4-1977

A Behavioral Assessment of Preference for Erotic Visual Stimuli

Robert P. King
Western Michigan University

A BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT OF PREFERENCE FOR EROTIC VISUAL STIMULI

by

Robert P. King

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation for the patience, guidance and constructive criticism afforded me by Professors Kathleen A. Lockhart, Bradley E. Huitema, David O. Lyon and Malcom R. Robertson. Their inspirational guidance as well as the intellectual training from the faculty in the Department of Psychology have made this research endeavor one of the most intense learning experiences of my life.

I would like to thank Dr. Roger Ulrich and the fine staff associated with the Behavior Research Development Corporation for unselfishly allowing me to use their facilities and equipment to conduct this research.

A very special thanks goes to Mr. William Redmon, for his emotional support and technical assistance, to whom I will always be indebted.

I am also grateful to Mr. Gregg Goddman, Mr. Michael Nusbaumer and Mr. Art Anderson for being close buddies and helping me preserve my sense of humor.

And, to the sunshine of my life, my dear wife Caren, thank you for being you. You are the greatest.

Robert P. King

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
LIST OF TABLES		iv
LIST OF APPENDICES		v
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
II	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	9
III	METHOD	10
	Apparatus	10
	Subjects	11
	Procedure	12
IV	RESULTS	18
V	DISCUSSION	33
REFERENCES		38
APPENDICES		41

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Correlated Sample t Tests of Behavioral Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females . . .	19
2	Correlated Sample t Tests of Behavioral Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males	20
3	Independent Sample t Test of Behavioral Responses per Slide Comparing Male and Female Differences	21
4	Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Male	22
5	Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Female	23
6	Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Male	24
7	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values for Slides with Statistically Significant Scale Intercorrelations by Females	26
8	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values for Slides with Statistically Significant Scale Intercorrelations by Males	27
9	Correlated Sample t Test of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females	30
10	Correlated Sample t Test of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males	31

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
A	Means and Standard Deviations--Females . . .	41
B	Means and Standard Deviations--Males	45
C	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values per Slide by Females	49
D	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values per Slide by Males	62
E	Correlated Sample t Tests of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females	75
F	Correlated Sample t Tests of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males	80
G	Rating Scales	85

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior to 1960, there was little scientific research concerning the behavioral effects of exposure to erotic and pornographic stimuli. In fact, a perusal of the literature suggests that sex research outside the strict confines of the work of Kinsey (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953) was virtually nonexistent. However, since the pioneering efforts of this author, numerous investigations centering on erotic and pornographic stimuli have been generated both by independent researchers and by the U. S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. It is of interest to note that the cornerstone of the Commission's foundation, Public Law 90-100, stated that the increase in the traffic of pornographic and obscene material is " . . . a matter of national concern" (The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1970, p. 1). On this basis, the Commission was founded and began investigative operations in July of 1968.

Initially, the Effects Panel of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography assessed public opinion concerning pornography and the presumed effects of exposure to erotic and pornographic materials. Results obtained under the direction of Abelson, Cohen,

Heaton, and Slider (1970) indicated that pornography is not a major national concern, as only 2% of their sample considered it as such. However, these results run counter to a national opinion poll conducted by Gallup (1969) in which men and women were asked if they would favor more strict state and local laws governing the sale of pornography and its transmission through the mail. Results indicate that 75% and 80%, respectively, desired more strict laws. Interestingly, Abelson's research revealed that if people were convinced that erotic materials were harmful, roughly 80% would oppose their availability. The Effects Panel states: "To summarize, contemporary public opinion about the effects of exposure to erotic materials is diverse and varied. Although most Americans have some opinion about the effects of erotica, there is no consensus as to what these effects are" (The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1970, p. 160). The discrepancies between the Abelson, et al., (1970) and the Gallup poll may be due to the fact that public opinion assessment techniques are subject to many irregularities in both sampling and reporting biases, rendering them rather rough assessment techniques at best.

Research concerning behavioral effects of erotica has involved two principal assessment techniques. The first involves traditional physiological measures such as galvanic skin response, pupillary dilation, heart rate, and more recently, the plethysomograph and

mercury strain gauge, which directly record penile circumference changes. The use of physiological measures in sex research has been criticized on a number of grounds (Abel, Blanchard, Barlow, & Manissakalian, 1975; Amoroso, 1973; Bancroft, 1971; The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1970, pp. 164-166; Mann, 1970; Zuckerman, 1971). It has not been shown conclusively that physiological arousal is the same as psychological arousal; and, in addition, most traditional physiological measures cannot distinguish between sexual arousal and other kinds of arousal. The placement of the plethysomograph itself may cause and maintain an erection, and simply being wired for physiological measurement is often enough to change the subject's reactions to stimuli. Especially damaging has been the finding that responses made to erotic stimuli cannot always be differentiated from those made to nonerotic (e.g., violent) stimuli. Thus, the validity of physiological measures as definitive assessment techniques in sexual research is questionable at this time.

The other frequently employed measure is self-report rating scales (Byrne & Lamberth, 1971). Subjects are typically asked to respond to erotic stimuli, either (1) describing their physiological responses to erotic stimuli, i.e., did the subjects experience an erection (partial/full), or (2) responding on an attitude scale on any of several different dimensions. For instance, the subject is

asked to rate on a continuum how sexually arousing different slides are, for example: (1) repulsive, (3) neutral, (5) highly arousing.

At least one study, Schnelle (1974), questioned the validity of verbal evaluation scales. The subjects were low income parents of children who had been referred to a counseling center because of school attendance problems. Four weeks subsequent to the termination of the counseling sessions a follow-up evaluation questionnaire was sent to the parents. The parents were asked to respond to the questionnaire that covered a number of specific behaviors, in particular, whether or not the child's attendance improved or worsened after the counseling sessions. Results indicated a lack of congruence between parental judgments of school attendance change and the actual attendance records.

Further, in Morgan and Lindsley's study (1966) comparing choice for stereophonic and monophonic music, differences were found in their subjects' preference demonstrated by their behavior and their verbal preference. These findings led the authors to state that clear differences exist between verbal and behavioral preference. Thus, the authors concluded that varbal preference may indicate nothing of the subjects' behavior with respect to the selected conditions.

