

THE USE AND ACCEPTANCE OF SEXUALLY AGGRESSIVE
TACTICS IN COLLEGE MEN

A thesis presented to
the faculty of
the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science

Jennifer B. Warkentin

August 2004

This thesis entitled
THE USE AND ACCEPTANCE OF SEXUALLY AGGRESSIVE
TACTICS IN COLLEGE MEN

BY
JENNIFER B. WARKENTIN

has been approved for
the Department of Psychology
and the College of Arts and Sciences by

Christine A. Gidycz
Associate Professor of Psychology

Leslie A. Flemming
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

WARKENTIN, JENNIFER B. M.S. August 2004. Clinical Psychology.

The Use and Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics in College Men (130pp.)

Director of Thesis: Christine A. Gidycz

The purpose of the present study is to examine the use of sexually aggressive tactics among perpetrators, as well as predictors of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. Participants included 297 male undergraduate students from a Midwestern university, who filled out instruments assessing for acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics, a history of sexual aggression, and other personality characteristics.

A history of sexual aggression was reported by 21% of the participants. An analysis of the acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics measure indicated the presence of two components: Overt and Covert Tactics. Further, a history of sexually aggressive behavior, sensation seeking, and adherence to traditional gender roles were found to predict acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. Support for the acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics measure was found in both the successful principal components analysis, and the measure's ability to be predicted by variables previously found to be related to sexual aggression.

Approved:

Christine A. Gidycz

Associate Professor of Psychology

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who have played a very important role in the creation and completion of this project. I would like to first express my sincere appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Christine Gidycz, for providing me with invaluable advice and encouragement throughout the process of completing this thesis. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Drs. John Garske and Bruce Carlson, for their valuable time and input on this project. In addition, I am grateful to my undergraduate research assistants, Jeff Bartlett, Evan Dicken, and Rob Shoecraft, for their hard work and assistance in data collection. Finally, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my boyfriend, Paul, as well as to my family and friends for all their support.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
List of Tables	8
Overview	9
Introduction	11
Definitions of Rape and Sexual Assault	11
Prevalence Rates	12
Risk Factors for Sexual Assault.....	15
Rape Tactics	25
Drug Tactics	26
Power Tactics	31
Rationale of the Present Study	33
Hypotheses	37
Method	38
Participants.....	38
Measures.....	41
Procedure	50
Results	54
Rates of Sexual Aggression	54
Assault Characteristics	56
Packet Order	58
Bivariate Analyses	58
Data Reduction on the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire	67

Relationship between Tactic Usage and Perpetrator's Relationship to the Victim.....	71
Relationship between Covert and Overt Sexually Aggressive Tactics	73
Regression Analysis	73
Discussion	76
Primary Hypotheses	76
Secondary Findings.....	79
Limitations	80
Implications	81
Conclusions.....	82
References	83
Appendices	94
A-1. Consent Form (Time 1).....	94
A-2. Debriefing Form (Time 1).....	96
A-3. Consent Form (Time 2).....	97
A-4. Debriefing Form (Time 2).....	99
B-1. Subject Number Calculation Form	100
C-1. Demographics Questionnaire	101
C-2. Hypergender Ideology Scale	107
C-3. Sexual Experiences Survey.....	108
C-4. Sexual Strategies Questionnaire	120
C-5. Self-report Psychopathy Scale	122
C-6. Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire- Impulsive Sensation Seeking Subscale	124

C-7.	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	126
C-8.	Filler Items	127

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Participant Demographics	39
2. Descriptives from the Pilot Studies for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire	45
3. Descriptives for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire in the Current Study	47
4. Measures Included in Packets A and B.....	51
5. Variables and Measures.....	53
6. History of Sexually Aggressive Behavior.....	55
7. Chi-Square Analyses of Assault Characteristics	57
8. Categorical Predictor and Demographic Variables and History of Perpetration...	60
9. Continuous Predictor Variables and History of Perpetration	62
10. Correlations for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire	68
11. Three Factor Solution for Sexual Strategies Questionnaire Items	69
12. Varimax Rotation of Two Factor Solution for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire Items	70
13. Relationship Between Tactic Usage and Perpetrator's Relationship to the Victim	72
14. Correlations Among Variables Predicting Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics	74
15. Standard Multiple Regression Predicting Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics	75

Overview

Sexual assault, ranging from sexually aggressive contact to rape, is prevalent on college campuses, with 53.8% of college women in a national study reporting some form of sexual victimization (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987). Further, the majority of sexual assaults occurring on college campuses are committed by an offender known to the victim, such as an acquaintance or date, as opposed to a stranger (Abbey, McAuslan & Ross, 1998).

A variety of factors can be identified as contributing to the perpetration of sexual assault, including developmental and socialization factors, beliefs and personality characteristics, and situational factors. Developmental and socialization factors encompass such areas as membership in an all-male group and degree of pornography usage. Several researchers have found that members of all-male fraternities and athletic teams are significantly more likely to both commit an act of sexual aggression (Boeringer, Shehan & Akers, 1991; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Loh, 2002), and to hold rape-supportive beliefs (Boeringer, 1999). The relationship between pornography usage and sexual aggression, however, remain inconclusive (Seto, Maric, & Barbaree, 2001).

Beliefs and personality characteristics of sexually aggressive men have also received a great deal of attention in the literature. Sexually aggressive and coercive behavior has consistently been linked to adherence to traditional gender roles (e.g., Loh, 2002; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1991) and acceptance of the sexually coercive behaviors of others (e.g., Kanin, 1985; Koss & Dinero, 1988). Similarly, personality characteristics that have been linked to sexual aggression include psychopathy (Lalumiere & Quinsey, 1996) and sensation seeking (Seto, Lalumiere, & Quinsey, 1995).

Situational factors associated with sexual assault have also been examined at length. The perpetrator's relationship to the victim appears to exert some degree of

influence over the victim's response to the attack, in that more violent victim responses are related to less intimacy between the perpetrator and the victim (Kanin, 1969).

Additionally, forced-sex scenarios that take place between a man and a woman that have previously had sexual intercourse are less likely to be viewed as coercive (Emmers-Sommer, 2002).

The specific rape tactics used by perpetrators was examined by Cleveland, Koss and Lyons (1999) in their study of unstructured narratives by rape victims. An analysis of the coercive behaviors in these narratives revealed two primary factors: Drug Tactics and Power Tactics. Cleveland and colleagues (1999) concluded that the two primary tactics are not significantly correlated to one another; however, the degree of tactic usage was related to the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim.

Specifically, the use of Drug Tactics was primarily associated with acquaintance or date rape, while the use of Power Tactics was related to stranger rape (Cleveland et al., 1999).

The purpose of the present study is to examine both the use of sexually aggressive tactics among perpetrators, and the acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. A factor analysis was conducted on a measure of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics to determine if the primary factors for perpetrators differed from those derived by victim reports. These factors were then examined in relation to self-reports of a history of sexual assault. Further, acceptance of traditional gender roles, psychopathy, and sensation seeking were assessed and examined in the contexts of use and acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. Finally, fraternity membership, athletic participation and pornography usage were assessed in relation to the use and acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics.

Introduction

Definitions of Rape and Sexual Assault

While rape and sexual assault have varying definitions and levels of severity, legal definitions have traditionally been narrow and conservative. In 1961, Ohio state law defined rape as an act of sexual conduct committed by force against a woman without her consent (Ohio Revised Code §5924.120, 1961). More recently, statutes have expanded this definition to include the administration of a drug, intoxicant or controlled substance, either surreptitiously or by the use of force (Ohio Revised Code §§28907.01-2907.02, 1998), and have further defined sexual conduct as the penetration, however slight, of the vagina, mouth or anus by the penis, hand, finger or other object (Ohio Revised Code §§28907.01-2907.02, 1998). However, the Uniform Crime Report, issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), still defines forcible rape simply as “the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will” (FBI, 2004a).

Conversely, researchers have generally included much broader definitions of sexual assault. These definitions are not uniform, however, so the terms must be clarified in each instance. One of the more commonly used definitions is the five levels of sexual assault identified by Koss and Oros (1982). The five levels, which will also be used in the current study, are defined as follows, in order from least to most severe: (a) *not sexually aggressive*: no history of sexually aggressive behavior; (b) *sexually aggressive contact*: the use of continual arguments, one’s authority, or physical force to coerce a woman into sex play, including fondling, kissing or petting, but not sexual intercourse, (c) *attempted rape*: the use of physical force, alcohol, or drugs to attempt sexual intercourse with a woman, but intercourse did not occur, (d) *sexual coercion*: the use of authority, continual arguments and pressure to compel a woman into sexual

intercourse, and (e) *rape*: the use of alcohol, drugs, or physical force to coerce a woman into sexual intercourse, including anal and oral sex.

While Koss and Oros (1982) defined sexual assault broadly, other researchers have chosen more narrow definitions of sexual assault and rape. For example, in the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS), women were considered victims of sexual assault if they “had ever in their lifetime been forced or threatened by a man or woman to have anal, oral or vaginal intercourse,” thus eliminating those instances when drugs or alcohol were used to obtain sexual intercourse (p. 58; Brecklin & Ullman, 2002).

Prevalence Rates

Determining the prevalence rate of sexual assault has been difficult not only because victims often do not report the crime to the police, but because they themselves may not define the act as a sexual assault. Efforts to establish accurate prevalence rates are further hindered by the varying definitions used both by researchers and criminal justice agencies. Regardless, several attempts have been made to determine the nationwide prevalence rates of sexual assault for women. The Uniform Crime Report states that 95,136 forcible rapes were reported in the year 2002, or about 33 rapes per 100,000 female inhabitants (FBI, 2004a), with preliminary results from 2003 indicating a 1.9% decrease in forcible rapes (FBI, 2004b). It should be noted, however, that this estimate includes only those cases that are reported to the police or other authorities, and it has been estimated that only 16% of rape cases are ever reported (Kilpatrick, Edmonds, & Seymour, 1992). Further, the rates of false rape allegations have been found to range between 10% (Theilade & Thomsen, 1986) to 41% (Kanin, 1994) of all rapes reported annually, further complicating attempts to establish accurate statistics.

In an effort to include those women who do not report their assaults to the police, and thus determine more accurate estimates of prevalence rates, other studies have

been conducted at the national and local levels. The NVAWS involved the administration of telephone interviews between 1995 and 1996, to a randomly chosen national sample of 8,000 women aged 18 years and older (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002). Their findings revealed that, at some point during their lives, 18.1% of the respondents reported an attempted or completed rape (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002). Similarly, the National Study of Health and Life Experiences of Women surveyed 1,099 females aged 21 years or older and found that 22% of respondents reported a history of unwanted sexual experiences (Ullman & Brecklin, 2000).

The prevalence of rape on college campuses is even higher than that among the general population. In a national study of university students, Koss and colleagues (1987) found that 53.8% of women reported some form of sexual victimization, including sexual contact (14.4%), sexual coercion (11.9%), attempted rape (12.1%), and rape (15.4%). Thus, 27.5% of college women in this study reported experiencing an act that is legally defined as rape or attempted rape. Similarly, Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) found that 14.7% of undergraduate women in their study reported experiencing a completed rape. A more recent national study of university students found that 20% of female respondents reported having sex forced on them against their will at some point during their lives (Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999), indicating that prevalence rates among college students have changed little over the past 20 years.

