducted to extend research on how likely it is that miscommunication occurs as dating partners express their desire and intent for sexual activity. We examined the incidence of two forms of sexual miscommunication, *token resistance to sex* and *consent to unwanted sex*, among both men and women in three very different cultures: the United States, Russia, and Japan.

Token Resistance to Sex

One form of sexual miscommunication of sexual intent is to say no to sexual intercourse while meaning

yes. A popular stereotype is perpetuated in the media, film, and literature that women resist sex while desiring it. Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988) examined whether there is any empirical support for the common belief that many women "say no to sex even when they mean yes and that their protests are not to be taken seriously" (p. 872). They asked women college students whether they had ever said no to men despite their intention of engaging in sexual intercourse eventually. They found that 39% of women had put up such token resistance and that most of these women reported doing it only once to a few times. In a second study, conducted at a different university, Muehlenhard and McCoy (1991) found a similar incidence of token resistance to sex (37%). There are a number of reasons why women might pretend to be less interested in sexual intercourse than they really are. According to research by Muehlenhard and Hol-

labaugh (1988), women may engage in token resistance to sex for three major reasons: practical reasons (e.g., fear of appearing promiscuous), inhibition-related reasons (e.g., moral concern), and manipulative reasons (e.g., desire to be in control). The tendency to engage in token resistance to sex has been found to be related to several sexual attitudes and beliefs. Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988), for example,

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the National Council of Family Relations Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL, November 1992.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Arthur Aron, Timothy Martin, Kathleen McKinney, and Ken-ichi Ohbuchi for helping to make the data collection possible, to Mark Kaiser and Natalya Kudachkina for back-translating the Russian questionnaire, and Gary Cox and Mark Kaiser for their advice on the Russian translation.

For requests, contact Susan Sprecher at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790-4660, or E-mail SPRECHER@ILSTU.BITNET.

found that women who had at least once said no when meaning yes, compared to women who had not, were more likely to endorse attitudes or beliefs such as romantic relationships are often adversarial, men are entitled to use force to get what they want, women like forceful men, and token resistance is common. In the current research, we investigated the phenomenon of token resistance in men as well as women, and we compared rates of self-reported token resistance in three cultures.

Consent to Unwanted Sex

The type of sexual miscommunication that is just the reverse of token resistance is saying yes when meaning no, which we call *consent to unwanted sex*. This form of sexual miscommunication is important to study because the act of consenting to unwanted sex may, in some cases, be a form of nonviolent sexual coercion. People may say yes to sex when they want to say no for a number of reasons, including verbal pressure from partner, need to conform to peer standards, and desire to maintain the relationship.

Although previous researchers have not published data on this form of sexual miscommunication, they have explored the frequency with which people report engaging in unwanted sexual activity. Researchers have found that such activity is common. Muehlenhard and Cook (1988), for example, found that 46% of women and 63% of men had acquiesced to unwanted sexual intercourse. Muehlenhard and Long (1988) also found that more men (49%) than women (40%) had engaged in unwanted sex. The reasons included enticement, altruism, inexperience, and intoxication.

Cultural Influences on Sexual Miscommunication

Although few researchers conducting social scientific research (e.g., survey studies) have examined cross-cultural differences and

similarities in sexuality, sexual attitudes and practices, such as sexual miscommunication, are likely to vary cross-culturally. Researchers have compared two or more cultures on such issues as premarital sexual attitudes (Foa et al., 1987; LaBeff & Dodder, 1982), desire for chastity in a marriage partner (Buss, 1989), and reactions to first intercourse (Schwartz, I., 1993). In most of these studies, cross-cultural variation has been found.

Anthropologists (e.g., Ford & Beach, 1951; Gregersen, 1986) have long noted that societies vary in the degree to which they are sexually restrictive vs. sexually permissive. Sexual values at the cultural level are supported by institutions, such as schools, family, and religion, which in turn are related to the sexual attitudes and norms held by groups and individuals within the society (DeLamater, 1989). Individuals from different cultures experience different socialization practices, which contribute to different sexual attitudes and activities and different degrees of gender equality. In societies in which men have more institutional power than women, there is generally greater restraint on female sexuality than on male sexuality, creating a double standard (Reiss, 1989).