Finally, Guilford (1954) offers an excellent critique on the use of attitude scales in social science research. As this author points

out, the problems inherent in the use of these scales are plentiful. For instance, subjects tend to respond neutrally rather than in the direction of nonneutral categories. In addition, individual interpretation of semantics of the response categories contaminates the scale's validity. That is, what one person considers a descriptive term to be may differ quite significantly from another person's interpretation of that same term. Further, an individual may respond to a scale in terms of how he perceives that the experimenter wants him to respond. Thus, the score may be biased and not accurately reflect the subject's attitude. Thus, the following research, then, must be read with these criticisms in mind.

A study by Wiggins, Wiggins, and Conger (1968) attempted to assess heterosexual somatic preference. Fifteen stimulus pairs (slides) of nude female silhouettes were varied on three body parts: breasts, buttocks, and legs. Pairings of all possible combinations of the 15 stimuli yielded a total of 105 stimulus pairs. Ninety-five male undergraduates served as subjects in the experiment. Subjects were instructed to indicate their preference for each of the slide pairings by rating each slide on a scale of "strongly preferred" to "no preference." Following the experimental conditions, background information was obtained and personality inventories were administered. Of interest in this study is the authors' rather novel use of paired slides that were varied along body parts. Though the authors

used a paired-comparison procedure to determine preference ratings, no behavioral measures of preference were employed.

Brady and Levitt (1965) measured sexual preference to erotic sexual stimuli presented in the form of photographs of various sexual themes. Sixty-eight male graduate students at a state university served as subjects in the experiment. Subjects were asked to rate 19 different photographs on a six point rating scale as to their sexually stimulating value. In addition, this rating procedure was also carried out for two additional sets of different photographs, though similar in that the 19 basic thematic areas were represented.

A sexual experience inventory, the content of which corresponded to the presenting photographs, was then administered to each subject. This inventory assessed past heterosexual and homosexual behavior. A correlational analysis between past sexual experiences and sexual preferences, controlling for overall reactivity, revealed a low level of significant correlations. Thirteen out of a total of 285 correlations were significant at the .05 level and only three were significant at the .01 level. A problem which the authors point out is the questionable validity of the subjects' rated arousal and their true sexual arousal.

More recently, Levitt and Hinesley (1967) explored the sexually stimulating qualities of erotic stimuli. They were intrigued by the relatively high ranking a photograph of a nude woman (ranked sixth)

received among the 19 sexual themes of the Brady and Levitt experiment previously mentioned. To this end, they compared the relative sexually stimulating value of erotic photographs of individuals engaged in comparable sexual activities of nude scenes against those in which they were clothed. In addition, the authors attempted to determine whether erotic photographs would be judged more sexually stimulating than erotic drawings of the same theme.

Seventy-four male graduate students, at least 21 years of age, served as subjects in the experiment. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of two order groups. That is, each group was subject to a different order of presentation to control for factors of nudity and reality. Stimuli were presented individually, order groups controlled for, to each subject for 30 seconds of viewing time. Subjects then rated each individual slide on the dimension of sexual stimulation.

Data revealed that photographs were judged significantly more sexually stimulating than drawings, and that nude photographs, regardless of the thematic content, were judged overall significantly more sexually stimulating than those scenes depicted as minimally unclothed.

In summarizing the studies cited above, one is struck by the lack of behavioral measures of preference, an oversight that is indeed unfortunate in light of Morgan and Lindsley's and Schnelle's

findings. Further, these studies are difficult to compare as they used different terminology, asking subjects to rate, variously, erotic quality, sexual stimulation, and sexual arousal. Given the reactive nature of attitude scales, it is likely that the choice of words used in the scales may influence the rating. Finally, these studies can be criticized on the grounds of generality in that females have not been used as subjects. Obviously, this has been partially due to the lack of technically sophisticated physiological recording devices for females. However, behavioral methods of assessing preference would to a certain extent obviate the need for these devices.

CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This present study represents an attempt to remediate some of the difficulties of the past studies. Specifically, behavioral and verbal preference for erotic stimuli will be assessed to determine to what degree, if any, they correlate. Female subjects, as well as males, will be used to increase the generality of the findings and to investigate sex differences in preference. This study will also attempt to further clarify the findings of Levitt and Hinesley. Specifically, the author submits that the explicit exposure of genitalia may be a key factor in determining preference for and ratings of erotic visual stimuli. Additionally, impersonality will be examined to determine to what extent, if any, it influences judgments about human sexual stimuli.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Apparatus

The subject sat in front of a 14 by 5 1/2 in. black wooden box, placed on a table top, with two telegraph keys mounted 10 1/2 in. apart. A switching key was mounted directly between both telegraph keys. Directly in front of the table were two Kodak Carousel slide projectors which served to project the visual stimuli, 20 by 14 in., on a 4 by 4 ft. movie screen, 8 ft. in front of the subject.

A total of six (N = 6) slide pairing comparisons were used. Two sets of photographic slides (n = 4 per set) depicting various sexual themes served as the specific visual stimuli. The set of slides in which the genitalia are fully exposed are called the explicit slides. A second set of slides, matched as closely as possible in sexual thematic content without full exposure of genitalia, are called the nonexplicit slides. Also, separate slides of a single, nude male and a single, nude female, both with full exposure of genitalia, served as a fifth comparison. Lastly, an explicit slide (genitalia exposed) of a male and female engaged in sexual intercourse was compared against a close-up of the same slide showing only the genitalia.

The set of explicit slides was reproduced from an erotic pictorial magazine obtained at an adult bookstore. The slides composing the nonexplicit category were reproduced from contemporary, readily available, pictorial magazines dealing with human sexual behavior. Stimulus pair #5 (single nude male and female comparison) was also from these contemporary magazines. All slides were reproduced in color.

Behavioral responses were recorded on electromechanical equipment housed in a hallway adjacent to the experimental room. A Gerbrands Model 1A tape puller served to maintain a VI 20 sec. schedule (5 sec. to 35 sec. range) for both projectors, and a Gerbrands cumulative recorder provided individual response records. An electric window fan served to circulate the air in the experimental room as well as to mask extraneous environmental noise.

Subjects

A total of 28 subjects participated in the experiment. Data from three subjects, two females and one male, were discarded due to equipment malfunctions. Male and female graduate and undergraduate students from Western Michigan University, as well as members of the community (n = 2), served. Undergraduate subjects were recruited from an introductory psychology class and were

offered points toward their final grade as incentive for their participation. A point incentive was not available for graduate students. All subjects were informed of the general nature of the experiment and informed consent was obtained in all cases. All subjects had attained a minimum age of 18 years. The mean age for both male and female subjects was 22.01 years. The mean age for females (n = 9) was 19.85 years (18.4 to 27.4 year range) and for males (n = 16) was 23.23 years (18.3 to 59.1 year range).