Also of importance is the fact that acquaintances or dates commit the majority of sexual assaults occurring on college campuses. According to victim reports, 84% of reported sexual assaults involved a known offender, with 57% of the aggressors classified as dates (Koss et al., 1987). Among victims of rape, 52% of respondents reported that the perpetrator was a casual or steady date, while only 11% reported being assaulted by a stranger (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). Similarly, over half of

college men report committing a sexual assault with a dating partner, while reported stranger rapes tend to be very rare (Abbey et al., 1998; Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003).

Perpetrator reports of sexual assault, however, vary greatly from victim reports. Koss and colleagues (1987) found that only 25.1% of men reported having committed some form of sexual assault. Specifically, 10.2% reported sexual contact, 7.2% reported sexual coercion, 3.3% reported attempted rape, and 4.4% reported rape (Koss et al., 1987). Brener and colleagues (1999) similarly found that only 4% of men reported forcing a woman to have sexual intercourse, while a much higher reporting rate was found by Muehlenhard and Linton (1987), with 57.3% of men reporting having committed some form of sexually aggressive behavior, and 7.1% reporting rape. Further, an examination of the number of acts reported by both victims and perpetrators revealed “virtually identical” reporting rates, indicating that the discrepancy is due more to perpetrators underreporting their behavior, than to a few extremely sexually active men sexually assaulting a large number of women (p. 169; Koss et al., 1987).

Thus, varying definitions and methods of obtaining victim reports complicate efforts to determine accurate prevalence rates. However, fairly consistent statistics have been reported over the years. These statistics indicate that between 18% and 22% of adult women, and between 20% and 27.5% of college women, have experienced an attempted or completed rape during their lives. Results also indicate that sexual assault occurring on college campuses are more likely to be committed by acquaintances or dates. Further, the discrepancy between perpetrator and victim reports of sexual assault appear to be the result of more perpetrators inaccurately reporting their behavior, rather than a small number of men sexually assaulting a large number of women.

Risk Factors for Sexual Assault

Developmental and Socialization Factors. Members of all-male peer groups, such as social fraternities and athletic teams, have been found to demonstrate significantly more sexually aggressive behavior and adherence to rape myths than men who do not belong to such groups. An examination of rape myth acceptance among members of fraternities and athletic teams revealed that 56% of the athletes were more accepting of rape myths than the control group (Boeringer, 1999). All-male social fraternity members were also found to be significantly more likely than the control group to positively endorse rape myth statements, including “women have a secret desire to be raped” and “women like to be physically ‘roughed up’” (Boeringer, 1999). When the frequency of strongly agreeing with the rape myth supportive statements was examined, a maximum of only 3% of the control group strongly agreed with any one statement, while up to 7% of fraternity members and 15.4% of athletes strongly agreed with at least one of the statements (Boeringer, 1999). Thus, not only are members of fraternities or athletic teams significantly more likely to accept certain rape myths, these groups tend to demonstrate a stronger adherence to such myths.

Acts of sexual aggression have also been found to be significantly more likely to occur among all-male social fraternity members (Boeringer, 1996; Boeringer et al., 1991; Fritner & Robinson, 1993; Loh, 2002). Although fraternity members do not differ from non-fraternity members in self-perceived likelihood to commit sexual assault, fraternity members do report using significantly more nonphysical force (Boeringer et al., 1991) and drugs or alcohol (Boeringer, 1996) to coerce a female into having sex. Furthermore, reports of having raped a woman do not differ significantly between fraternity and non-fraternity members, indicating a lack of understanding or acknowledgement on the part of fraternity members that their behaviors are coercive and assaultive (Boeringer et al.,

1991). Other researchers (Koss & Gaines, 1993; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996), however, have failed to find that fraternity membership made a significant contribution to the prediction of sexual aggression.

Athletic membership has also been found to be significantly related to sexual aggression (Fritner & Robinson, 1993; Koss & Gaines, 1993), and a greater proclivity for rape (Boeringer, 1996). Further, an examination of judicial affairs records demonstrated that male undergraduate student-athletes were overrepresented in reports of sexual assault and battering (Crosset, Ptacek, McDonald, & Benedict, 1996). Other researchers, however, have failed to demonstrate significant relationships between athletic participation and a history of sexually aggressive behavior (e.g. Caron, Halteman, & Stacy, 1997). Interestingly, while Boeringer (1996) found that student athletes reported a greater proclivity for rape, he did not find significant differences with respect to actual reports of sexual aggression.

Numerous theories have been posited to explain the inconsistencies in findings regarding fraternity membership and athletic participation, including level of risk, environmental factors, and peer support. Humphrey and Kahn (2000) theorize differences in the literature could be attributed to variations among high-risk and low-risk groups of social fraternity members and athletes. In their study, fraternities and athletic teams were defined as perceived high- or low-risk, based on student ratings of the “extent to which the group’s parties create an atmosphere conducive to sexual offenses” (p. 1316; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Perceived high-risk groups were found to report committing significantly more acts of sexual aggression than the perceived low-risk group (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Additionally, the perceived high-risk groups demonstrated significantly greater levels of hostility towards women, peer support for sexual assault, and drinking intensity and frequency than perceived low-risk groups

(Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Thus, results regarding the prevalence of sexual assault among both fraternities and athletic teams might vary as a function of each group's behaviors regarding alcohol consumption and peer support for sexual assault.

Likewise, Martin & Hummer (1989) argue that the environment of fraternities and athletic teams contribute to the higher proportion of sexually aggressive behaviors. Specifically, they argue that the lack of supervision of fraternity houses contributes to the ability to use alcohol more frequently, which may lead to an increase in sexual assaults (Martin & Hummer, 1989). Further, the fraternity norms, including secrecy, competitiveness, preoccupation with loyalty, and protection of the group contribute to a general atmosphere that denigrates women, and encourages the use of women as sexual conquests (Martin & Hummer, 1989). Similarly, Caron and colleagues (1997) found that, even after controlling for athletic participation, competitiveness was highly correlated with hostility towards women and a history of sexual aggression. This led to the authors' suggestion that it is the characteristics of athletes that should be examined rather than athletic membership per se (Caron et al., 1997). Boeringer (1996), however, failed to find that residence in an all-male environment itself was significantly related to a history of sexual aggression.

Finally, Schwartz & DeKeseredy (1997) explain differences among various fraternity and athletic groups using a male peer support model, which attributes some of sexually aggressive behavior to the presence of sexually aggressive friends and a general climate of tolerance. In fact, male peer support and the presence of sexually aggressive friends have been found to be the best predictors for sexually aggressive behavior (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Alder, 1985). Further, fraternity members are significantly more likely to associate with other men who engage in behavior that is coercive or violent (Boeringer et al., 1991). It should also be noted, however, that many

of the rituals conducive to committing a sexual assault, such as male bonding and vows of secrecy, are not unique to fraternities and athletic teams (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Thus, any group of men following similar rituals could provide an environment conducive to committing a sexual assault.

Another aspect of development and socialization factors that remains inconclusive is the extent to which pornography usage contributes to sexually aggressive behavior. An increase in positive attitudes toward pornography has been significantly correlated with an increased likelihood among men to blame the rape victim (Caron & Carter, 1997). Similarly, DeKeseredy (1997) found exposure to pornographic media significantly contributed to sexual abuse among Canadian college dating partners. Any findings of a direct link between sexual aggression and pornography usage, however, could also be attributed to the interaction between individual characteristics and pornography exposure (Seto et al., 2001).

In summary, the developmental and socialization factors addressed in the current study include fraternity membership, athletic participation, and pornography usage. Not only have fraternity members been found to be more accepting of rape myths, they also report engaging in more sexually aggressive acts. Similarly, college athletes have been found to be overrepresented in reports of interpersonal violence. Theories for these phenomena include a focus on environmental factors and male peer-support models, which claim that sexually aggressive behavior can be fueled by both environments conducive to sexual assaults and the presence of sexually aggressive friends.

Beliefs and Personality Characteristics of Sexually Aggressive Men. Sexually aggressive and coercive behavior has consistently been linked to adherence to traditional gender roles (e.g., Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Loh, 2002; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1991; O'Donohue, McKay, & Schewe, 1996), and the sexually

coercive behaviors of others (e.g., Kanin, 1985; Koss & Dinero, 1988; Petty & Dawson, 1989). Similarly, research has demonstrated a positive relationship between greater levels of dominance and a history of sexually aggressive behavior (Petty & Dawson, 1989). Macho personality traits, which include a desire to dominate other people, are also significantly correlated to both aggressive behavior after drinking (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984), and a history of sexually aggressive behavior (Mosher & Anderson, 1986).

Men who are more accepting of traditional or stereotypical gender roles are also more likely to use strategies such as verbal coercion, getting the woman intoxicated, and rape in order to obtain sexual intercourse than are men who are less accepting of such roles (Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1991). In addition, rapists demonstrated more adherence to the principles of traditional gender roles and male sexual dominance than did verbally coercive or noncoercive men (Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1991). Lastly, Malamuth and Thornhill (1994) found that high scores on measures of sexual aggression and hostile masculinity predicted male participants' domineeringness in conversations with females, but not other males.

Numerous studies have also found that some men believe sexual coercion to be at least marginally acceptable in certain situations, particularly if they have used such tactics themselves. Kanin (1985) discovered that 86% of a sample of rapists, as compared to 19% of the control group, believed that rape could generally be justified. In addition, sexually aggressive men are more likely than nonsexually aggressive men to believe that the use of force and coercion are acceptable ways to obtain sex (Koss & Dinero, 1988), and that it is normal for aggression to interact with sexuality (Koss et al., 1985). Similarly, Petty and Dawson (1989) found that acceptance of the use of force to obtain sex in various situations made a significant contribution to differentiating sexual aggressors from nonaggressors. As was expected, men who reported frequently using

force in sexual experiences were more likely to find the use of force acceptable than men who reported rarely using force in sexual experiences (Petty & Dawson, 1989).

The acceptability of various date rape scenarios was examined by Jenkins and Dambrot (1987), who found that men with a history of sexual aggression differed from nonsexually aggressive men in their perception of rape. Specifically, sexually aggressive men consistently indicated more victim blame and were more likely to believe that the victim wanted to have sexual intercourse, regardless of the dating situation (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). Such men were also less likely to consider the assailant's behavior to be violent, or to agree that a rape had occurred (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). Interestingly, men who had a history of less severe acts of sexual aggression reported attributions that were more similar to those of men whose acts have a higher level of severity, than men whose acts have a moderate level of severity (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). Thus, the relationship between the levels of severity of sexual aggression and rape attributions appears to be curvilinear in nature instead of linear, indicating that rape attributions may have more to do with the perpetrator's characteristics than with the victim's response to the attack (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). Such attributions also enable the perpetrator to take less responsibility for his actions, thus allowing him to justify his behavior on the basis that the woman deserved it (Koss & Cleveland, 1997).

Consistent with the findings regarding acceptance of sexual aggression, research has found that perpetrators are more likely to be proud of their behavior, and less likely to feel guilty or remorseful (Koss, 1989). In a national study of college students, very few of the perpetrators viewed their actions as rape (12%) and almost half reported that they intended to engage in such behaviors again in the future (47%, Koss, 1989). Further, sexually aggressive college men may perceive token resistance on the part of the victim

as justifying their behavior, thereby dismissing the victim's refusal for sexual intercourse or viewing their role as that of persuading the victim to comply (Loh, 2002).

In addition to beliefs, a variety of personality characteristics have also been linked to sexually aggressive behavior, including psychopathy and sensation seeking. Psychopathy has frequently been examined as a variable contributing to sexual aggression, although results have been somewhat mixed. Psychopathy has been found to be among the greatest indicators of risk for sexual coercion (Lalumiere & Quinsey, 1996), and has been shown to act as a general predictor of recidivism for both sexual and violent offenses (Quinsey, Rice, & Harris, 1995). Conversely, Malamuth (1989) found psychoticism made only a marginally significant contribution when predicting sexual aggression. Further, in their review of previous studies of incarcerated rapists, Koss and Leonard (1984) found that, while clinical impressions consistently identified psychopathic characteristics, very little empirical evidence existed to support their presence with either incarcerated rapists or college men's self-reports.