Cultural variation in socialization practices related to sexual permissiveness and gender equality in sexuality is likely to be related to values of collectivism and individualism (Dion & Dion, 1988; Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, in press; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). Individualistic societies tend to emphasize "rights over duties, personal autonomy, self-realization, individual initiative and achievement, and the superiority of individual decisions" (Dion & Dion, 1988, p. 280). They also tend to place a high value on romantic and passionate love, marriage for love (as opposed to arranged marriage), egalitarian families (as opposed to patriarchal, hierarchal arrangements), sexual

freedom for men *and* women, and sexual permissiveness (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, in press). Collectivist cultures emphasize "reduced privacy, emotional dependence on organizations and institutions, a belief in superiority of group over individual decisions, and one's identity being defined by one's place in the social system" (Dion & Dion, 1988, p. 280). They also tend to place a lower value on romantic and passionate love, marriage for love, women's rights, egalitarian families, and sexual freedom for men and/or women (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, in press).

How would we expect these cultural dimensions to be related to sexual miscommunication in the courtship behavior of young adults? In sexually permissive (individualistic) cultures, dating couples probably would communicate more frequently and more casually about sexual matters than would couples in sexually restrictive (collectivistic) societies. However, conversation opens the way not just for honest and open dialogue, but also for miscommunication and misunderstandings. Furthermore, individuals in sexually permissive societies might more likely find themselves in situations experiencing conflicting desires, with divergent sexual standards, and possibly end up both miscommunicating and being pressured to do things they don't really want to do. It also seems reasonable to predict that couples will be less free to engage in direct and honest communication in societies that grant more power and sexual rights to men than to women than in societies that grant equal sexual privileges to men and women.

Purposes of This Investigation

The purpose of this study was to examine gender and cultural differences in token resistance to sex and in consent to unwanted sex.

Effects of Gender

Expanding the published research on token resistance to sex to include men tested the popular stereotype that only (or primarily) women engage in token resistance to sex. Although many reasons may motivate men to feign sexual disinterest in appropriate circumstances, we expected to find women reporting a somewhat higher incidence of token resistance to sex than would men because traditionally (in the U.S. and in many other countries) men are socialized to initiate sexual encounters and women are socialized to resist such advances (McCormick & Jessor, 1983).

Conventional wisdom also suggests that women are pressured into pretending to desire sex when they do not more than are men, because men (verbally) request more sex (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979). On the other hand, people seem to be aware of the sexual double standard, "Nice women don't say yes and real men don't say no" (Muehlenhard, 1988), and women do initiate sex, although often indirectly (Perper & Weiss, 1987). Thus, traditional sex roles may put more pressure on men to consent to sexual advances despite their own desires. Research showing that a greater proportion of men than women have unwanted sex supports this hypothesis (e.g., Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988). Thus, we hypothesized that both men and women would consent to unwanted sex, with the incidence higher for men. We also explored how gender differences for both types of sexual miscommunication might vary across the cultures, which are likely to vary in degree of gender equality.

Effects of Culture

Although we did not directly measure the cultural dimensions of sexual permissiveness/restrictiveness, gender equality, and individualism/collectivism, we chose three diverse cultures to compare the incidence of sexual miscommunica-

tions. The United States, an exemplar of an individualistic society, has been classified as somewhat permissive (sexually) and somewhat egalitarian. The double standard has sharply declined in the last 50 years (DeLamater, 1987). Russia, intermediate in individualism/collectivism, has traditionally been a somewhat sexually restrictive society, but since *glasnost* it has become increasingly permissive. Women value egalitarian relationships, whereas men still tend to value traditional male prerogatives (Shlapentokh, 1984; Stern, 1979). Finally, Japan, the exemplar of a traditional collectivist culture, is sexually restrictive and hierarchical with respect to men's and women's sexual rights (see Abramson, 1986; Iwawaki & Eysenck, 1978). (See Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, in press; Hofstede, 1983; Schwartz, S., 1993, in press; and Triandis et al. 1990, for information as to how these societies should be classified regarding individualism/collectivism, permissiveness, and gender equality.)

Depending on which aspect of each society we focus, we can make different predictions about levels of sexual miscommunication. For example, if we focus on degree of gender inequality, we might expect that the Japanese sample would be most likely to engage in sexual miscommunication—at least on the part of the women. On the other hand, if we focus on the degree of sexual permissiveness, we would expect the U.S. sample would have the highest level of sexual miscommunication.