Procedure

Every subject went through six successive trials, each trial lasting two min. and 45 secs. For each trial, a different stimulus pair was used. For every subject the order of presentation of each stimulus pair was randomized, as well as the side of presentation. Each projector housed six slides so as to produce the six stimulus pairs. A female aid to the experimenter was in close proximity to the experimental area only when female subjects were run. Male and female subjects were seated at the table in the experimental room and read the following directions:

> Please be seated. There are two telegraph keys in front of you. If you press the left key, some but not all of your presses will produce a slide; this will always be the same slide. The same is true of the right key; if you press it, some but not all of your key presses will produce a slide, which will always be the same one. There are two slides involved, one of which is only on

the left key, and the other only on the right. Your task is to press the keys whenever you wish, in any order you wish, and as often as you wish, as long as you do not press both keys at once.

To insure that you do not press both keys at once, there is a switching key mounted between both telegraph keys. When the switching key is pointed to the right, the telegraph key will be on for the right key indicating power to that key. That is, you may gain access to view the slide on your right. The same holds true for the left key. Here is what you will see (black-out slide) until the slide(s) come on. (Demonstration/Clarification)

At the start of each trial, both slides will appear for five seconds so that you may view both of them. Remember, only at the beginning of each trial will you be able to see both slides at once. Once again, you may switch afterwards to view either slide. During trial one, the same two slides will be appearing, one on the left key and one on the right. In total, there are six trials, or six pairs of slides. Each trial will last two minutes and 45 seconds. At the end of each trial, a houselight will appear indicating the end of that trial. (Demonstration/Clarification) The slides will automatically change before trial two and again before trial three and so on. That is, I will automatically advance the projectors so that you will be able to view the next set of slides. The houselight will go off when it is time to start again, and two new slides will be presented simultaneously, indicating a new trial. (Questions/Clarification)

If at anytime during the experiment you no longer feel you want to view these slides, you may simply leave this room. In no way should you feel obliged to stay. If you elect to leave, you are simply exercising your experimental rights afforded you in this experiment.

Is this clear? Any other questions?

If not, the session will begin shortly. I will return after this part of the experiment is over.

Adherence to these directions was maintained throughout, allowing only for further clarification of the procedure if necessary. Each trial was composed of two phases: forced exposure and behavioral preference.

Phase I forced exposure

At the start of each trial, both slides were initially shown simultaneously for five seconds to create a condition of forced exposure. In this way, the subject is able to ascertain which slide was in each of the two projectors. Thus, responding to determine which slide is housed in each projector was unnecessary. After both slides were shown simultaneously, the projectors automatically reset to the holding stimuli (innocuous black-out stimuli), and Phase II immediately began.

Phase II behavioral preference

During this set of conditions, the subject responded (response on telegraph key) in order to receive a slide presentation. Reinforcement was defined as a five second presentation of the erotic visual stimuli. During this phase, only one slide of the stimulus pair could appear at any one time on the movie screen. That is, the subject determined which slide in the stimulus pair would appear by responding on the key that allowed him access to his preferred slide.

If the subject failed to respond, reinforcement would not occur and only the holding stimuli would be seen. Responses made during the five second slide exposure were also recorded, but were ineffective in producing or maintaining reinforcement. Both keys were programmed to produce reinforcement according to one VI 20 sec. tape (5 sec. to 35 sec. range) with a 5 sec. COD.

Phase I and II were repeated successively for all six stimulus pairs, after which the experimenter entered the room and readied the equipment for the rating scale procedure.

Phase III rating scales

Upon readying the equipment, the experimenter read the following set of instructions:

> Now, you will be asked to indicate your reactions to these slides on the following four dimensions:
>
> 1. How pleasant or unpleasant you found the slide.
>
> 2. How pornographic you think the slide is.
>
> 3. How sexually stimulating you found the slide.
>
> 4. How physically attractive you found the models or slides of the anatomy.
>
> Each scale before you has 11 points, with the ends of the scale labeled five and five. Please indicate your reactions by circling the number that accurately represents your reaction. For example, if you found a slide unpleasant rather than pleasant, you would use the left-hand side of that scale. The more unpleasant you found a slide the higher the number you would circle. Similarly,

if you found a slide to be not very stimulating, you would probably circle a three or four on that part of the scale. If not at all stimulating, you would circle the four or five on that scale.

Try to make use of the entire scale in your ratings so as to make the ratings accurately reflect your reactions. In rating the slides, consider each of the scales separately and independently. Try not to let the way you rated one thing affect the way you rate another.

Now, each slide that you have already viewed will again be presented for 45 seconds of viewing time. During these 45 seconds, you are to complete these four scales. (Clarify) Then, I will automatically advance the projector to the black-out slide for a 10 second pause to allow you to ready yourself for the next slide. This procedure will continue until all slides from both projectors are viewed. First, we will start with this projector (Clarify) and continue until completed.

Once completed, the experiment will be over and I will return to release you and try to answer any questions you may have.

Any other questions? If not, we will begin shortly.

Each slide was visually presented for 45 seconds, during which the subject was to complete the four rating scales. The projector was then advanced automatically to the holding stimulus for a 10 second pause before the next slide appeared. This pause allowed the subject to ready himself for a new slide.

Slides were presented such that no two slides that composed a stimulus pair were viewed and rated sequentially. Thus, the possibility of comparison carry-over effects was greatly reduced and more accurate rating scale responses for each slide was obtained.

In addition, the order of the four rating scales was randomized.

Upon completion of this phase, the experimenter entered the room for a final debriefing period and subjects were excused.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study attempted to test the efficacy of developing a behavioral measure of sexual preference. Analysis of data examined separate male and female within-subject behavioral response preferences for each of the six stimulus pairs using a correlated sample *t* test on grouped data. The data in Table 1 indicate no statistically significant within-subject differences for the six stimulus pairs for the females. However, the data in Table 2 clearly indicate a statistically significant within-subject difference at the .05 level for male subjects, $t(15) = 2.267$, $p < .05$ for stimulus pair #5 (single nude male and single nude female comparison). In this case, males overwhelmingly preferred to view the single nude female slide.