Psychopathy has been associated with other personality characteristics such as deception (Seto, Khattar, Lalumiere & Quinsey 1997), opportunism, impulsiveness, and callousness (Lalumiere & Quinsey, 1996). Lalumiere and colleagues (Lalumiere, Chalmers, Quinsey, & Seto, 1996) posited that such personality traits would be consistent with findings that sexually aggressive men prefer, and have been successful at, opportunistic and short-term approaches to obtaining sexual intercourse, such that they have little to no interest in attempting to manage a long-term approach like those preferred by women. Further, it has been hypothesized that sexually aggressive men who prefer to attack complete strangers, as opposed to those who prefer to attack acquaintances, may possess more of the psychopathic characteristics often found among criminals of other violent crimes (Koss et al., 1985). Support for that position

comes in part from an examination of 34 cases of incarcerated drug-facilitated sexual assault perpetrators, which found that they presented with significantly more pathological narcissism than psychopathy (Welner, 2001).

Consistent with Lalumiere's theory regarding the sexual strategies of sexually aggressive men, sensation seeking is higher among sexually coercive men than nonsexually coercive men (Seto et al., 1995). Further, a major component of sensation seeking, impulsivity, has also been found to be related to sexual aggression (Spence, Losoff, & Robbins, 1991). Petty and Dawson (1989) found that impulsivity made a minor but significant contribution to differentiating men on the basis of sexual aggression, and was positively correlated with a history of sexually aggressive behavior.

Finally, research has demonstrated that sexually aggressive men have had more sexual experiences than nonsexually coercive men, and often engage in their first sexual experience at an earlier age (Kanin, 1985; Lalumiere et al., 1996; Loh, 1999).

Regardless of their higher rate of sexual experiences, however, perpetrators report dissatisfaction with the amount of sexual intercourse they have experienced, and desire more partners (Kanin, 1985; Lalumiere et al., 1996). Interestingly, Lalumiere and colleagues (1996) found that, even after controlling for sexual experience, men with a history of sexual coercion desire significantly more partner variety and casual sex than nonsexually coercive men. Thus, it does not appear that a perpetrator's greater number of sexual experiences leads to a larger desire for sexual experiences; rather, their level of desire for sexual experiences is greater from the outset.

In summary, a variety of beliefs and personality characteristics have been linked to sexually aggressive behaviors. Adherence to traditional gender roles and dominance have been found to be significantly related to sexual aggression, particularly through the use of verbal coercion. Research has also demonstrated that acceptance of sexually

coercive behaviors is associated with the use of force in sexual experiences, although the relationship between such acceptance and the level of severity may be curvilinear in nature. Similarly, psychopathy and sensation seeking have been found to be correlated with a history of sexual coercion.

Situational Factors. The context within which the perpetrator chooses a tactic must also be examined. Sexually aggressive men may seek out environments where aggressive behavior is accepted, perhaps even encouraged, such as with some social fraternities and athletic teams (Koss & Cleveland, 1997). Additionally, sexually aggressive men may regulate their interactions with specific kinds of women in order to decrease a female's resistance to sexual coercion (Koss & Cleveland, 1997). This can include targeting women who are at a bar or are wearing seductive clothing, then using alcohol as a tactic to facilitate a sexual assault (Koss & Cleveland, 1997). Similarly, Craig, Kalichman, and Follingstad (1989) posited that verbally coercive males may take an active role in creating situations where coercion is more likely to take place, such as altering or seeking out particular situations. Such behaviors aim to ensure that the perpetrator's responsibility will be less apparent, in addition to decreasing the victim's credibility (Koss & Cleveland, 1997).

The perpetrator's relationship to the victim is another factor that appears to exert some degree of control over the specific tactic chosen. For instance, assaults where the perpetrator and the victim are more intimate typically involve less aggression and are less severe in nature. Koss (1989) found that between 70% and 86% of victims of lesser forms of aggression were committed by a dating partner, whereas only 57% of rapes included dating couples. Similarly, sexual coercion is more likely to be committed by a steady dating partner, while strangers or acquaintances are more likely to commit rape

(Abbey, Ross, McDuffie & McAuslan, 1996). In addition, rapes and attempted rapes were found to include more violence than did lesser forms of aggression (Koss, 1989).

The victim's response to the assault also appears to vary as a function of her relationship to the perpetrator. Kanin (1969) discovered that more violent victim responses took place in instances where little closeness existed between the victim and the aggressor. Further, females who had known the aggressor or been dating were more apt to respond to an assault with quarrelling and crying than with screaming and fighting (Kanin, 1969).

Acceptance of sexual coercion has also consistently been found to differ as the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator varies. Specifically, as the intimacy of a couple's relationship increases, the perception that an act will be considered coercive decreases. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1991) found that when a couple had previously had sexual intercourse, men and women were more accepting of the use of verbal pressure and sexual stimulation to coerce a woman into having sex. Other studies have supported the notion that when a forced-sex scenario takes place between a man and a woman that have previously had sex, the situation is less likely to be viewed as coercive (Emmers-Sommer, 2002; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). This may be due, in part, to the belief that dating relationships should be sexual as well as romantic (Muehlenhard, Goggins, Jones, & Satterfield, 1991).

Intimacy level and dating stage also act as influencing factors in how a man reacts to a woman's refusal to engage in sexual intercourse (Quinn, Sanchez-Hucles, Coates & Gillen, 1991). Specifically, data indicated that as the level of previous intimacy increases, the man's use of threats or force and verbal persuasion also increased (Quinn et al., 1991). With regard to dating stages, those men who had been with their partners for longer periods of time and were more romantically involved were more likely

to respect the woman's refusals and stop their advances (Quinn et al., 1991). Consistent with these findings, Craig et al. (1989) found that men in steady dating situations were less willing to engage in verbal coercion, less likely to view having sex as achieving a goal, and reported more guilt over engaging in verbal coercion than men with first/second dates or acquaintances. In addition, the role of drunkenness and goal accomplishment increased as the two partners were less familiar with each other (Craig et al., 1989).

Thus, the environment within which a sexual assault occurs must also be considered, in that sexually aggressive men may prefer situations where their behaviors will be accepted. Similarly, the perpetrator's relationship to the victim appears to influence the degree of acceptability of the act, the level of aggression used, and the victim's response to the attack.

Rape Tactics

In order to better define the various tactics and strategies use by perpetrators, Cleveland and colleagues (1999) examined rape victims' reports for patterns of behavior. Rape tactics, as the authors termed them, were defined as "behaviors used by a male perpetrator to increase the chance of coercing his potential victim into unwanted sexual intercourse and to decrease the chance that she will report him for his behavior" (p. 533; Cleveland et al., 1999). Thus, rape tactics can include a wide range of behaviors, from verbal pressure to the use of a weapon.

To discover specific rape tactics, Cleveland and colleagues (1999) analyzed unstructured narratives from 257 rape victims. Results indicated that six primary types of coercive behavior were displayed by the perpetrator: (a) *promises of positive consequences*: the use of promises of affection or material goods in return for going along with the perpetrator's attempts to coerce, (b) *threats of negative consequences*:

threats of future harm to the victim or a loved one, or the withholding of material goods, (c) *demand for silence*: instructing the victim not to tell anyone about the assault, (d) *isolation*: putting the victim in an isolated situation and using that to enable the assault, (e) *alcohol*: the perpetrator uses alcohol as a tool to commit the assault, and (f) *drugs*: the perpetrator uses drugs as a tool to commit the assault (Cleveland et al., 1999).

These behaviors were combined with the categories of (g) *victim drug and alcohol use*, (h) *perpetrator drug and alcohol use*, (i) *use of force*, and (j) *use of a weapon* for the purpose of a factor analysis, which resulted in two main factors. The *Drug Tactic* factor included victim drug and alcohol use, perpetrator drug and alcohol use, use of drugs as a tactic and use of alcohol as a tactic, while the *Power Tactic* factor included the use of force, isolation, demand for silence and the use of a weapon. Promises of positive consequences and threats of negative consequences failed to significantly load onto either factor.

Drug Tactics

As noted above, drug tactics can include drug and alcohol use by both the victim and the perpetrator, as well as the tactical use of drugs or alcohol on the perpetrator's part to obtain intercourse. This finding is supported by a large body of research indicating the frequent presence of drugs and alcohol by both victims and perpetrators of sexual assaults (e.g., Abbey et al., 1996; Brecklin & Ullman, 2001; Copenhaver & Gruerholz, 1991; Koss, 1989; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Victim alcohol or drug use can contribute to sexual assaults in a variety of ways, including impairing cognitive and motor functioning which would lead to a decrease in both ability to resist an attack and likelihood to choose an effective defense strategy (Testa & Parks, 1996). Further, the use of drugs or alcohol by perpetrators can increase the likelihood of misperceptions,

which often leads to a sexual assault (Abbey et al., 1996), and may also lower the man's inhibitions (Testa & Parks, 1996).

Koss (1989) found that 55% of sexual assault victims reported drinking or using drugs prior to the assault, however, percentages as high as 79% have been reported (Copenhaver & Grauerholz, 1991). Further, a woman's chances of being sexually assaulted have been found to increase when she is consuming alcohol (Copenhaver & Grauerholz, 1991; Koss, 1989), and victims of completed rapes report drinking significantly more alcohol than victims of attempted rapes (Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawacki, and Buck, 2002). One explanation for the discrepancy between victims of completed versus attempted rapes centers around the deteriorating effects of alcohol on motor skills and cognitive functioning. However, current research has not yet clarified whether it is the consumption of alcohol that results in an increased vulnerability to sexual assault, or if a third variable, such as a particular lifestyle, contributes to the relationship (Testa & Parks, 1996).

In addition, alcohol-involved sexual assaults are more likely to include victims and perpetrators who are casual acquaintances or casual dates rather than intimates (Abbey et al., 2002; Testa & Parks, 1996). Abbey and colleagues (2002) speculate that this finding could be because women who are drinking tend to focus on cues related to their enjoyment or their date's level of interest, as opposed to those that might indicate threatening behavior (Abbey et al., 2002). These women, therefore, have lowered their guard and are failing to attend to salient cues, putting them at greater risk of being sexually assaulted.

Such findings are compounded by women's reports that they would be less likely to use physical resistance or verbal assertiveness in response to a sexual assault if they were drinking, further decreasing their use of effective defense strategies (Norris, Nurius,

& Dimeff, 1996). In addition, drinking can increase a woman's anxiety, fear of rejection and general embarrassment over a possible misunderstanding regarding a coercive situation, which can lessen her chances of using effective defenses against an assault (Norris et al., 1996). In spite of this, women often reported feeling that they would still be able to be aware of risky cues and remain in control while they are drinking, further contributing to a false sense of security (Norris et al., 1996).

A perpetrator's use of drugs and alcohol prior to an incident of sexually aggressive behavior has been reported to range from between 55% (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987) to 74% (Koss, 1989). Additionally, environments where sexual assaults are more frequent tend to include more heavy drinking than those where no assaults occur (Abbey et al., 1996). Differences have been found among perpetrators, however, in that men who report engaging in more serious acts of sexual aggression are more likely to consume alcohol in greater quantities (Koss & Gaines, 1993) and at a higher frequency (Koss & Dinero, 1988) than men reporting less severe acts. Brecklin and Ullman (2002) also noted the significance of men's drinking behaviors in their finding that the perpetrator's behaviors were more important in determining sexual assault outcomes than the victim's behaviors. Specifically, the greatest predictor of victim injury and utilization of medical care was offender alcohol use prior to the assault (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002).