Method

Subjects

The data for this article came from a larger survey study of college students' sexuality and romantic relationships. A self-administered questionnaire was distributed to college students in the United States, Russia, and Japan. After eliminating subjects who were mar-

ried or for whom gender information was not available (some subjects did not complete the demographics section of the questionnaire), 1,519 (634 men and 885 women) were included in the analyses.

The U.S. sample consisted of 970 participants from five different universities: Illinois State University in Normal, IL ($N = 470$), Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX ($N = 272$), the University of Hawaii in Honolulu, HI ($N = 96$), Bradley University in Peoria, IL ($N = 78$), and Millikin College in Decatur, IL ($N = 54$). The Russian sample consisted of 327 participants from the Vladimir Poly-Technical Institute (located about 100 miles from Moscow). The Japanese sample consisted of 222 participants from two universities: Nanzan University in Nagoya ($N = 108$) and Tohoku University in Sendai ($N = 114$). These universities were chosen on the basis of access; they were the home universities of the authors, or an author had contact with a faculty member from the university who was willing to distribute the questionnaire. Table 1 presents demographic information on the samples from the three countries.

Measures

Token resistance to sex was measured by the following question:

Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to engage in sexual intercourse and you wanted to also, but for some reason you indicated that you didn't want to, although *you had every intention to and were willing to engage in sexual intercourse*. In other words, you indicated "no" and you meant "yes." Has this ever happened to you?

This wording is almost identical to that used by Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988). In this study, subjects were given the following response options: 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = two or three times, 4 = four or more times. (For both this item and the next one we recoded

Table 1

Percentages in Various Demographic Categories in the U.S., Russian, and Japanese Samples

	U.S. (N = 970)	Russia (N = 327)	Japan (N = 222)
Gender	63% females	49% females	53% females
Age	78% aged 18-21 Median = 20	63% aged 18-21 Median = 21	84% aged 18-21 Median = 20
Identified Race/ Ethnic Background*	79% White/Caucasian	94% White/Caucasian	94% Asian
Setting Grew Up In			
Rural	8	14	7
Small town	18	12	20
Large town or small city	20	44	35
Suburb	40	3	19
Large city	14	26	18
Family's social class**			
Upper	7	4	1
Upper middle	37	12	23
Middle	44	49	57
Lower middle	8	10	14
Working	3	25	5
Lower	1	1	1

Notes: *We have more confidence in the validity of the ethnic/race question for the U.S. sample than for the Russian or Japanese samples. For example, the 6% of the subjects from Japan who chose a category other than "Asian" were probably Asian (Japanese) as reported by the two individuals who distributed the questionnaire in their classes. Furthermore, an expert on the Russian language from the U.S. reported that the question on ethnicity was inappropriate for the Russians. Although we did not ask about whether subjects were native born, we believe that either 100% or nearly 100% of the subjects in each country were native born.

**One of the experts on the Russian language from the U.S. noted that the Russians would probably be confused by the question that asks about social class and would not be able to identify to which social class they belong. Thus, it may not be meaningful to compare this item across cultures.

the answers so that 1 = never and 2 = once or more.)

A second item assessed subjects' willingness to consent to unwanted sex:

Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to engage in sexual intercourse and you did not want to, but for some reason you indicated that you did want to. In other words, you indicated "yes" and you meant "no." Has this ever happened to you?

Subjects indicated their reactions on the same response scale as described for the first question.

For some analyses, we selected subjects who could be identified as "nonvirgin," or, that is, who had had sexual intercourse at least once. Information on intercourse experience was obtained from responses to questions asking about sexual

intercourse partners in their lifetime and during the past year. Subjects who responded 0 to both questions were classified as virgins (sexually inexperienced). Subjects who gave a number of 1 or greater to either or both questions were placed in the nonvirgin (sexually experienced) sample. Although the number of lifetime sexual partners should always be equal to or greater than the number of sexual partners in the previous year, some subjects reported 0 for lifetime partners but reported one or more sexual partners during the previous year. Most of these cases were from Russia and may have been due to how the question on lifetime sexual behavior was translated. The back-translation suggests that this question referred to number of partners in "your life until now," which could

have been interpreted to exclude a current sexual partner. Because of this, we classified a person as nonvirgin if he or she reported a sexual partner in the past year, even though he or she had indicated 0 to the lifetime question. Subjects who responded to only one of the two questions were assigned a category based on the one score they provided, and subjects who did not respond to either question ($n = 18$) were not included in the sexually experienced sample selected for certain analyses.