Behavioral responses made by males for each slide were then compared to behavioral responses made by females for each slide. An independent sample *t* test performed on grouped data revealed a statistically significant between-subject difference at the .05 level for the slide of the single nude male, $t(23) = 2.549$, $p < .05$. These data displayed in Table 3 support the finding mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Table 1

Correlated Sample t Tests of Behavioral Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	74.8888		
			-24.8888	-1.474
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	50.0000		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	115.0000		
			-80.4444	-1.250
	Group, Explicit	34.5555		
#3	Personal, Explicit	74.0000		
			-55.2223	-1.302
	Impersonal, Explicit	18.7777		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	75.6666		
			-24.3333	-1.245
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	51.3333		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	49.6666		
			16.6667	0.4991
	Nude Female, Explicit	66.3333		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	92.6666		
			-52.0000	-1.068
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	40.6666		

df = 8

* $p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

** $p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Table 2

Correlated Sample *t* Tests of Behavioral Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	*t*
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	36.5625		
			-15.9375	-0.7742
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	20.6250		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	43.8750		
			-21.6250	-1.531
	Group, Explicit	22.2500		
#3	Personal, Explicit	43.6250		
			-22.5000	-1.566
	Impersonal, Explicit	21.1250		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	34.8125		
			0.2500	.03794
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	35.0625		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	3.5625		
			50.2500	2.267*
	Nude Female, Explicit	53.8125		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	41.0000		
			-6.1875	-0.4357
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	34.8125		

df = 15

* $p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

** $p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Table 3

Independent Sample t Test of Behavioral Responses per Slide Comparing Male and Female Differences

Slide	Sex	Mean	Mean Difference	t
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	M =	36.5625		
	F =	74.8888	38.3263	.9573
Cunnilingus, Explicit	M =	20.6250		
	F =	50.0000	29.375	1.284
Group, Nonexplicit	M =	43.8750		
	F =	115.0000	71.125	1.193
Group, Explicit	M =	22.2500		
	F =	34.5555	12.3055	.6209
Personal, Explicit	M =	43.6250		
	F =	74.0000	30.375	.7562
Impersonal, Explicit	M =	21.1250		
	F =	18.7777	-2.3473	-1.723
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	M =	34.8125		
	F =	75.6666	40.8541	1.017
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	M =	35.0625		
	F =	51.3333	16.2708	.6030
Nude Male, Explicit	M =	3.5625		
	F =	49.6666	46.1041	2.549 *
Nude Female, Explicit	M =	53.8125		
	F =	66.3333	12.5208	.2626
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	M =	41.0000		
	F =	92.6666	51.6666	1.026
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	M =	34.8125		
	F =	40.6666	5.8541	.2516

df = 23

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

The behavioral methodology used in this study also provided a means by which to assess individual behavioral preference. Since it is impossible to control for individual learning histories, one might naturally expect variations in behavioral response patterns to occur. As can be clearly seen from the individual behavioral response records summarized in Tables 4, 5, and 6, these response patterns are quite variable. These three examples cited are not meant to be representative of the total sample, but rather, point to the efficacy of the methodology in determining individual behavioral preferences.

Table 4

Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Male

Stimulus Pair:		
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit n = 311	Cunnilingus, Explicit n = 0
#2	Group, Nonexplicit n = 129	Group, Explicit n = 9
#3	Personal, Explicit n = 226	Impersonal, Explicit n = 0
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit n = 196	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit n = 135
#5	Nude Male, Explicit n = 0	Nude Female, Explicit n = 359
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit n = 230	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit n = 44

Table 5

Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Female

Stimulus Pair:		
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit n = 250	Cunnilingus, Explicit n = 201
#2	Group, Nonexplicit n = 332	Group, Explicit n = 182
#3	Personal, Explicit n = 171	Impersonal, Explicit n = 89
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit n = 168	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit n = 136
#5	Nude Male, Explicit n = 147	Nude Female, Explicit n = 46
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit n = 145	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit n = 144

Table 6

Individual Behavioral Response Record per Trial - Male

Stimulus Pair:		
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit n = 38	Cunnilingus, Explicit n = 5
#2	Group, Nonexplicit n = 9	Group, Explicit n = 8
#3	Personal, Explicit n = 5	Impersonal, Explicit n = 0
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit n = 39	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit n = 13
#5	Nude Male, Explicit n = 0	Nude Female, Explicit n = 19
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit n = 25	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit n = 0

The degree of within-subject linear relationship between behavioral responses and corresponding scaled responses for each slide was examined, as well as the degree of intercorrelation between scales. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied to separate male and female analyses. Results indicate that for both sexes, no significant correlation between behavioral responses and scaled responses occurred. However, the data summarized in Tables 7 and 8 clearly indicate that for both sexes, the physical attractiveness, sexual stimulation and pleasantness scales were all positively intercorrelated. (Note: One significant negative correlation between the physical attractiveness and sexual stimulation scales did emerge for females rating the single nude female slide.) Additionally, for both sexes the pornographic scale was negatively intercorrelated with the other three scales. These findings are also supported by data presented in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 7

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values for Slides with Statistically Significant Scale Intercorrelations by Females

Slide	Scale Intercorrelations	r
Group, Nonexplicit		
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.6886*
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.6828*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7351*
Group, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.7719*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.6594*
Personal, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7185*
Impersonal, Explicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.7254*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.8722**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.7288*
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit		
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.8203**
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7151*
Nude Male, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7823*
Nude Female, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.7932*
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	-.8547**
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.6725*

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Table 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values for Slides with Statistically Significant Scale Intercorrelations by Males

Slide	Scale Intercorrelations	r
Cunnilingus, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.7610**
Group, Nonexplicit		
	Sexual Stimulation and Pornography	-.5770*
	Physical Attractiveness and Pornography	-.5290*
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.5523*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.8645**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.5352*
Group, Explicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.6396**
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7315**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.8224**
Personal, Explicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.6018*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.5746*
Impersonal, Explicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.6750**
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.6921**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.7241**
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.5413*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.8382**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.5688*
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Sexual Stimulation	.8090**
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.8258**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.6855**

Table 8--Continued

Slide	Scale Intercorrelations	r
Nude Male, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.5536*
Nude Female, Explicit		
	Sexual Stimulation and Pornography	-.5392*
	Pleasantness and Pornography	-.5657*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.6484**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.6850**
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit		
	Physical Attractiveness and Pornography	-.6054*
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.7060**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.5488*
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit		
	Pleasantness and Sexual Stimulation	.6993**
	Pleasantness and Physical Attractiveness	.7945**

