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## Background

- We often present participants with a set of options from which to choose.
- Yet real-world decisions often lack pre-defined options
- Option generation is critical to decision-making It determines the options from which people choose
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between Sara and Ted in this sort of situation.

## Method

- 99 undergraduates: 68 females, 31 males
- Read a hypothetical scenario characteristic of sexual assault
- Generated options for preventing unwanted sexual activity (5+ mins.)
- Prompts varied in terms of additional explicitly stated goals
- Entered options into spreadsheet that recorded timestamp for each option

Given extended time, what is the range and nature of options that participants generate-i.e., their self-generated option set? And given findings that we often choose the first option we generate in time-pressured situations, what is the nature of the first options that participants generate? In this exploratory study, we began to examine these questions, focusing on a situation of significance to undergraduate students and society at large.

Open coding revealed a range of initiators and themes.
Most Common Initiators \& Themes


Some less common initiators: authority figures, peer leaders, organizations

First Options: Initiators \& Themes
Prior studies suggest that in real-world, time-constrained situations, participants may simply choose theif first generated option.

What did participants' first options look like?
Most Common Initiators \& Themes



"Extra themes and initiators were added when a goal condition or gender's
top 6 were not represented by the overall top 6 inititators and themes.

An emergent attribute, Offering an Excuse, is also noteworthy, characterizing on average $23 \%$ of all options, and $17 \%$ of first options.



## Some Sample Options

- Katie could join them as they walk upstairs (Re-frame)
- Sara could tell Ted that she isn't interested (Communicate)
- Jim can pretend that he needs Ted to help him with something (Offer an Out)
- Pull Ted to the side and distract him while Sara makes a run for the door (Extract)
- Ted stops getting Sara drinks (Maintain Judgment)
- Sara's friends could go over to Sara to see if everything is okay (Ask if OK)

Overall Option Diversity

| Number of Options Generated |  |  |  |  | Number of initiators Generated |  |  |  |  | Number of Themes Generated |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | sD | Max | Min |  | Mean | sD | Max |  |  | Mean | sD | Max |  |
| Overall | 15.1 | 5.9 | 35 | 5 | Overall | 4.9 | 2.0 | 12 | 1 | Overall | 6.5 | 1.8 | 12 | 2 |
| Females | 16.5 | 6.2 | 35 | 5 | Females | 5.1 | 2.1 | 12 | 1 | Females | 6.8 | 1.6 | 12 | 2 |
| Males | 12.1 | 4.1 | 20 | 6 | Males | 4.7 | 1.7 | 9 | 2 | Males | 5.9 | 2.0 | 9 | 2 |
| Base Goal | 16.8 | 6.4 | 28 | 6 | Base Goal | 5.2 | 1.7 | 9 | 3 | Base Goal | 6.6 | 1.6 | 9 | 4 |
| + Safety | 14.6 | 7.1 | 35 | 5 | + Safety | 5.7 | 2.4 | 12 | 2 | + Safety | 6.6 | 1.9 | 12 | 3 |
| + Social | 15.0 | 5.2 | 31 | 7 | + Social | 4.5 | 1.6 | 8 | 2 | + Social | 6.0 | 2.2 | 9 | 2 |
| + Safety $\&$ Social | 13.9 | 4.8 | 24 | 5 | + Safety $\&$ Social | 4.4 | 2.0 | 10 | 1 | + Safety \& Social | 6.8 | 1.4 | 9 | 4 |
| Summary Points |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | All Options |  |  | First Options |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

All Options

- Females generated more options, initiators, and themes than males; an overarching goal yielded more options than additional goals
- Options involving excuses were more commonly generated by females and in goal conditions with a social component


## First Options

- Interestingly, excuses were again more common among options generated by females, but less likely in conditions with a social component


## Reflections

- Participant-generated options are a rich source of data, with each option embodying multiple components and characteristics (e.g., initiator, theme), even beyond those represented here (e.g., recipient).
- Option characteristics may be:
anticipated (e.g., extract) or emergent (e.g., excuse)
situation-general (e.g, an initiator) or situation-specific (e.g.,
authority figure)
- Examination of option set characteristics can reveal both patterns and individual variability in the options people consider in a particular situation
e.g., In a possible sexual-assault scenario,
- The potential victim may be commonly viewed as more responsible for taking action than others-even the potential perpetrator.
- Both explicit and implicit goals may impact the kinds of options participants think of, such as generating more options involving excuses if one wants to maintain social relationships.
- Participant-generated options can valuably inform decision-making interventions.
e.g., Do participants generate effective, evidence-based options?
- If not, interventions can seek to highlight these.
- If so, interventions can target other aspects of the decisionmaking process.
- Exploratory studies can offer meaningful directions for future, more systematic and statistical investigation