The sexually experienced (nonvirgin) sample consisted of 797 U.S. subjects (90% of the U.S. male sample and 78% of the U.S. female sample), 253 Russian subjects (90% of the Russian male sample and 64% of the Russian female sample), and 104 Japanese subjects (35% of the Japanese male sample and 58% of the Japanese female sample). The fact that more Japanese women than Japanese men were nonvirgins should probably be considered a finding unique to this sample. Most Japanese women were from Nanzan University and were slightly older than the men, who came primarily from Tohoku University.

Procedure

Most questionnaires were completed during class time, but at Tohoku University in Japan students completed the questionnaire at home. The introduction to the questionnaire and preliminary oral instructions emphasized voluntary participation and questionnaire anonymity. The 120-item questionnaire took 20 to 30 minutes to complete. Subjects recorded their responses on an op-scan sheet, primarily so the data from Russia and Japan could be more easily transported to the United States.

For the Russian sample, the questionnaire was translated into Russian. Although there was not an opportunity to have the Russian version of the questionnaire back-

translated into English and compared to the original draft before data were collected in Russia, this comparison was made later. The questionnaire was initially back-translated by a professor from the Foreign Languages Department at Vladimir Poly-Technical. Later, two U.S. professors of Russian languages independently backtranslated the Russian questionnaire into English and approved of the original translation. A few problems in the lengthy questionnaire were noted, but none was found in the measures used in this study (with one minor exception, to be discussed).

The questionnaire remained in English for the Japanese sample because the Japanese students who were contacted had excellent command of the English language, with many years of formal English language instruction. Japanese subjects were allowed to use Japanese-English dictionaries if necessary. The professors who distributed the questionnaire in their classes reported that the subjects did not seem to have any problem completing and understanding the questionnaire.

Results

Token Resistance to Sex

Data are presented in Table 2 for all unmarried respondents and for the subsample of nonvirgins who indicated token resistance to sexual intercourse. Differences across societies were significant, $\chi^2 = 29.65$, $p < .001$, with the Japanese sample reporting the lowest percentage, 30%, and the Russian sample the highest percentage, 53%. Differences across societies were also significant when we consider the subsample of nonvirgin subjects, $\chi^2 = 14.97$, $p < .001$. However, for this subsample, the U.S. sample had the lowest incidence of token resistance to sex. Russian women had a particularly high level of token resistance to sex, both in the

Table 2

Percentage Reporting Token Resistance to Sex Among All Unmarried Subjects and Nonvirgin Subjects in the U.S., Russian, and Japanese Samples

Subsample	U.S.	Russia	Japan
Total Unmarried			
Sample	41	53	30
Men	47	48	21
Women	38	59	37
Nonvirgin Sample	45	58	54
Nonvirgin Men	49	50	42
Nonvirgin Women	42	70	60

Note: These are the percentages who said that they had at least once said no to sex although they "had every intention to and were willing to engage in sexual intercourse."

total unmarried sample and in the nonvirgin sample.

United States. Of the 399 U.S. subjects who reported engaging in token resistance to sex, 44% reported doing this only once, 41% reported that it happened two or three times, and 15% reported a frequency of four or more times. A greater proportion of men than of women had engaged at least once in token resistance to sex, $\chi^2 = 6.56$, $p = .01$. A trend for men's greater incidence of token resistance to sex relative to women's was also found in the nonvirgin sample, but the difference was not significant, $\chi^2 = 3.32$, $p = .07$. No regional U.S. differences were found for either men or women; exactly 38% of women from each region reported engaging in token resistance to sex. For men, the percentages were 45% (Texas sample), 46% (Hawaii sample), and 47% (Illinois sample).

Russia. Of the 169 Russian subjects reporting token resistance to sex, 58% did this once, 30% indicated two or three times, and 12% reported four or more times. Contrary to what was found for the U.S. sample, more Russian women than men reported token resistance to sex, but this gender difference was not significant, $\chi^2 = 3.34$, $p = .07$. Among the subsample of nonvirgin Russians, however, the difference between men and women was significant, $\chi^2 = 8.33$, $p < .01$.