Alcohol also increases the likelihood of misperceptions, especially with regard to a female's sexual intent. Often a female's use of alcohol is perceived by men as a cue that she is interested in sex, thereby increasing the likelihood that a man will wrongly interpret a woman's friendliness as a sign of sexual intent (Abbey et al., 1996). Further, the amount of alcohol consumed by the man was positively related to the frequency of misperceptions of sexual intent on the part of the woman (Abbey et al., 1998). Such

misperceptions on the part of the man are further complicated by the fact that a victim's lack of consent is often perceived as "not at all clear" by perpetrators of sexual aggression (Koss, 1989, p. 160).

A number of additional factors regarding alcohol and drug use can enable a perpetrator to commit sexual assault and decrease his chances of being caught. Women who are drinking are perceived as being more sexually available and are more likely to be classified as "deviants," which can decrease a perpetrator's feeling of responsibility (Kanin, 1985). In addition, when alcohol is consumed, even in small quantities, females are perceived as more likely to initiate sexual intercourse (Corcoran & Thomas, 1991). Alcohol can also be used as an excuse for behavior that normally would be socially unacceptable; such that the belief that one's actions could be justified through intoxication may increase the risk of committing a sexual assault more than the act of becoming intoxicated (Muehlenhard et al., 1991). Further, a recent meta-analysis found that if both parties were using drugs or alcohol, forced sex would be perceived by both men and women as less coercive than if both parties were sober (Emmers-Sommer, 2002).

In addition to a perpetrator's typical drinking behavior, several studies have also found evidence of a tactical use of alcohol. Kanin (1985) found that 76% of rapists, compared to 23% of controls, reported having attempted to intoxicate a female with alcohol in order to have sex with her. Men have also reported using alcohol to lower a potential victim's inhibitions in order to increase their chances of obtaining sex (Muehlenhard et al., 1991). Likewise, a series of open-ended interview questions with fraternity members revealed reports of the "pervasive" use of alcohol as a tactic among fraternity men to overcome a women's reluctance to have sex (Martin & Hummer, 1989; p. 464).

Similarly, the tactical use of drugs, also termed drug-facilitated sexual assaults, is often carefully orchestrated. One examination of 34 incarcerated, drug-facilitated sexual assault perpetrators found that very few perpetrators resorted to using force, and evidence of impulsivity was present only when the plan was disrupted (Welner, 2001). However, the perpetrator does not actually have to give the victim a drug in order for it to be considered a drug tactic. Cases in which a perpetrator takes advantage of a victim who has voluntarily consumed recreational drugs would also be considered a drug-facilitated sexual assault (LeBeau, 1999).

Perpetrators of drug-facilitated sexual assaults are often further protected from prosecution because the victims frequently have no memory of the assault, and the drugs used are quickly absorbed by the body. The most common drug currently used to commit sexual assaults is ethanol; however, benzodiazepines, Rohypnol, and gamma hydroxybutyrate (GHB) are often reported (LeBeau, 1999). These drugs can easily be slipped into a victim's drink, and induce strong sedation and loss of consciousness even at very low doses (LeBeau, 1999). Detection is further hindered by the fact that victims must be tested within a few days of the attack in order to find traces of the drugs. However, victims can be confused or disoriented for hours or even days, reducing the chances of reporting the assault in time for samples to be obtained (LeBeau, 1999).

When combined, the use of alcohol and drugs not only increase the likelihood of a sexual assault occurring, they also work to decrease the perpetrator's feelings of responsibility. By labeling the behavior as a tactic instead of merely a "causal mechanism," some researchers hope to place the blame back onto the perpetrator (Koss & Cleveland, 1997). DeKeseredy and Schwartz (1993) have taken a similar approach, describing a perpetrator's own use of alcohol as "instrumental," to indicate that the man already intended to commit sexually aggressive acts before consuming alcohol.

Therefore, the use of drugs and alcohol are pervasive in sexual assaults, contributing to the occurrence of such assaults in a number of ways. The use of substances work to inhibit the woman's motor skills and cognitive functioning, however, women fail to accurately perceive the risks of drinking. Alcohol also increases the likelihood of misperceptions regarding sexual intent, and can be used as an excuse for behaviors that would otherwise be unacceptable. Finally, drugs can be used to facilitate sexual assaults by disorienting the victim for a prolonged period of time, such that the victim may have no memory of the attack. Both of these approaches to obtaining sexual intercourse could be viewed as tactical, thereby placing the responsibility onto the perpetrator.

Power Tactics

Power tactics can include the use of force, isolation, demand for silence and the use of weapon. A review of the literature regarding college students reveals that the use of power tactics does not appear to be as prevalent as the use of drug tactics; however, this could be due in part to the greater proportion of acquaintance rapes that take place on college campuses. One nationwide study found that only 9% of sexual assault victims and 3% of perpetrators reported hitting or beating, while 5% of victims and 4% of perpetrators reported the use of a weapon during the assault (Koss, 1989). Similarly, Miller and Marshall (1987) found that very few victims reported the use or threat of physical force in a rape (2% for each), or the use of force in an attempted rape (3%). Among the men surveyed, only 1% admitted to the use or threat of physical force (Miller & Marshall, 1987). Additionally, force is present more often in non-coital sexual aggression (72.9%) than coital sexual aggression (4.78%; Petty & Dawson, 1989). Interestingly, while a sample of women reported their level of resistance as moderate, a sample of perpetrators viewed their victim's level of resistance as only minimal (Koss,

1989), indicating that the men may have perceived their victims to be engaging in token resistance.

In contrast, Copenhaver and Grauerholz (1990) investigated females who belonged to sororities and found much higher rates of power tactic usage. Among the victims of rape or attempted rape, the most commonly reported attack involved pinning the woman down (57%). Other victims reported having their arms twisted (14%), being threatened with the use of force (10%), hit (12%), threatened with the use of a weapon (5%), and having a weapon used against them (5%). This discrepancy in reports of tactic usage may be due in part to the fact that over half of these assaults took place in a fraternity house or were committed by a fraternity member. It is possible that such environments are more tolerant of physical aggression than non-fraternity environments.

The use of isolation or demand for silence used as specific tactics to accomplish a sexual assault has not received as much attention as the other power tactics; however, literature has found evidence of the use of isolation to accomplish a rape. Kanin (1985) found that 9% of rapists, compared to none of the controls, admitted to having threatened to leave a female stranded in order to coerce her into having sex. Similarly, Miller and Marshall (1987) found that perpetrators reported sexual assaults taking place in a private house or apartment (60%), dormitory (20%), parked car (10%), or fraternity house (7%). Thus, the vast majority of assaults took place in more private or isolated locations (private house, fraternity house, or parked car) as opposed to locations where help would be more readily available (dormitory). It is possible that the use of isolation and demand for silence are used primarily in conjunction with other power tactics, rather than used independently. This could, at least in part, explain the lack of research focusing on these specific tactics.

In summary, less research has been conducted on power tactics among college students than on drug tactics, in part because power tactics are not commonly used among college-aged perpetrators. Regardless, research demonstrates that force is present more often in coital sexual aggression as opposed to non-coital aggression, and sorority members report experiencing greater levels of force during sexual assaults than non-sorority members. Further, the majority of assaults appear to take place in more private or isolated areas, where assistance for the victim would be less likely.

Rationale of the Present Study

Thus far, Cleveland and colleagues (1999) have provided the only comprehensive approach to the specific area of rape tactics as it is described here. In addition to conducting a factor analysis, the authors examined the relationship between the two tactics, and the degree of tactic usage as a function of the victim-perpetrator relationship. Their findings indicated that the use of power tactics was not associated with the use of drug tactics, even after controlling for relationship to the victim (Cleveland et al., 1999). Further, using a regression model, they found that the interaction between the perpetrator-victim relationship and drug tactics did not act as a predictor of power tactics (Cleveland et al., 1999). Thus, they established that within each instance of sexual aggression, the use of drug tactics was not associated with the use of power tactics, although examining each perpetrator's history of behaviors would likely show a pattern of usage (Cleveland et al., 1999). These findings indicated that if one tactic type would not be effective in a certain situation or appears too risky, then the other tactic type may be substituted (Cleveland et al., 1999).

Degree of tactic usage was also examined as it related to the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. Seven perpetrator-victim subgroups were used, in order from least intimate to most intimate: stranger, acquaintance, date, steady

boyfriend, husband, ex-husband, and other. Strangers were found to use significantly more power tactics than any other perpetrator-victim subgroup, except ex-husbands (Cleveland et al., 1999). More specifically, the degree of power tactics used by the perpetrators decreased as the level of intimacy increased from stranger through steady boyfriend and husband (Cleveland et al., 1999). However, the findings for drug tactics were not so linear: husbands were found to use significantly fewer drug tactics than either the acquaintance or steady date groups, but no other groups were significantly different (Cleveland et al., 1999). Thus, it appears that the use of tactics may be, at least in part, determined by contextual factors (Cleveland et al., 1999).

Based on their results, Cleveland and colleagues (1999) hypothesized that power tactics may be used more frequently by strangers as an attempt to address the lack of intimate access. Due to the absence of intimacy and trust, no amount of verbal coercion would increase a stranger's chances of obtaining sex, thus requiring more power-oriented tactics in order to achieve coercion (Cleveland et al., 1999). Similarly, ex-husbands no longer retain their previous level of trust, and must also resort to more power-oriented tactics (Cleveland et al., 1999). Boyfriends and husbands, however, have already achieved a level of interpersonal trust and intimate access, thereby increasing their ability to use less power-oriented tactics to achieve coercion (Cleveland et al., 1999).

This hypothesis is supported in part by findings that stranger rapes are reported to be more violent (Koss et al., 1988; Ullman & Seigel, 1993), and that perpetrators of stranger rapes are perceived by the victim to be more aggressive (Koss et al., 1988). Specifically, stranger rapes are more likely to include threats of bodily harm, hitting and slapping, and use of a weapon than acquaintance rapes (Koss et al., 1988). Ullman and Seigel (1993) also found that strangers and intimates used more aggression than

acquaintances, who appeared to prefer verbal coercion. Similarly, women who were raped by a husband or other family member were more likely to report the use of threatened bodily harm, hitting or slapping, choking or beating, and display of a weapon (Koss, 1988). In addition, Abbey and colleagues (2002) found that sexual assaults where the victim is drinking are less violent than those where the victim is sober, presumably because less force was needed. These findings indicate that the nature of the relationship between the use of force and level of intimacy may be curvilinear in nature (Rozee, 1999), as opposed to the more linear findings of Cleveland and colleagues (1999).

Cleveland and colleagues (1999) further hypothesized that the use of drugs and alcohol as a tactic by acquaintances and steady dates may be an attempt to address the issue of consent, or lack thereof. It would be expected, then, for husbands to use drug tactics less frequently, since they may view the marriage itself as a form of consent (Cleveland et al., 1999). Koss and colleagues (1988) also found higher levels of drug and alcohol usage among casual, steady and nonromantic dates, than among husbands or other family members, thereby increasing the chances that assaults by the former group would coincide with substance use. Other studies, however, have found that both victim and offender alcohol consumption were significantly associated with stranger assaults (Ullman & Brecklin, 2000; Brecklin & Ullman, 2001).