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

A closer look at the rating scale results for stimulus pair #5 (single nude male and single nude female comparison) points to some rather interesting male/female differences. While both sexes rated the single nude male and female slides as being generally nonpornographic, both sexes rated members of their own sex as being more pornographic relative to the opposite sex, though the differences were not significant. Additionally, while females viewed the slide

of the single nude female as being very physically attractive, $\underline{M}$ = 3.000, they did not consider the slide to be very sexually stimulating, $\underline{M}$ = -2.333. Males on the other hand also rated the slide of the single nude male as being nonsexually stimulating, $\underline{M}$ = -3.625, but were not as generous as their counterparts in rating a slide of the same sex as being physically attractive, $\underline{M}$ = .3125. This discrepancy between male and female judgments of physical attractiveness account for the high negative correlation between physical attractiveness and sexual stimulation for female ratings for the nude female slide.

Explicit exposure of genitalia was examined as a factor that could influence judgments of human sexual stimuli as pornographic. Results from the correlated sample $\underline{t}$ test on the scaled responses for the four explicit/nonexplicit comparisons (stimulus pairs one, two, four, and six) are summarized in Tables 9 and 10. It can be clearly seen that for both sexes, the direction of responses for all four comparisons on all four rating scales is identical. That is, in all four comparisons, both sexes rated the slide with genitalia exposed as being more pornographic. So also, in all four comparisons, both sexes rated those slides in which genitalia was not exposed as being more sexually stimulating, physically attractive and pleasant to view than the genitalia exposed slides.

Table 9

Correlated Sample t Test of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

Stimulus Pair	Pornography t	Sexual Stimulation t	Physical Attractiveness t	Pleasantness t
#1 Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit Cunnilingus, Explicit	3.244*	-0.5946	-3.487**	-4.311**
#2 Group, Nonexplicit Group, Explicit	5.292**	-0.9578	-2.932*	-2.949*
#3 Personal, Explicit Impersonal, Explicit	1.782	0.5431	-2.987*	-0.4264
#4 Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	2.884*	0.0000	-4.357**	-1.414
#5 Nude Male, Explicit Nude Female, Explicit	2.268	-2.519*	0.4714	-2.884*
#6 Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	1.456	-3.411**	-3.982**	-4.608**

df = 8

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Table 10

Correlated Sample t Test of Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

Stimulus Pair	Pornography t	Sexual Stimulation t	Physical Attractiveness t	Pleasantness t
#1 Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit Cunnilingus, Explicit	2.321*	-2.595*	-4.180**	-2.660*
#2 Group, Nonexplicit Group, Explicit	4.015**	-1.266	-2.517*	-3.199**
#3 Personal, Explicit Impersonal, Explicit	2.132*	-0.5447	-1.772	-1.620
#4 Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	3.660**	-0.6102	-1.664	-2.877*
#5 Nude Male, Explicit Nude Female, Explicit	-1.577	6.392**	4.259**	4.725**
#6 Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	2.660*	-2.871*	-5.042**	-4.362**

df = 15

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Lastly, the possibility that impersonality enters into and influences judgments of human sexual stimuli was also examined. Results from the correlated sample t test summarized in Tables 9 and 10 reveal that males viewed the impersonal slide significantly more pornographic than the personal slide at the .05 level, $t(15) = 2.132$, $p < .05$. Female subjects also rated the impersonal slide as more pornographic, though differences were not significant. Additionally, females rated the personal slide significantly more physically attractive than the impersonal slide at the .05 level, $t(8) = -2.987$, $p < .05$. Males also rated the personal slide as more physically attractive than the impersonal slide, though differences were not significant.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purposes of the present study were:

1. to test the efficacy of a behavioral measure of preference,

2. to determine possible correlations between behavioral preference measures and rating scale responses,

3. to examine male/female differences in preferences and ratings,

4. to test for intercorrelation among rating scales,

5. to attempt to determine some of the factors which influence the rating of sexual stimuli as pornographic, i.e.,

   a. explicit dimension

   b. impersonal dimension.

The behavioral measure used in this study has demonstrated quite clearly that most people will view human sexual stimuli if given the opportunity. That is, the behavioral preference measure used in this study was effective in not only determining larger group preferences, but also in providing valuable information with respect to individual preferences, which were quite individualistic.

In light of Morgan and Lindsley's (1966) research, it is not surprising that no significant correlations between the behavioral

preference measure and rating scales were found. As Morgan and Lindsley's (1966) and Schnelle's (1974) data indicate, the verbal behavior of a subject may not always match his actual behavior. Researchers and applied scientists would do well to remember that data obtained from behavioral preference methodologies and from rating scales pertain to two different phenomena, and, therefore, answer different questions. The point is, it is not always possible to predict a subject's behavior using rating scales.

It has been clearly shown that males overwhelmingly preferred to view the single nude female slide as opposed to the male slide. In light of the fact that females exhibited no significant behavioral preferences, though the mean behavioral response was higher viewing the male slide, an explanation is needed. This may be due to the normal sexual preference conditioning American males and females have undergone since infancy. Or perhaps, the taboo nature of male homosexuality in American society influenced the male's behavioral responses.

Aside from the male/female slide pairing, then, both sexes in this study demonstrated remarkable consistency in rating these human sexual slides. In other words, on nearly every other pairing, all subjects rated the slides approximately the same on all four dimensions. This is in contrast to results obtained concerning behavioral preference.

Concerning intercorrelations among the rating scales, the data indicate that for both sexes, the physical attractiveness, sexual stimulation and pleasantness scales were overwhelmingly positively intercorrelated. Also, the pornographic scale is negatively intercorrelated with all three of these scales. These results point directly to the need for further semantic clarification with respect to society's concern over exposure to pornographic or sexually stimulating materials. It appears that since these subjects did not find pornographic slides sexually stimulating or attractive, or pleasant, perhaps more concern should be directed to material not presently considered pornographic, but merely sexual in nature, i.e., popular magazines available at any drugstore.

The question was raised as to what factors influence ratings of human sexual stimuli. Data obtained from the present study suggest that exposure of genitalia is a factor that determines whether visual stimuli depicting human sexual behavior will be labeled pornographic, sexually stimulating, physically attractive or pleasant to view. Additionally, results suggest that the impersonal depiction of a slide, i.e., visual presentation of just the genitalia, also influences an individual's rating scale judgments.