Table 3

Percentage Reporting Consent to Unwanted Sex Among Nonvirgin Subjects in the U.S., Russian, and Japanese Samples

	U.S.	Russia	Japan
Total Nonvirgin			
Sample	47	34	27
Nonvirgin men	35	35	30
Nonvirgin women	55	32	25

Note: These are the percentages who said they had at least once said yes to sex although they did not want to engage in sex.

Japan. Of the 65 Japanese respondents reporting token resistance to sex, 34% reported doing this once, 50% reported that it happened two or more times, and 17% reported a frequency of four or more times. Similar to the Russian sample but unlike the U.S. sample, a greater proportion of Japanese women than Japanese men had engaged in token resistance to sex, $\chi^2 = 5.93$, $p < .05$. The gender difference in the nonvirgin subsample was not significant, $\chi^2 = 2.44$, $p = \text{n.s.}$

Consent to Unwanted Sex

For the analysis on consent to unwanted sex, we selected only nonvirgin respondents. These data are reported in Table 3. The Japanese sample had the lowest percentage of consent to unwanted sex; the U.S. sample had the highest percentage, $\chi^2 = 23.51$, $p < .001$. However, we found significant cross-cultural differences only among women ($\chi^2 = 32.65$, $p < .001$). U.S. women had a particularly high level of consent to unwanted sex.

United States. The incidence of consent to unwanted sex among the sexually experienced subjects in the U.S. sample was 47% ($n = 372$). Of these 372 subjects, 45% reported doing this only once, 39% reported that it happened two or three times, and 16% reported a frequency of four or more times. A gender difference was found: a greater proportion of women than men reported that they had consented to unwanted sex, $\chi^2 = 28.20$, $p < .001$, which was contrary to our hypothesis.

We also examined the incidence of consent to unwanted sex among the sexually active subjects from the different regions within the U.S. (Illinois, Texas, and Hawaii). The Hawaiian students had the lowest incidence of consent to unwanted sex. Among the female sample, their incidence (39%) was significantly lower than the incidence for the Illinois sample (59%) and the Texas sample (50%), $\chi^2 = 7.65$, $p < .02$. Among males, the Hawaiian sample also had the lowest incidence (27%), but this percentage was not significantly lower than that for the Illinois male sample (34%) or the Texas male sample (41%), $\chi^2 = 2.46$, $p = \text{n.s.}$

Russia. The incidence of consent to unwanted sex among the sexually experienced subjects in the Russian sample was 34% ($n = 86$). Of the 86 Russian subjects who had consented to unwanted sex, 60% had done this only once, 30% reported that it happened two or three times, and 9% reported a frequency of four or more times. No significant difference was found between men and women on the proportion who had consented to unwanted sex, $\chi^2 = .13$, $p = \text{n.s.}$

Japan. In the sexually experienced Japanese sample, 27% ($n = 27$) had engaged in consent to unwanted sex. Of these 27 subjects, 63% reported doing this once, 30% reported that it happened two or three times, and 7% reported a frequency of four or more times. Approximately the same proportion of men as women had consented to unwanted sex, $\chi^2 = .17$, $p = \text{n.s.}$

In a final analysis, we also examined the relationship between token resistance to sex and consent to unwanted sex. With the sexually experienced sample (from all three countries combined), we found that there was a low but significant positive correlation between the responses to the two items, $r = .15$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

We examined the extent of sexual miscommunication in dating relationships among college students in three diverse countries: the United States, Russia, and Japan. We enlarged the scope of the research carried out by Muehlenhard and her colleagues (e.g., Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991) on *token resistance to sex* (saying no but meaning yes) by adding another form of miscommunication of sexual intent: *consent to unwanted sex* (saying yes but meaning no), and conducting cross-cultural comparisons. We found both gender and cultural differences in the incidence of sexual miscommunication.

Token Resistance to Sex

Our results make it clear that men as well as women have at least once said no to sex when they really wanted it. This is contrary to the stereotype that only women engage in token resistance to sex. Only in the United States sample did proportionately more men than women express token resistance to sex, a pattern that held across all three U.S. college locations (Illinois, Texas, and Hawaii). These findings are consistent with those of a recent study by Muehlenhard and Rodgers (1993), who also found that more men (61%) than women (34%) reported having engaged in token resistance to sex at least once.