The relationship between alcohol use and aggression has also been examined, and may be curvilinear in nature. One study found that the most aggressive sexual assaults were committed by men who were either sober or had been drinking very heavily (Abbey et al., 2002). One explanation is that higher levels of aggression are needed by sober perpetrators in order to achieve intimidation of the victim, while more intoxicated perpetrators may be unaware of how much force they are using (Abbey et

al., 2002). Brecklin and Ullman (2001), however, found that attacks containing less offender aggression appeared to demonstrate the strongest relationship between perpetrator alcohol use and assault outcomes. Further, the most important predictor of victim injury and medical care was offender aggression, while offender drinking was not related to either of the variables (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002). This led the authors to conclude that two distinct pathways may exist to committing sexual assault, each employing separate strategies (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002). Such a conclusion is supported by McCormick (1979) who found that the goal behind the desire to achieve sex greatly influences the strategies chosen by the perpetrator to carry out the sexually aggressive act.

One such model, which includes two distinct pathways leading to sexual assault, was formulated by Malamuth, Heavey and Linz (1993). This interactive model for sexual aggression, which has received support from the literature, includes two separate paths in early experiences that may lead to sexual aggression later on in life (Malamuth et al., 1993). The first is the hostile masculinity path, in which aggression and hostility towards women result in sexual arousal (Malamuth et al., 1993). The second path is that of sexual promiscuity, where the emphasis is on sexual conquest, and peer status and where self-esteem are tied to sexuality (Malamuth et al., 1993). These paths could affect the motivation for carrying out a sexual assault, thereby influencing the tactics and strategies used by the perpetrator. It is possible that those offenders in the hostile masculinity path utilize more power-oriented tactics, while those in the sexual promiscuity path use more drug-oriented tactics. Future research would be needed in order to determine the magnitude of such a relationship.

The only study concerning specific rape tactics (Cleveland et al., 1999), and much of the supporting literature (e.g., Abbey et al., 2002; Brecklin & Ullman, 2001,

2002), has been obtained through victim reports. While this is a necessary and informative avenue of research, these findings also need to be examined from the perpetrator's perspective. It is possible that perpetrator's reports would result in different types of tactic scales than those created by the victim's reports.

The purpose of the present study was to examine both the use of sexually aggressive tactics among perpetrators, and the prediction of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. Analyses were conducted on a measure of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics to determine the primary factors reported by perpetrators. Following that, a correlation was conducted to determine the magnitude of the relationship between any factors generated by the acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics questionnaire. Finally, the sample was assessed with regards to adherence to traditional gender roles, psychopathy, sensation seeking, fraternity membership, athletic participation, pornography usage and social desirability. These variables were then examined in the contexts of use and acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics to determine the nature of their relationships.

Hypotheses

The first research question concerns the factors created by the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire, using a principle components analysis. Since no previous research has been conducted on this topic, no specific hypotheses were made. However, the resulting components were used in the following analyses.

Consistent with the literature overall, it was also hypothesized that acceptance of rape tactics would be predicted by a history of sexually aggressive behavior, increased levels of psychopathy, sensation seeking, traditional gender role ideology, fraternity membership, athletic participation, social desirability, and pornography use.

Method

Participants

Three hundred and forty nine male undergraduate students were surveyed from a Midwestern university. However, 9.7% ($N = 34$) of the participants failed to attend both sessions, and 4.9% ($N = 17$) of the surveys were less than 50% completed, resulting in a total of 298 participants used for data analyses. Participants were enrolled in psychology courses and had the choice of volunteering to participate in psychology experiments or writing a brief summary of a journal article in exchange for credit applied toward course grades. Students volunteered for participation through sign-up sheets posted on a sign-up board in the Department of Psychology building. Participants were recruited from winter 2003 through spring 2003 to participate in two separate sessions, conducted two days apart. Participation involved approximately 40 minutes of time per session, and participants received one experimental credit per hour or partial hour of participation.

The vast majority of participants were heterosexual (96.3%), Caucasian, non-Hispanic (94.0%), and single men who had never been married (98.3%). Further, more than half were in their first year of college (62.4%), between the ages of 18 and 19 (68.5%), and did not date or dated only casually (64.4%). Demographic data are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Demographics.

	<i>N</i>	%
Age		
(a) 18	58	19.5
(b) 19	146	49.0
(c) 20	54	18.1
(d) 21	26	8.7
(e) over 21	14	4.6
Marital Status		
(a) Single, never married	293	98.3
(b) Co-habiting	1	0.3
(c) Married	3	1.0
Year in School		
(a) Freshman	186	62.4
(b) Sophomore	69	23.2
(c) Junior	34	11.4
(d) Senior	9	3.0
Dating Status		
(a) Do not date	29	9.7
(b) Date casually	163	54.7
(c) Involved in long-term relationship	100	33.6
(d) Engaged	1	0.3
(e) Married	3	1.0
Ethnicity		
(a) Caucasian, non-Hispanic	280	94.0
(b) African American	9	3.0
(c) Latino	1	0.3
(d) Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0.7
(e) Other	6	2.0
Religious Affiliation		
(a) Catholic	115	38.6
(b) Protestant	79	26.5
(c) Jewish	6	2.0
(d) Nondenominational	16	5.4
(e) Muslim	1	0.3

Table 1: Continued.

	<i>N</i>	%
(d) None	47	15.8
(e) Other	34	11.4
Family Income		
(a) Unemployed or disabled	5	1.7
(b) \$10,000 - \$20,000	7	2.3
(c) \$21,000 - \$30,000	6	2.0
(d) \$31,000 - \$40,000	21	7.0
(e) \$41,000 - \$50,000	41	13.8
(f) \$51,000 - \$75,000	72	24.2
(g) \$76,000 - \$100,000	61	20.5
(h) \$101,000 or more	85	28.6
Sexual Orientation		
(a) Heterosexual	287	96.3
(b) Homosexual	4	1.3
(c) Bisexual	7	2.3
Current Residence		
(a) College dormitory or residence hall	241	80.9
(b) Fraternity house	11	3.7
(c) Other university housing	1	0.3
(d) Off-campus housing	35	11.7
(e) Parent or guardian's home	10	3.4

Measures

Demographics Questionnaire. This is a brief questionnaire used to collect relevant personal information regarding basic participant characteristics such as age, ethnicity and race, religious background, and sexual orientation. (See Appendix C-1).

Hypergender Ideology Scale- 19 (HGIS-19). The Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hogben, McGowen, & Dawson, 1996) is a measure designed to replace the Hyperfemininity Scale (HFI; Murnen & Byrne, 1991) and the Hypermasculinity Inventory (HMI; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). As an attempt at a combined measure, the Hypergender Ideology Scale was developed to be suitable for men and women and, thus, to alleviate the need for two separate scales in assessing adherence to extreme, stereotypical gender roles.

The short form of the Hypergender Ideology Scale was used in this study. The measure is a 19-item self-report scale, where responses fall on a 6-point scale, from 0 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree"). Items 4, 13, and 19 are reverse scored. A score was obtained by summing across the items, and scores range from 0 to 95, with higher scores indicating a greater endorsement of hypergender ideologies. The short form of the Hypergender Ideology Scale was found to have a coefficient alpha of .93, and has demonstrated marginal concurrent validity when compared to the Hypermasculinity Inventory, $r(106) = .55, p < .001$, and Hyperfemininity Inventory, $r(125) = .56, p < .001$ (Hamburger et al., 1996). In the current study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .84. (See Appendix C-2).

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES). The Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) was designed to identify perpetrators of sexual assault through a series of 10 sexually explicit questions, in which the respondent assesses his past sexual behavior along a variety of dimensions. The respondent simply responds "Yes" or "No"

to the items in a self-report format. This measure is used to detect sexual assault perpetration even when the perpetrator is unaware of the criminal nature of his behavior and fails to deem it as such. The SES is the most frequently used of all similar measures assessing sexually aggressive behavior, and reliability and validity are very good (Glylys & McNamara, 1996; Koss & Oros, 1982). The SES was found to have good internal consistency reliability for men (Cronbach alpha = .89), and the 2-week test-retest reliability was found to be .93 for a sample of both males and females (Koss & Gidycz, 1985). Validity for the SES has been established by comparing men's responses to the SES with those given to an interviewer, which demonstrated a reliability coefficient of .61 (Koss & Gidycz, 1985).

Perpetration history since adolescence (age 14 and on) was examined, and six questions were added following each item on the SES. These questions assessed assault characteristics, including the frequency of engaging in each form of sexually aggressive behavior, as well as the perpetrator's relationship to the most recent victim. In addition, the perpetrator's drug and alcohol use, as well as his perception of the victim's drug and alcohol use, were determined for the most recent episode.

The SES has been used to classify individuals into categories reflecting the level of their use of coercion or force. Participants were classified into one of five levels of perpetration, according to the most severe type of assaultive behavior they had endorsed. The five levels of sexual assault, in order from least to most severe, were defined as follows: (a) *not sexually aggressive* (no items were endorsed), (b) *sexually aggressive contact* (items 1, 8, and 15): the use of continual arguments, their authority, or physical force to coerce a woman into sex play, including fondling, kissing or petting, but not sexual intercourse, (c) *attempted rape* (items 22 and 29): the use of physical force, alcohol, or drugs to attempt sexual intercourse with a woman, but intercourse did

not occur, (d) *sexual coercion* (items 36 and 43): the use of authority, continual arguments and pressure to compel a woman into sexual intercourse, and (e) *rape* (items 50, 57, and 64): the use of alcohol, drugs, or physical force to coerce a woman into sexual intercourse, including anal and oral sex. (See Appendix C-3).

Sexual Strategies Questionnaire (SSQ). The Sexual Strategies Questionnaire is a 10-item measure adapted from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1991) vignettes regarding sexual coercion. A date scenario is presented, followed by 10 questions to measure the acceptability of various coercive sexual strategies that could occur. The strategies were chosen based on those frequently found among victim reports, as measured by Cleveland and colleagues (1999), and reflect increasing levels of coercion or force. The ten levels of sexual coercion, in order from least to most severe, were defined as follows: (a) *promise of positive consequences* (item 1), (b) *demand for silence* (item 2), (c) *use of isolation* (item 3), (d) *victim and perpetrator alcohol use* (item 4), (e) *perpetrator use of alcohol* (item 5), (f) *alcohol used as a specific tactic* (item 6), (g) *drugs used as a specific tactic* (item 7), (h) *threat of negative consequences* (item 8), (i) *use of physical force* (item 9), and (j) *use of a weapon* (item 10). Participants recorded their responses on a 7-point scale, ranging from 0 ("Always unacceptable") to 6 ("Always acceptable"), and a score is obtained by summing across the items. Scores range from 0 to 60, with higher scores indicating a greater acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics.

Two separate pilot studies were conducted with male undergraduates from the psychology subject pool to determine the variability and test-retest reliability of the SSQ. The first pilot study contained two scenarios; one in which the male and female meet during a class (the "good girl" scenario) and one in which the male and female meet at a bar ("the bad girl" scenario). The reasoning behind two scenarios was the belief that

participants might respond differently depending on the context of the meeting. Finally, two filler questionnaires from Snyder (1974) and Cacioppo and Petty (1982) were inserted between the two scenarios, to provide some distraction. To determine the test-retest reliability, participants were instructed to return 4 days later, where they would complete the same set of questionnaires. Twenty-three of the 25 participants (92%) returned for the follow-up. Two of the cases were greater than five standard deviations from the mean and therefore were deemed outliers, leaving 21 participants used for the Time 2 internal consistency reliability and test-retest analyses. The scale demonstrated good internal consistency reliability for both Time 1 (Cronbach alpha = .87) and for Time 2 (Cronbach alpha = .82), as well as good test-retest reliability, $r(21) = .82$ ($p < .01$). In addition, some variability in responses was demonstrated (see Table 2).