The results of this study can be generalized to relatively young, well-educated, white middle class male and female college students. It is believed that the sample in this study is fairly

representative of college populations attending state funded universities. This study represents an improvement over many sex research studies in that females were used for both the behavioral and rating scale procedures. In this respect, the generality of these findings is increased.

The author recognizes that a natural sampling bias occurred by virtue of the fact that those subjects who participated in the experiment were different from those who were not willing to participate. An additional limitation of this study, and for that matter all sex research studies, is the reactivity of the setting. Yet, this study represents an improvement in this respect as no physiological apparatus was used.

Future research should expand not only the number of stimulus pairs but also the types of sexual themes. Larger samples of a greater age range, which should include various races, as well as further refinement of the stimulus pairs is needed. The ideal means by which to control for extraneous variables in matched stimulus pairs would be to have the same models pose for both slides in the stimulus pairs. The advantages of this are obvious, however, as in this study, the cost, time, and feasibility of doing such an operation need to be taken into account.

Additionally, future research testing the personal/impersonal dimension might include stimulus pairs that would fit the nonexplicit

classification defined earlier. In the present study both slides used for the personal/impersonal comparison were classified as explicit. Future research might also include the use of behavioral preference measures with physiological and rating scale measures. It is unclear at this point in time as to how they are intercorrelated.

It is hoped that future research will take into account the limitations of this study, as well as encompass the recommendations set forth.

REFERENCES

Abel, G. G., Blanchard, E. B., Barlow, D. H., and Manissakalian, M. Identifying specific erotic cues in sexual deviations by audiotaped descriptions. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1975, 8, 247-260.

Abelson, H., Cohen, R., Heaton, E., and Slider, C. Public attitudes toward and experience with erotic materials. Technical Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 6, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Amoroso, D. M. and Brown, M. Problems in studying the effects of erotic material. The Journal of Sex Research, 1973, 9, 187-195.

Bancroft, J. The application of psychophysiological measures to the assessment and modification of sexual behavior. Behavior, Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 119-130.

Brady, J. P. and Levitt, E. E. The relation of sexual preferences to sexual experiences. The Psychological Record, 1965, 15, 377-384.

Byrne, D. and Lamberth, J. The effect of erotic stimuli on sexual arousal, evaluative responses, and subsequent behavior. Technical Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and

Pornography, 8, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Gallup, G. Gallup political, social and economic trends. Report No. 49. Princeton, N. J.: Gallup International Inc., July 1969.

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., and Martin, C. E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia and London: Saunders, 1948.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., and Gebhard, P. H. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953.

Levitt, E. E. and Hinesley, R. K. Some factors in the valences of erotic visual stimuli. The Journal of Sex Research, 1967, 3, 63-68.

Mann, J. The experimental induction of sexual arousal. Technical Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Morgan, B. J. and Lindsley, R. R. Operant preference for stereophonic over monophonic music. Journal of Music Therapy, 1966, 3 (4), 135-143.

Schnelle, J. F. A brief report on invalidity of parent evaluations of behavior change. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1974, 7, 341-343.

The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Wiggins, J. S., Wiggins, N., and Conger, J. E. Correlates of heterosexual somatic preference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 82-90.

Zuckerman, M. Physiological measures of sexual arousal in the human. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 75, 297-329.

APPENDIX A

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS--FEMALES

Means and Standard Deviations--Females

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	19.85	333.8840
Behavioral Responses:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	74.8888	126.1194
Cunnilingus, Explicit	50.0000	81.0678
Group, Nonexplicit	115.0000	223.4295
Group, Explicit	34.5555	58.3718
Personal, Explicit	74.0000	139.0917
Impersonal, Explicit	18.7777	28.6521
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	75.6666	148.3947
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	51.3333	91.6065
Nude Male, Explicit	49.6666	72.7925
Nude Female, Explicit	66.3333	152.4352
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	92.6666	188.1608
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	40.6666	58.1657
Scale Responses--Pornography Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	-0.6666	3.0000
Cunnilingus, Explicit	2.6666	1.9364
Group, Nonexplicit	-0.4444	2.6034
Group, Explicit	3.4444	1.1303
Personal, Explicit	1.5555	3.1666
Impersonal, Explicit	3.4444	1.5898
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.5555	2.2973
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	2.4444	1.4240
Nude Male, Explicit	-2.6666	2.5980
Nude Female, Explicit	-0.6666	2.8284
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	0.4444	2.4551
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	2.0000	2.2912
Scale Responses--Sexual Stimulation Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	0.4444	2.0069
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-0.4444	3.6438
Group, Nonexplicit	0.3333	2.3452

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group, Explicit	-0.7777	3.4197
Personal, Explicit	0.3333	3.0822
Impersonal, Explicit	0.7777	3.3829
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	-0.2222	2.6352
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-0.2222	3.1534
Nude Male, Explicit	0.4444	2.4037
Nude Female, Explicit	-2.3333	2.3452
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.4444	2.6977
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-1.2222	3.5629
Scale Responses--Physical Attractiveness Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.8888	2.8480
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.3333	2.6925
Group, Nonexplicit	3.1111	2.4720
Group, Explicit	-0.6666	2.6457
Personal, Explicit	2.0000	1.5811
Impersonal, Explicit	-0.4444	2.6034
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.7777	1.7159
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-3.1111	1.8333
Nude Male, Explicit	2.6666	1.3228
Nude Female, Explicit	3.0000	1.8708
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	3.2222	2.6822
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-2.5555	2.2973
Scale Responses--Pleasantness Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.7777	1.8559
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.2222	2.4888
Group, Nonexplicit	1.7777	2.2236
Group, Explicit	-1.5555	2.8333
Personal, Explicit	-0.6666	2.5495
Impersonal, Explicit	-0.8888	3.0595
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.0000	1.6583
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	0.0000	2.2912
Nude Male, Explicit	1.8888	1.6914
Nude Female, Explicit	0.0000	2.0615

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.4444	1.7400
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-2.0000	2.5980