Because token resistance to sex requires not only saying "no" but also the desire and willingness to have sex and the belief that one's partner desires sex, it may be that men's greater incidence of token resistance to sex is because of their greater likelihood of being in situations that they define as sexual (regardless of whether they are defined as sexual by the other person). For example, research shows that men, in general, are more eager than women to have sex (Clark & Hatfield, 1989), and report that female partners initiate more

sex than women actually report initiating (Anderson & Aymami, 1993). It is also possible that at least moderately egalitarian sexual mores in the United States have afforded men the opportunity to bargain, manipulate, or "play hard to get."

Reverse gender differences were found in Russia and Japan, where more women than men had engaged in token resistance to sex. This finding may reflect the lesser gender equality in these other two countries. Men may have fewer opportunities to say no because of a lower incidence of female sexual initiation, and women in these societies may still be more likely to believe they should say no even if they are interested in sex. The high incidence of token resistance to sex among Russian women may also stem from the unique problems associated with modern Russia—e.g., the unavailability of effective contraception, the lack of private space—problems that may be more upsetting to women than to their male partners.

Consent to Unwanted Sex

Proportionately more U.S. women than any other group analyzed in the current research reported having consented to unwanted sex, a disturbing finding. U.S. women indicated the highest rates of consent to unwanted sex (55%), Russian women moderate rates (32%), and Japanese women the lowest (27%); there were no cultural differences among men. Why would U.S. women be so vulnerable to sexual pressure? Perhaps changing sexual norms mean that women are caught in the middle of a social revolution. Perhaps U.S. men have simply learned to keep asking until women finally give in. Perhaps U.S. women no longer possess the traditional "excuses" for avoiding premarital sex and have not yet developed the interpersonal skills required to assert themselves—to say no when they don't want sex.

The low level of consent to unwanted sex in Japan supports our belief that in sexually restrictive societies, couples communicate less frequently and less casually about sexual matters than would couples from more sexually permissive cultures. However, our hypothesis that gender inequalities in sexual freedom would be associated with a greater likelihood of sexual miscommunication, particularly on the part of women, was not supported. Despite massive gender inequality, our Japanese sample did not fit the model of a traditional sexual society where men virtually always urge women to have sex and women almost always resist until they are married.

This research supports the value of collecting cross-cultural data when examining aspects of sexuality in dating relationships. Even when samples are not completely comparable, data collected in more than one country increase the generalizability of the results and introduce new modifications and limitations.

Future researchers on sexual miscommunication should explore why men engage in token resistance to sex. Perhaps men have learned that it is not an effective strategy to reveal sexual intentions too soon, even if one's partner seems interested; women may still worry that their reputations will suffer if they admit their sexual interest. Such information would enable us to sharpen our predictions and help us understand why the rates were higher for men than for women in the U.S. (See recent work by Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1993, and Muehlenhard, Giusti, & Rodgers, 1993, on reasons for token resistance to sex for both men and women.)

Second, it would also be interesting to explore why men and women in various cultures consent to unwanted sex. In more traditional societies, it is possible that men may feel compelled to initiate sex,

even when they do not really want to do so (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983), and women may feel pressured to respond to men's initiatives. On the other hand, as modern women are emboldened to initiate sex on occasion themselves, it may be men who feel the most social pressure to accede. Do people sometimes acquiesce to "prove" their manhood or womanhood, to respond out of a sense of guilt, to avoid conflict or confrontation, to avoid hurting others, because of peer pressure, because they were intoxicated, because they were coerced, or from combinations of these motives? Future research will enrich our understanding of the process of sexual communication and miscommunication in intimate relationships, from both partners' perspectives.