A second pilot study was conducted with forty-two male undergraduates to assess attempts made to further increase the variability in scores for each scenario and improve the reliability of the overall scale. The description of each scenario was expanded slightly, an anchor was added in the response scale for point 3 ("Not Sure"), and the font and layout of the second scenario was altered to encourage differentiation between the scenarios. The internal consistency reliability did not deviate significantly from the first pilot study (Cronbach alpha = .81), however, some additional variability in responses was demonstrated (see Table 2).

Table 2

Descriptives from the Pilot Studies for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pilot Study 1				
<i>"Good girl" Time 1</i>	0.0	13.0	3.26	3.78
<i>"Bar girl" Time 1</i>	0.0	10.0	2.65	3.27
<i>"Good girl" Time 2</i>	0.0	9.0	2.86	3.21
<i>"Bar girl" Time 2</i>	0.0	10.0	2.71	3.15
Pilot Study 2				
<i>"Good girl"</i>	0.0	15.0	6.26	4.06
<i>"Bar girl"</i>	0.0	16.0	5.79	4.47

Following an examination of the results from the second pilot study, two additional changes were made to the measure. Each point on the scale was weighted, such that respondents could rate each statement on a scale that contained the options: 0 (“Always unacceptable”), 1 (“Frequently unacceptable”), 2 (“Often unacceptable”), 3 (“Sometimes unacceptable, sometimes acceptable”), 4 (“Often acceptable”), 5 (“Frequently acceptable”), and 6 (“Always acceptable”). In addition, the “good girl” scenario was dropped in an effort to further increase variability in scores. Results from the current study demonstrated that the SSQ had an adequate internal consistency reliability (Cronbach alpha = .74), and an increase in the range of scores (see Table 3). (See Appendix C-4).

Self-report Psychopathy Scale (SRPS). The Levenson, Kiehl, and Fitzpatrick (1995) Self-report Psychopathy Scale is a 26-item measure used to assess psychopathic attributes among noninstitutionalized populations. The SRPS yields two subscales that reflect differing aspects of psychopathy. *Primary Psychopathy* assesses characteristics such as lack of remorse and callousness (ex. “Looking out for myself is my top priority” and “For me, what’s right is whatever I can get away with”), while *Secondary Psychopathy* measures characteristics such as impulsivity and quick-temperedness (ex. “I quickly lose interest in tasks I start” and “I find myself in the same kinds of trouble, time after time”). Each statement was rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 (“Disagree strongly”) to 3 (“Agree strongly”), and scores were obtained by summing the items both overall and within each subscale. Items 5, 11, 14, 17, 19, 23, and 24 are reverse scored. Total scores range from 0 to 78, while scores for the Primary Psychopathy subscale range from 0 to 48, and scores on the Secondary Psychopathy subscale range from 0 to 30. Higher scores, both overall and among the subscales, indicate greater levels of psychopathy.

Table 3

Descriptives for Sexual Strategies Questionnaire in the Current Study.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Promise of positive consequences	0.0	6.0	1.31	1.50
Demand for silence	0.0	5.0	0.28	0.83
Use of isolation	0.0	6.0	0.53	1.09
Victim/perpetrator alcohol use	0.0	6.0	1.23	1.43
Perpetrator use of alcohol	0.0	6.0	0.78	1.33
Alcohol used as tactic	0.0	3.0	0.05	0.33
Drugs used as tactic	0.0	1.0	0.02	0.14
Threat of negative consequences	0.0	2.0	0.02	0.16
Use of physical force	0.0	3.0	0.02	0.20
Use of weapon	0.0	1.0	0.00	0.20
Sum total	0.0	24.0	4.24	4.95

With regards to internal consistency reliability, the total scale and the Primary Psychopathy subscale both demonstrated good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$ and $.83$, respectively) while the Secondary Psychopathy subscale is marginal (Cronbach's $\alpha = .69$; Brinkley, Schmitt, Smith, & Newman, 2001). Further, the eight-week test-retest reliability demonstrated a Cronbach α of $.83$, and with regards to convergent validity, the measure was significantly correlated with the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised, $r(547) = .35$ ($p < .001$; Brinkley et al., 2001; Lynam, Whiteside, & Jones, 1999). In addition, the SRPS correlates both with self-reports of serious antisocial behavior, $r(782) = .31$ ($p < .001$), as well as with records of violent criminal activity, $r(376) = .24$ ($p < .001$) (Brinkley et al., 2001). Lalumiere and Quinsey (1996) also found that participants who had engaged in sexually coercive behavior demonstrated higher scores on this measure than participants who had not engaged in such behaviors, $t(97) = -2.36$, $p < .05$. In the current study, the Cronbach α was good for both the total scale ($\alpha = .82$) and the Primary Psychopathy subscale ($\alpha = .82$), and marginal for Secondary Psychopathy subscale ($\alpha = .66$). (See Appendix C-5).

Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire- Impulsive Sensation Seeking (ZKPQ-ImpSS). The Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (Zuckerman, Kuhlman, Joirement, Teta, & Kraft, 1993) is an updated version of frequently used personality scales, including the Sensation Seeking Scale (Zuckerman, 1979). The 19-item Impulsive Sensation Seeking Subscale reflects two factors, however, the factors are treated as one scale and thus scored together: (a) *Sensation Seeking*: a general need for excitement and novelty (ex. "I'll try anything once") and (b) *Impulsivity*: lack of planning and a tendency to act without thinking (ex. "I tend to change interests frequently"). Participants responded to the questions as "True" or "False" based upon whether they felt the statements were descriptive of them. The ZKPQ-ImpSS was scored

by summing the answers to the items after they were recoded into 0 (false) and 1 (true). Items 4 and 18 were reverse coded, and scores can range from 0 to 19, with higher scores indicating greater levels of sensation seeking. Research has found a Cronbach alpha of .77 for men and a 3 to 4 week test-retest reliability of .80 (Zuckerman, 2002). Further, the ZKPQ-ImpSS is correlated with psychopathy ratings (Thornquist & Zuckerman, 1995), early use of cocaine and severity of drug use (Ball, 1995), and general risk-taking and risky sex (Zuckerman & Kuhlman, 2000). In the current study, the Cronbach alpha was .79. (See Appendix C-6).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD). The short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) is a 13-item measure, designed to measure one's desire for social approval. It is believed that the stronger one's desire for social approval or need to give a positive impression, the more "virtuous" or socially desirable their responses will be. Participants responded to a series of statements as "True" or "False" based upon their agreement or disagreement with the statements. The MCSD was scored by summing the answers to the items after they were recoded into 0 (True) and 1 (False), with scores ranging from 0 to 13. Higher scores indicate a greater desire for social approval. Research indicates an internal consistency reliability of .76 and concurrent validity of .93 with the long form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). (See Appendix C-7).

Filler Items. Three sets of filler items were included in the packets, to provide a break between some of the more explicit questionnaires. Twelve items were taken from the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), 15 items were taken from the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureño, & Villaseñor, 1988), and 10 items were taken from the Social Support Questionnaire (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983). These items were not included in any analyses. (See Appendix C-8).

Procedure

Sessions were held in classrooms in the Department of Psychology and were run in groups of no more than 25 participants. A trained male undergraduate student facilitated the data collection, and the principle investigator was available on the premises during active data collection.

Participation involved approximately 40 minutes of time each for Session I and for Session II, which occurred 2 days later. Participants received one experimental credit per hour or partial hour of participation for both sessions at the end of Session II. Two sets of questionnaires were created, Packets A and B, and they were counterbalanced when administered to minimize the probability of an order effect. Table 4 summarizes the measures contained in Packets A and B. Packet A included the demographics questionnaire, filler items (Conflict Tactics Scale), Sexual Strategies Questionnaire, filler items (Social Support Questionnaire), Self-report Psychopathy Scale, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire- Impulsive Sensation Seeking subscale. Packet B included the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Sexual Experiences Survey, filler items (Inventory of Interpersonal Problems), and the Hypergender Ideology Scale.

Table 4

Measures Included in Packets A and B.

Packet A	Packet B
Demographics questionnaire	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale
Filler items (Conflict Tactics Scale)	Sexual Experiences Survey
Sexual Strategies Questionnaire	Filler items (Inventory of Interpersonal Problems)
Filler items (Social Support Questionnaire)	Hypergender Ideology Scale-19
Self-report Psychopathy Scale	
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	
Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire - Impulsive Sensation Seeking	

In Session I, the facilitator passed out the Time 1 consent form (see Appendix A-1), and then informed subjects of the coding procedure for questionnaires. To protect their identity, subjects identified themselves only with the number attained using the Subject Number Calculation Form (see Appendix B-1). Participants then filled out all the questionnaires in the predetermined packet on scantrons. After completing all questionnaires in the packet, participants were given a Time 1 debriefing form (see Appendix A-2), which contained campus and community resources in case any concerns arose that participants wished to talk about with a professional. Participants were also reminded that they should return two days later to complete the experiment, as was indicated on the sign-up sheets.

At Session II, the facilitator passed out the Time 2 consent form (see Appendix A-3). All participants recalculated their subject numbers using the Subject Number Calculation Form and completed whichever packet of questionnaires they did not complete in Session I. At the end of Session II, participants received a Time 2 debriefing form (see Appendix A-4) and their experimental credit points.

Table 5 summarizes the variables included and the measures used to assess them.

Table 5

Variables and Measures.

Variable	Measure
Sexual Assault Perpetration	Sexual Experiences Survey
Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics	Sexual Strategies Questionnaire
Gender Role Ideology	Hypergender Ideology Scale
Psychopathy	Self-report Psychopathy Scale
Sensation Seeking	Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire -Impulsive Sensation Seeking
Fraternity Membership	Demographics
Athletic Participation	Demographics
Frequency of Pornography Use	Demographics

Results

Prior to analysis, the Hypergender Ideology Scale, Self-report Psychopathy Scale, Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire-Impulsive Sensation Seeking scale, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and Sexual Strategies Questionnaire were examined for fit between their distributions and the assumptions of multivariate analysis. To reduce extreme skewness and kurtosis, the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire was transformed using a square root transformation. The resulting variables were used in the analyses examining continuous predictor variables and history of perpetration, as well as in the data reduction on the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire. Finally, statistical significance was defined as an alpha level of $p < .05$ for all analyses, with the exception of the bivariate analyses in which statistical significance was defined as $p < .01$.

Rates of Sexual Aggression

The Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) was administered in order to determine history of sexual aggression and is defined here as any sexually coercive act after the age of 14. With regards to participants' history of sexually aggressive behavior, 21.2% ($N = 63$) of participants reported engaging in a sexually aggressive act. Of these incidents, 39.7% ($N = 25$) were acts of sexually aggressive contact, 17.5% ($N = 11$) were acts of attempted rape, 34.9% ($N = 22$) were sexually coercive acts, and 7.9% ($N = 5$) were rapes. Table 6 summarizes the frequencies of history of sexually aggressive behavior.

Table 6

History of Sexually Aggressive Behavior.

	<i>N</i>	%
None	235	78.9
Sexually aggressive contact	25	8.4
Attempted rape	11	3.7
Sexual coercion	22	7.4
Rape	5	1.7

For the purposes of the following analyses, participants were categorized into four groups according to the degree of severity of past sexually aggressive behavior. Individuals who reported that they did not engage in sexually aggressive acts were labeled “none;” those who engaged in unwanted sexual contact were labeled “contact;” those who engaged in sexual coercion were labeled “coercion;” and those who engaged in attempted rape or rape were grouped into a category labeled “severe.”