APPENDIX B

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS--MALES

Means and Standard Deviations--Males

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	23.23	982.4400
Behavioral Responses:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	36.5625	75.3144
Cunnilingus, Explicit	20.6250	33.4382
Group, Nonexplicit	43.8750	68.9897
Group, Explicit	22.2500	40.6374
Personal, Explicit	43.6250	62.7193
Impersonal, Explicit	21.1250	34.6484
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	34.8125	49.9522
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	35.0625	44.2213
Nude Male, Explicit	3.5625	7.9997
Nude Female, Explicit	53.8125	87.6988
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	41.0000	59.1968
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	34.8125	54.5603
Scale Responses--Pornography Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	0.1250	3.6124
Cunnilingus, Explicit	2.8750	2.3629
Group, Nonexplicit	-0.4375	2.5811
Group, Explicit	3.0000	1.8618
Personal, Explicit	2.1250	2.7294
Impersonal, Explicit	3.3125	2.3012
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.1875	2.4281
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	2.8750	1.8929
Nude Male, Explicit	-0.3125	3.1138
Nude Female, Explicit	-1.3750	2.3345
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	0.6250	3.0956
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	3.1250	2.0936
Scale Responses--Sexual Stimulation Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.3750	2.6801
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-1.3125	2.6004
Group, Nonexplicit	1.5000	2.7080

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group, Explicit	0.4375	2.7560
Personal, Explicit	1.6875	2.8686
Impersonal, Explicit	1.5000	3.3665
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.8125	3.0379
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	1.2500	2.7688
Nude Male, Explicit	-3.6250	2.0936
Nude Female, Explicit	2.1875	2.5355
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.7500	2.9776
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-0.7500	2.4630
Scale Responses--Physical Attractiveness Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	2.0625	2.9769
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.0625	3.2551
Group, Nonexplicit	1.6875	3.2806
Group, Explicit	-0.6875	2.6512
Personal, Explicit	1.1250	3.3837
Impersonal, Explicit	-0.3750	3.6674
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.6250	2.6299
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-0.4375	3.3260
Nude Male, Explicit	0.3125	2.7256
Nude Female, Explicit	3.8750	1.1474
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.5000	3.5213
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-3.5000	1.8257
Scale Responses--Pleasantness Scale:		
Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.5000	2.4494
Cunnilingus, Explicit	-1.1250	2.6044
Group, Nonexplicit	2.5000	2.2211
Group, Explicit	-0.1875	2.6887
Personal, Explicit	1.3750	2.7049
Impersonal, Explicit	0.2500	3.3763
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	2.2500	1.9832
Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	0.2500	2.5948
Nude Male, Explicit	-0.8125	2.3443
Nude Female, Explicit	3.1875	1.5585

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.8750	2.5527
Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-1.7500	2.2060

APPENDIX C

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION VALUES PER SLIDE BY FEMALES

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values
per Slide by Females

Slide: Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.5850	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.3454	-0.4221	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.4416	0.2536	0.2065	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.4923	-0.4340	0.3654	0.6096	1.0000
	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Cunnilingus, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0557	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.1104	-0.0590	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.5174	-0.1199	-0.5011	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2949	-0.3804	0.6080	-0.0124	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Group, Nonexplicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.3952	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.3242	-0.4436	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.2114	0.1252	0.6828*	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.4665	-0.6886*	0.7351*	0.4371	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Group, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0478	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.1609	-0.5461	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.4975	-0.3901	0.0875	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.1752	-0.7719*	0.6594*	0.0445	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Personal, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.2251	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.4365	-0.0213	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.1108	0.2746	0.3078	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.1156	-0.2426	0.7158	0.1240	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Impersonal, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0552	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.0936	-0.3512	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.0735	-0.0067	0.7254*	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.1401	-0.3712	0.8722**	0.7288*	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.1948	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.3825	-0.6378	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.0028	-0.4721	0.2089	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2906	-0.8203**	0.7151*	0.6150	1.0000
	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0300	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.3757	-0.1423	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.1878	-0.5054	-0.2859	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.6533	0.0766	0.0346	0.1190	1.0000

Behavioral Response
Pornography Scale
Sexual Stimulation Scale
Physical Attractiveness Scale
Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Nude Male, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.3437	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.4298	-0.3670	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.3180	0.1455	0.0917	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.0521	-0.4172	0.7823*	0.0931	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Nude Female, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.3030	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.4650	0.2827	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.2525	-0.4725	-0.8547**	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.1090	-0.7932*	-0.2068	0.4213	1.0000

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.6103	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.6646	0.4949	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.3088	-0.1118	0.3129	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.1853	-0.3446	0.4586	0.5118	1.0000

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.3602	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.0497	-0.1684	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.3308	-0.3087	0.0594	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2506	-0.1260	0.6752*	0.4398	1.0000
	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 7

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

APPENDIX D

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION VALUES PER SLIDE BY MALES

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values
per Slide by Males

Slide: Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.2465	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.3936	-0.0327	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.3111	-0.1929	0.1222	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.4335	-0.4746	0.4367	0.3154	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Cunnilingus, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.0745	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.3265	-0.2238	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.2244	-0.2438	0.0527	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2670	-0.7610**	0.4466	0.0855	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Group, Nonexplicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.3302	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.1049	-0.5770*	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.1394	-0.5290*	0.3865	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.1427	-0.5523*	0.8645**	0.5352*	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Group, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.2520	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.2499	-0.0130	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.1685	-0.1351	0.6369**	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.3626	-0.2930	0.7315**	0.8224**	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Personal, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.4431	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.3864	-0.0713	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.3783	0.0559	0.6018*	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.4381	-0.4853	0.5746*	0.4534	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Impersonal, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.1358	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.2869	-0.0473	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.0696	-0.0958	0.6750**	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.1148	-0.3539	0.6921**	0.7241**	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.1965	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.4084	-0.4378	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.3609	-0.-196	0.5413*	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.4140	-0.4672	0.8382**	0.5688*	1.0000

Behavioral Response

Pornography Scale

Sexual Stimulation Scale

Physical Attractiveness Scale

Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.4214	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.0290	-0.1336	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.1992	0.0013	0.8090**	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2000	-0.2782	0.8258**	0.6855**	1.0000

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Nude Male, Explicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0246	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.1776	0.2135	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.1126	-0.4433	0.3286	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.1908	-0.1924	0.4601	0.5536*	1.0000
	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Nude Female, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.0085	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.0985	-0.5392*	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.0263	-0.2924	0.3294	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.0168	-0.5657*	0.6484**	0.6850**	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit

Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	-0.3132	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	0.2560	-0.3074	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	0.2031	-0.6054*	0.4133	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	0.3379	-0.4450	0.7060**	0.5488**	1.0000