References

- Abramson, P. R. (1986). The cultural context of Japanese sexuality: An American perspective. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*, 29, 1-9.
- Anderson, P. B., & Aymami, R. B. A. (1993). Reports of female initiation of sexual contact: Male and female differences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 22, 335-343.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Blumstein, P. W., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples*. New York: Morrow.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.
- Clark, R. D., III, & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 2, 39-55.
- DeLamater, J. (1987). Gender differences in sexual scenarios. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Females, males, and sexuality: Theories and research* (pp. 127-139). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- DeLamater, J. (1989). The social control of human sexuality. In K. McKinney & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Human sexuality: The societal and interpersonal context* (pp. 30-62). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- DeLamater, J. D., & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). *Premarital sexuality: Attitudes, relationships, behaviors*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1988). Romantic love: Individual and cultural perspectives. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 264-289). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Foa, U. G., Anderson, B., Converse, J., Urbansky, W. A., Cawley, M. J., Muhlhausen, S. M., & Tornblom, K. Y. (1987). Gender-related sexual attitudes: Some cross-cultural similarities and differences. *Sex Roles*, 16, 511-519.
- Ford, C. S., & Beach, F. A. (1951). *Patterns of sexual behavior*. New York: Harper.
- Gregersen, E. (1986). Human sexuality in cross-cultural perspective. In D. Byrne & K. Kelley (Eds.), *Alternative approaches to the study of sexual behavior* (pp. 87-102). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (1993). Historical and cross-cultural perspectives on passionate love and sexual desire. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 4, 67-98.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (in press). *Love and sex: A cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. B. Derogowski, S. Dziurawiec, & R. C. Annis (Eds.), *Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 335-355). Lisse, Holland: Swets & Zittlinger.
- Iwawaki, S., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Sexual attitudes among British and Japanese students. *Journal of Psychology*, 98, 289-298.
- LaBeff, E. E., & Dodder, R. A. (1982). Attitudes toward sexual permissiveness in Mexico and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 116, 285-286.
- McCormick, N. B., & Jessor, C. J. (1983). The courtship game: Power in the sexual encounter. In E. R. Allgeier & N. B. McCormick (Eds.), *Changing boundaries: Gender roles and sexual behavior* (pp. 64-86). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (1988). "Nice women" don't say yes and "real men" don't say no: How miscommunication and the sexual double standard can cause sexual problems. *Women and Therapy*, 7, 95-108.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Cook, S. W. (1988). Men's self-reports of unwanted sexual activity. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 24, 58-72.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Giusti, L. M., & Rodgers, C. S. (1993, November). *The social construction of "token resistance to sex": The nature and function of myth*. Presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Chicago.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 872-879.

- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Long, P. J. (1988). *Men's versus women's reports of pressure to engage in unwanted sexual intercourse*. Paper presented at the Western region meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & McCoy, M. L. (1991). Double standard/double bind: The sexual double standard and women's communication about sex. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 447-461.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Rodgers, C. S. (1993, August). *Narrative descriptions of "token resistance" to sex*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Perper, T., & Weiss, D. L. (1987). Proceptive and rejective strategies of U.S. and Canadian college women. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 455-480.
- Reiss, I. L. (1989). Society and sexuality: A sociological explanation. In K. McKinney & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Human sexuality: The societal and interpersonal context* (pp. 3-29). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Schwartz, I. M. (1993). Affective reactions of American and Swedish women to their first premarital coitus: A cross-cultural comparison. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 18-26.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1993, June). *Toward explanations of national differences in value priorities*. Invited address delivered at the XXXIV Congress of the InterAmerican Society of Psychology, Santiago de Chile.
- Schwartz, S. H. (in press). Beyond individualism-collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. To appear in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues*.
- Shlapentokh, V. (1984). *Love, marriage, and friendship in the Soviet Union*. New York: Praeger.
- Stern, M. (1979). *Sex in the USSR*. New York: The New York Times.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-1020.

Manuscript accepted May 17, 1994

Sex and Reason

RICHARD A. POSNER

At bookstores or from

**Harvard
University
Press**

Cambridge, MA 02138
800 448 2242

"Posner is one of the most distinguished and prolific legal thinkers of his generation [and this is an] extraordinary book...He combines a passion for exposing humbug and pseudo-profundity with an odd but genuine sort of social compassion, a delight in shocking the self-righteous with a love of human diversity and freedom...We will remember, and profit by, the wit and the courage of his attacks on bigotry, folly, and cruelty."

—Martha C. Nussbaum, *New Republic*

"An incisive tour through theories of sexuality and legal regulation of such matters as marriage, pregnancy, homosexuality, sexual revolution in the courts, erotic art, pornography and nudity, sexual abuse, and the separation of reproduction from sex...At a time when intellectual shoddiness permeates our highest court, [Posner] is a true philosopher of law."

—Carlin Romano, *Washington Post Book World*

\$15.95 paper