Assault Characteristics

Chi-squares analyses were conducted to determine if perpetrators differed on assault characteristics, as assessed by the follow-up questions on the Sexual Experiences Survey (see Table 7). Analyses revealed that perpetrators differed in how much alcohol they reported drinking at the time of the assault, $\chi^2 (6, N = 63) = 20.52, p < .01$. Specifically, men who reported engaging in sexually coercive acts were approximately 2 times more likely to have consumed 5 or more drinks than to have consumed 2 drinks or fewer. Similarly, perpetrators who reported engaging in rape or attempted rape were approximately 3 times more likely to have consumed 5 or more drinks than to have consumed 3 to 4 drinks, and approximately 7 times more likely to have consumed 5 or more drinks than to have consumed 2 drinks or fewer.

Table 7

Chi-Square Analyses of Assault Characteristics.

	History of perpetration					
	Contact		Coercion		Severe	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Frequency of assault						
1 time	5	27.8	8	44.4	5	27.8
2 times	8	44.4	4	22.2	6	33.3
3 or more times	12	44.4	10	37.0	5	18.5
Relationship to victim						
Stranger	4	40.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
Acquaintance or friend	11	44.0	4	16.0	10	40.0
Casual or steady date	9	33.3	14	51.9	4	14.8
Perpetrator's alcohol usage**						
5 or more drinks	10	33.3	6	20.0	14	46.7
3-4 drinks	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
2 drinks or fewer	12	44.4	14	51.9	1	3.7
Perpetrator's drug usage						
No	19	40.4	18	38.3	10	21.3
Yes	6	37.5	4	25.0	6	37.5
Victim's alcohol usage*						
No	8	32.0	14	56.0	3	12.0
Yes	17	44.7	8	21.1	13	34.2
Victim's drug usage						
No	21	40.4	19	36.5	12	23.1
Yes	4	36.4	3	27.3	4	36.4

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Further, perpetrators differed in how much they estimated their victim to be drinking at the time of the assault, $\chi^2 (2, N = 63) = 8.82, p < .05$. Specifically, those perpetrators who reported engaging in sexual coercion were approximately 2 times more likely to report that the victim was not drinking prior to the assault than victims who were drinking prior to the assault. Similarly, those perpetrators who reported committing rape or attempted rape were approximately 3 times more likely to report that the victim was also drinking prior to the assault, than those men who reported their victim was not drinking prior to the assault.

Packet Order

One hundred eighty-three (61.4%) of the participants completed Packet A during Session I, while 115 (38.6%) of the participants completed Packet B during Session I. A chi-square analysis was performed to determine if there was a relationship between packet order and reports of sexually aggressive behavior, however, no significant relationship was found, $\chi^2 (3, N = 298) = 1.80, p > .05$.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare scores on the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire for packet order to determine if a relationship existed between packet order and reports of acceptance of sexually aggressive behavior. Although marginally significant, there was no significant difference in scores for those participants who completed Packet A first ($M = 3.80, SD = 4.53$), versus those who completed Packet B first ($M = 4.92, SD = 5.47$), $t(296) = -1.91, p = .06$. Further, the magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared = .01).

Bivariate Analyses

Analyses of the bivariate relationships between predictor variables were conducted to examine the relationships between these factors and history of sexual

assault. Chi-square analyses were conducted to assess the relationships between history of perpetration and categorical predictor and demographic variables (see Table 8).

One-way analyses of variance were conducted to assess the relationships between continuous predictors and history of perpetration. Variables that have significant bivariate relationships were then examined more closely, using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) to examine the differences between the groups (see Table 9).

Table 8

Categorical Predictor and Demographic Variables and History of Perpetration.

	History of perpetration							
	None		Contact		Coercion		Severe	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Fraternity membership								
<i>No</i>	193	77.8	22	8.9	19	7.7	14	5.6
<i>Yes</i>	41	83.7	3	6.1	3	6.1	2	4.1
Athletic membership								
<i>No</i>	199	79.0	20	7.9	19	7.5	14	5.6
<i>Yes</i>	36	78.3	5	10.9	3	6.5	2	4.3
Pornography usage								
<i>Rare</i>	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<i>Moderate</i>	72	76.6	10	10.6	8	8.5	4	4.3
<i>Frequent</i>	154	79.0	15	7.7	14	7.2	12	6.2
Frequency of alcohol use								
<i>Rarely</i>	43	93.5	0	0.0	2	4.3	1	2.2
<i>Sometimes</i>	175	76.4	21	9.2	18	7.9	15	6.6
<i>Frequently</i>	17	68.0	4	16.0	2	8.0	2	8.0
Quantity of alcohol use								
<i>Light drinker</i>	30	93.8	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	3.1
<i>Moderate drinker</i>	92	80.7	10	8.8	7	6.1	5	4.4
<i>Heavy drinker</i>	113	74.3	15	9.9	14	9.2	10	6.6
Frequency of binge drinking								
<i>Rarely</i>	70	90.9	2	2.6	3	3.9	2	2.6
<i>Sometimes</i>	111	77.1	15	10.4	13	9.0	5	3.5
<i>Frequently</i>	54	70.1	8	10.4	6	7.8	9	11.7
Age of first sexual intercourse*								
<i>18 years old or older</i>	133	90.5	7	4.8	4	2.0	4	2.7
<i>16 to 17 years old</i>	71	66.4	14	13.1	14	13.1	8	7.5
<i>15 years old or younger</i>	30	71.4	4	9.5	4	9.5	4	9.5

Table 8: continued.

	History of perpetration							
	None		Contact		Coercion		Severe	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Number of consensual sex partners**								
<i>0 to 2 sex partners</i>	162	88.0	12	6.5	7	3.8	3	1.6
<i>3 to 6 sex partners</i>	51	66.2	9	11.7	7	9.1	10	13.0
<i>7 or more sex partners</i>	21	58.3	4	11.1	8	22.2	3	8.3

Note. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 9

Continuous Predictor Variables and History of Perpetration.

	History of perpetration							
	None		Contact		Coercion		Severe	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Self-report Psychopathy Scale								
<i>Total</i>	26.02	9.52	30.84	9.22	31.45	10.69	27.50	9.45
<i>Primary</i>	16.06	7.36	19.80	7.51	20.05	7.91	16.81	6.85
<i>Secondary</i>	10.58	4.30	11.92	4.74	12.32	4.58	10.94	4.23
Hypergender Ideology Scale*	30.44	13.53	37.76	16.87	40.36	12.47	38.81	14.99
Impulsive Sensation Seeking	10.72	2.77	10.80	2.22	12.36	2.74	11.56	2.87
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	5.90	1.65	5.70	1.82	5.86	1.44	5.00	1.67
Sexual Strategies Questionnaire*	2.49	2.56	2.76	2.34	4.50	3.43	4.55	4.26

Note. * $p < .01$.

Developmental and socialization variables. None of the developmental or socialization variables were found to be significantly related to history of perpetration. Sixteen percent of participants ($N = 49$) reported being affiliated with a fraternity, defined as membership in an all-male social fraternity, while 15% of participants ($N = 46$) reported participating in an athletic team, defined as participation in either a varsity or club sports team. Neither fraternity membership nor athletic participation were related to a history of sexual assault perpetration.

Pornography usage was categorized into three levels: *rare* (never used pornography, or used it once or more but not in the past year), *moderate* (ranging from at least once last year to at least once a month), and *frequent* (ranging from at least once a week to at least once a day). The majority of participants (65%) used pornography frequently; however, usage of pornography was not related to a history of sexual aggression.

Beliefs and personality characteristics of sexually aggressive men. Adherence to traditional gender roles, as measured by the Hypergender Ideology Scale-19, was found to be significantly different as a function of history of perpetration, $F(3, 297) = 5.93$, $p < .01$, with an effect size of .06. Further inspection of the means, using the Tukey's HSD test, revealed that the mean scores for perpetrators of sexual coercion ($M = 40.36$, $SD = 12.47$) differed significantly from those of men with no history of sexual assault ($M = 30.44$, $SD = 13.53$). Thus, those men who reported having engaged in acts of sexual coercion endorsed more items consistent with traditional gender stereotypes than did men who reported no history of sexually aggressive behavior.

Acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics, as measured by the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire, also differed significantly as a function of group membership, $F(3, 297) = 7.45$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .07. Further examination of the data, using the

Tukey's HSD test, indicated that the mean scores for both perpetrators of sexual coercion ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 3.43$) and perpetrators of rape or attempted rape ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 4.26$) differed significantly from men who reported no history of sexually aggressive acts ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 2.56$). Therefore, men who reported a history of sexual coercion, rape or attempted rape were significantly more likely to report acceptance of various tactics used to obtain sex than men who reported no history of sexually aggressive acts.

Using the Self-report Psychopathy Scale, psychopathy was not found to be significantly different as a function of group membership. The subscales of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale, Primary and Secondary Psychopathy, were also examined for differences among group membership; however, none were found. Similarly, sensation seeking, as measured by the Impulsive Sensation Seeking subscale of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire was examined for differences among group membership; however, none were found.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was also examined for differences as a function of group membership; however, none were found. Thus, the extent of socially desirable responses did not differ as a result of the respondent's history of sexually aggressive acts.

The participant's age at which they first willingly had sexual intercourse, as assessed by the demographics questionnaire, was also examined for differences among group membership. Those participants who reported having not yet willingly had sexual intercourse were combined with the category of men who first reported having sex at the age of 18 years or older. The age at which a participant first willingly had sexual intercourse was found to be significantly related to a history of sexual assault perpetration, $\chi^2 (21, N = 297) = 40.95$, $p < .01$. Men who reported first having sexual intercourse at the age of 16 or 17 years of age were approximately 3 and a half times

more likely to have committed a sexually aggressive act than those men who reported first having sex at the age of 18 or older. Specifically, 33.7% of respondents who reported having sex at the age of 16 or 17 years of age also reported committing an act of sexual assault, as compared to 9.5% of those who first had sex at the age of 18 or older.

Finally, the number of consensual sex partners, as reported on the demographics questionnaire, was examined for a relationship to history of perpetration. A little over half of participants (54%) reported having had 0 to 2 partners. The number of consensual sex partners a participant reported having was related to a history of sexual assault, $\chi^2 (18, N = 297) = 61.04, p < .001$. Men who reported having had 7 or more sex partners were approximately 3 times more likely to have committed a sexually aggressive act than those participants who reported having had 2 or fewer partners. Specifically, 41.6% of men who reported having 7 or more sex partners also reported a history of sexual aggression, while only 11.9% of men with 2 or fewer sex partners reported a history of sexual aggression.

Further, men who reported having had between 3 and 6 sex partners were approximately 8 times more likely to have committed an act of rape or attempted rape than those participants who reported having had 2 or fewer partners. Specifically, 13% of men who reported having had between 3 and 6 sex partners also reported having engaged in rape or attempted rape, as compared to 1.6% of participants who had between 0 and 2 sex partners and also reported engaging in rape or attempted rape. Lastly, participants who reported having engaged in sexual coercion were approximately 6 times more likely to have had 7 or more sex partners than to have had 2 or fewer sex partners. Specifically, while 22.2% of men who reported having engaged in sexual

coercion reported having had 7 or more partners, as opposed to 3.8% of those who reported 2 or fewer sex partners.