Behavioral Response

Pornography Scale

Sexual Stimulation Scale

Physical Attractiveness Scale

Pleasantness Scale

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Slide: Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit

	Behavioral Response	Pornography Scale	Sexual Stimulation Scale	Physical Attractiveness Scale	Pleasantness Scale
Behavioral Response	1.0000				
Pornography Scale	0.0708	1.0000			
Sexual Stimulation Scale	-0.3156	-0.3038	1.0000		
Physical Attractiveness Scale	-0.1442	-0.1046	0.4003	1.0000	
Pleasantness Scale	-0.2882	-0.3536	0.6993**	0.7945**	1.0000

---

df = 14

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

APPENDIX E

CORRELATED SAMPLE $\underline{t}$ TESTS OF SCALE RESPONSES PER STIMULUS PAIR BY FEMALES

Correlated Sample t Tests of Pornography Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	-0.6666		
			3.3332	3.244*
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	2.6666		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	-0.4444		
			3.8888	5.292**
	Group, Explicit	3.4444		
#3	Personal, Explicit	1.5555		
			1.8889	1.782
	Impersonal, Explicit	3.4444		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.5555		
			1.8889	2.884*
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	2.4444		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	-2.6666		
			2.0000	2.268
	Nude Female, Explicit	-0.6666		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	0.4444		
			1.5556	1.456
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	2.0000		

df = 8

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample t Tests of Sexual Stimulation Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	0.4444		
			-0.8888	-0.5946
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-0.4444		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	0.3333		
			-1.111	-0.9578
	Group, Explicit	-0.7777		
#3	Personal, Explicit	0.3333		
			0.4444	0.5431
	Impersonal, Explicit	0.7777		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	-0.2222		
			0.0000	0.0000
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-0.2222		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	0.4444		
			-2.7777	-2.519*
	Nude Female, Explicit	-2.3333		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.4444		
			-2.6666	-3.411**
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-1.2222		

df = 8

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample *t* Tests of Physical Attractiveness Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	*t*
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.8888		
			-4.2221	-3.487**
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.3333		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	3.1111		
			-3.7777	-2.932*
	Group, Explicit	-0.6666		
#3	Personal, Explicit	2.0000		
			-2.4444	-2.987*
	Impersonal, Explicit	-0.4444		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.7777		
			-3.8888	-4.357**
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-3.1111		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	2.6666		
			0.3334	0.4714
	Nude Female, Explicit	3.0000		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	3.2222		
			-5.7777	-3.982**
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-2.5555		

df = 8

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample t Tests of Pleasantness Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Females

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.7777		
			-3.9999	-4.311**
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.2222		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	1.7777		
			-3.3332	-2.949*
	Group, Explicit	-1.5555		
#3	Personal, Explicit	-0.6666		
			-0.2222	-0.4264
	Impersonal, Explicit	-0.8888		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.0000		
			-1.0000	-1.414
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	0.0000		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	1.8888		
			-1.8888	-2.884*
	Nude Female, Explicit	0.0000		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.4444		
			-3.4444	-4.608**
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-2.0000		

df = 8

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

APPENDIX F

CORRELATED SAMPLE *t* TESTS OF SCALE RESPONSES PER STIMULUS PAIR BY MALES

Correlated Sample t Tests of Pornography Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	0.1250		
			2.7500	2.321*
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	2.8750		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	-0.4375		
			3.4375	4.015**
	Group, Explicit	3.0000		
#3	Personal, Explicit	2.1250		
			1.1875	2.132*
	Impersonal, Explicit	3.3125		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	0.1875		
			2.6875	3.660**
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	2.8750		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	-0.3125		
			-1.0625	-1.577
	Nude Female, Explicit	-1.3750		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	0.6250		
			2.5000	2.660*
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	3.1250		

df = 15

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample t Tests of Sexual Stimulation Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.3750		
			-2.6875	-2.595*
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-1.3125		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	1.5000		
			-1.0625	-1.266
	Group, Explicit	0.4375		
#3	Personal, Explicit	1.6875		
			-0.1875	-0.5447
	Impersonal, Explicit	1.5000		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.8125		
			-0.5625	-0.6102
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	1.2500		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	-3.6250		
			5.8125	6.392**
	Nude Female, Explicit	2.1875		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.7500		
			-2.5000	-2.871*
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-0.7500		

df = 15

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample t Tests of Physical Attractiveness Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	2.0625		
			-4.125	-4.180**
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-2.0625		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	1.6875		
			-2.375	-2.517*
	Group, Explicit	-0.6875		
#3	Personal, Explicit	1.1250		
			-1.5000	-1.772
	Impersonal, Explicit	-0.3750		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	1.6250		
			-2.0625	-1.664
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	-0.4375		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	0.3125		
			3.5625	4.259**
	Nude Female, Explicit	3.8750		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.5000		
			-5.0000	-5.042**
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-3.5000		

df = 15

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

Correlated Sample t Tests of Pleasantness Scale Responses per Stimulus Pair by Males

	Stimulus Pair	Mean	Mean Difference	t
#1	Cunnilingus, Nonexplicit	1.5000		
			-2.625	-2.660*
	Cunnilingus, Explicit	-1.1250		
#2	Group, Nonexplicit	2.5000		
			-2.6875	-3.199**
	Group, Explicit	-0.1875		
#3	Personal, Explicit	1.3750		
			-1.125	-1.620
	Impersonal, Explicit	0.2500		
#4	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Nonexplicit	2.2500		
			-2.0000	-2.877*
	Intercourse Woman Dominant, Explicit	0.2500		
#5	Nude Male, Explicit	-0.8125		
			4.0000	4.725**
	Nude Female, Explicit	3.1875		
#6	Intercourse Rear Entry, Nonexplicit	1.8750		
			-3.625	-4.362**
	Intercourse Rear Entry, Explicit	-1.7500		

df = 15

*$p < .05$ for two-tailed test of significance

**$p < .01$ for two-tailed test of significance

APPENDIX G

RATING SCALES

Rating Scales*

1. How pornographic do you think the slide is?

5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
Not at all										Extremely

2. How sexually stimulating did you find the slide?

5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
Not at all										Extremely

3. How physically attractive do you find the model(s) or human anatomy slides?

5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Unattractive										Extremely Attractive

4. How pleasant or unpleasant did you find the slide?

5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Unpleasant										Extremely Pleasant

* For purposes of analysis, responses that fell to the left of the zero were assigned a negative (-) value and those to the right of the zero a positive (+) value.