Situational factors. The frequency of participants' alcohol use during the 6 months prior to the study was assessed in the demographics questionnaire and examined for a relationship to history of perpetration. Alcohol use was categorized into three levels: *rarely* (ranging from not drinking to drinking 6 times in the past 6 months), *sometimes* (ranging from 7 times to at least once a week in the past 6 months), and *frequently* (drinking every day or nearly every day in the past 6 months). The vast majority of participants (77%) reported drinking sometimes, however, the frequency with which participants drank alcohol was not related to a history of sexual assault perpetration.

Participants were also asked to report the quantity of alcohol they typically consumed on a single occasion during the 6 months prior to the study. Quantity of alcohol use during a single occasion was categorized into three levels: *light* (ranging from not drinking to having 1 to 2 drinks), *moderate* (ranging from 3 to 7 drinks), and *heavy* (8 or more drinks). Approximately half of participants (51%) reported drinking heavily, however, the quantity of alcohol use was not related to a history of sexual assault perpetration.

Finally, participants were asked to report how often they engaged in binge drinking, defined as consuming 5 or more drinks in one sitting. Frequency of binge drinking was categorized into three levels: *rarely* (ranging from never to less than once a month), *sometimes* (ranging from 1 to 2 days per week), and *frequently* (3 or more days per week). Almost half of participants (48%) reported binge drinking sometimes, however, frequency of binge drinking was not significantly related to a history of sexual assault perpetration.

Data Reduction on the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire

The transformed 10 items of the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire were subjected to a principal components analysis. Prior to performing the principal components analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix (see Table 10) revealed the presence of a number of coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .72, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970; 1974), indicating the factors share a large proportion of common variance. In addition, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance, further supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Principal components analysis revealed the presence of three components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 35.52%, 20.66% and 11.57% of the variance respectively (see Table 11). An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the second component, so it was decided to retain two components for further investigation. To aid in the interpretation of these two components, a Varimax rotation was performed. In the rotated solution (see Table 12), both components showed a number of strong loadings, with all of the variables loading onto only one component. Component 1, labeled Covert Tactics, consisted of the items promise for positive consequences, demand for silence, use of isolation, perpetrator's use of alcohol, and the use of alcohol by both the victim and the perpetrator. Component 2, labeled Overt Tactics, consisted of alcohol used as a specific tactic, drugs used as a specific tactic, threat of negative consequences, the use of a weapon, and the use of physical force. The two-factor solution explained a total of 56.18% of the variance, with Component 1 contributing 35.52% and Component 2 contributing 20.66%.

Table 10

Correlations for the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire.

	Positive ^a	Silence ^b	Isolation ^c	Vic/perp alc ^d	Perp alc ^e	Alcohol ^f	Drugs ^g	Negative ^h	Force ⁱ	Weapon ^j
Positive ^a	—	.29**	.36**	.48**	.38**	.14*	.11	.15**	.10	.07
Silence ^b		—	.56**	.39**	.44**	.18**	.18**	.28**	.07	.05
Isolation ^c			—	.48**	.58**	.27**	.19**	.28*	.17**	.02
Vic/perp alc ^d				—	.72**	.17**	.04	.14*	.25**	.07
Perp alc ^e					—	.23**	.08	.19**	.14*	.01
Alcohol ^f						—	.63**	.80**	.04	.17**
Drugs ^g							—	.57**	.11	.44**
Negative ^h								—	.09	.35**
Force ⁱ									—	.29**
Weapon ^j										—

Note. ^apromise of positive consequences, ^bdemand for silence, ^cuse of isolation, ^dvictim and perpetrator alcohol use, ^eperpetrator use of alcohol, ^falcohol used as a specific tactic, ^gdrugs used as a specific tactic, ^hthreat of negative consequences, ⁱuse of physical force, ^juse of a weapon.

* < .05. ** < .01.

Table 11

Three Factor Solution for Sexual Strategies Questionnaire items.

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
Use of isolation	.72	-.37	
Perpetrator's use of alcohol	.69	-.50	
Threat of negative consequences	.66	.53	
Alcohol used as a specific tactic	.64	.53	-.35
Victim and perpetrator alcohol use	.64	-.52	
Demand for silence	.64		
Promise of positive consequences	.53	-.37	
Drugs used as a specific tactic	.58	.62	
Use of physical force	.35		.81
Use of a weapon	.41	.52	.53
Eigen value	3.55	2.06	1.16
% of variance explained	35.52%	20.66%	11.57%

Table 12

Varimax Rotation of Two Factor Solution for Sexual Strategies Questionnaire items.

	Component 1 Covert Tactics	Component 2 Overt Tactics
Perpetrator use of alcohol	.85	
Victim and perpetrator alcohol use	.82	
Use of isolation	.78	
Demand for silence	.65	
Promise of positive consequences	.64	
Drugs used as a specific tactic		.85
Threat of negative consequences		.83
Alcohol used as a specific tactic		.82
Use of a weapon		.66
Use of physical force		.32
Eigen value	3.55	2.06
% of variance explained	35.52%	20.66%

Relationship Between Tactic Usage and Perpetrator's Relationship to the Victim

Perpetrators' tactic usage was determined by applying the components derived from the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire principal components analysis to the questions in the SES. Specifically, Covert Tactics included the use of continual arguments or authority to coerce a woman into sex play, including fondling, kissing or petting but not sexual intercourse (items 1 and 8), and the use of authority, continual arguments or pressure to compel a woman into sexual intercourse (items 36 and 43). Overt Tactics included physical force to coerce a woman into sex play (item 15), the use of physical force, alcohol or drugs to attempt sexual intercourse with a woman but intercourse did not occur (items 22 and 29), and the use of alcohol, drugs or physical force to coerce a woman into sexual intercourse, including anal and oral sex (items 50, 57, and 64). Those perpetrators who utilized both types of tactics were categorized as Both Tactics.

A Chi-Square analysis was conducted to explore the differences in tactic usage among the three perpetrator-victim subgroups (stranger, acquaintance or friend, and casual or steady dating partner). The analysis revealed no significant differences in tactic usage among the perpetrator-victim subgroups, $\chi^2 (8, N = 62), p > .05$ (see Table 13).

Table 13

Relationship Between Tactic Usage and Perpetrator's Relationship to the Victim.

	Stranger		Acquaintance or Friend		Casual or Steady Dating Partner	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Covert Tactics	7	16.3	16	37.3	20	46.6
Overt Tactics	1	12.5	3	37.5	4	50.0
Both Tactics	2	18.2	6	54.6	3	27.3

$\chi^2 (8, N = 62) = 8.95, p > .05.$

The Relationship Between Covert and Overt Sexually Aggressive Tactics.

A correlation between Overt and Covert Sexually Aggressive Tactics scales from the full sample of participants revealed that the two scales were in fact significantly related, $r = -.56$, $p < .001$. Due to the fact that such a significant relationship between the tactics was discovered, combined with the lack of a significant relationship between tactic usage and the perpetrator's relationship to the victim, no further analyses were needed to better define the nature of the relationship between the two tactics.

Regression Analysis

The Prediction of Rape Tactic Acceptance. A standard multiple regression analysis was performed, using acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics as the criterion variable and group membership, psychopathy, sensation seeking, gender role ideology, fraternity membership, athletic membership, pornography usage, and social desirability as independent variables.

Results of the evaluation of assumptions indicated that no assumptions had been violated. With the use of a $p < .001$ criterion for Mahalanobis distance, one outlier was found. The case was deleted and the analysis was run again. Three cases had missing data, such that the final sample consisted of 295 participants.

Table 14 displays the correlations between the variables, while Table 15 shows the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), the semipartial correlations (sr_i^2) and R^2 . R for regression was significantly different from zero, $F(8, 294) = 12.59$, $p < .001$. For the three regression coefficients that differed significantly from zero, 95% confidence intervals were calculated. The confidence limits for group membership were .29 to 1.50, those for gender role ideology were .06 to .15, and those for sensation seeking were .01 to .3.

Table 14

Correlations Among Variables Predicting Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics.

	Rape tactics	Group mem	Psych- opathy	Gender role	Sensation seeking	Frat mem	Ath mem	Porn usage	Social desir
Acceptance of rape tactics	—	.25**	.33**	.44**	.19**	-.08	-.15**	.18**	-.05
Group membership		—	.14**	.23**	.14**	.05	.01	.04	-.10*
Psychopathy			—	.55**	.18**	.06	.09	.20**	-.12*
Gender role ideology				—	.13**	-.08	.14**	.12*	-.10*
Sensation seeking					—	.07	.02	.13*	-.18**
Fraternity membership						—	-.04	-.15**	-.07
Athletic membership							—	.05	-.12*
Pornography usage								—	-.06
Social desirability									—

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 15

Standard Multiple Regression Predicting Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics.

	<i>B</i> (unique)	β	sr_i^2
Group membership	.90**	.15	.02
Psychopathy	.01	.11	.01
Hypergender ideology	.11**	.31	.06
Sensation seeking	.20*	.11	.01
Fraternity membership	-.80	-.06	.00
Athletic membership	1.23	.09	.01
Pornography usage	.83	.09	.01
Social desirability	.14	.05	.00
Intercept = -7.45			
$R^2 = .26^a$			
Adjusted $R^2 = .24$			
$R = .51^{**}$			

Note. ^aUnique variability = .09; shared variability = .17.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Three of the predictor variables contributed significantly to prediction of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. These variables are group membership ($sr_i^2 = .02$), gender role ideology ($sr_i^2 = .06$), and sensation seeking ($sr_i^2 = .01$). The eight predictor variables in combination contributed another .17 in shared variability. Altogether, 26.1% (24.0% adjusted) of the variability in acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics was predicted by knowing the scores on these eight variables. Thus, a greater acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics was found among those men who reported a history of sexually aggressive behavior, endorsed characteristics consistent with sensation seeking, and demonstrated a greater acceptance of gender stereotypes.

Discussion

The proportion of participants who reported a history of sexually aggressive behavior (21.2%) is somewhat lower, yet still comparable, to other studies which have found that 25.2% of college men surveyed reported engaging in some form of sexually aggressive behaviors after the age of 14 (Koss et al., 1987). Further, the proportion is also somewhat lower than previous studies conducted with college men at Ohio University, the most recent of which found that 31.2% of men reported a history of some form of sexual aggression (Loh, 2002). Interestingly, the proportion of men in the current study who reported committing an act legally defined as rape (1.7%) is less than half of that found by previous studies (approximately 4%; Brener et al., 1999; Koss et al., 1987). It is possible that sampling differences account for some of this discrepancy, and obtaining responses from a larger or more diverse population would yield a greater proportion of reports of sexually aggressive behavior in general, and rape in particular.

Primary Hypotheses

This study was designed to examine both the use of sexually aggressive tactics among perpetrators of sexual assault, as well as the acceptance of such tactics among

college men in general. It was hypothesized that (a) the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire would be successfully factor analyzed using a principal components analysis, and (b) acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics would be predicted by a history of sexually aggressive behavior, increased levels of psychopathy, sensation seeking, adherence to traditional gender roles, fraternity membership, athletic participation, social desirability, and increased usage of pornography.

Principal Components Analysis of the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire. Using a principal components factor analysis with a Varimax rotation, the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire was successfully reduced to two factors, Overt Tactics and Covert Tactics, explaining a total of 56% of the variance. Covert Tactics consisted of the perpetrator's use of alcohol, the victim and perpetrator's use of alcohol, use of isolation, demand for silence, and the promise of positive consequences. Overt Tactics included the tactical use of drugs and/or alcohol, the threat of negative consequences, the use of a weapon and the use of force. Support for the measure can also be found in the fact that each item loaded onto only one tactic, and that the results showed a number of strong loadings. In addition, the ten primary items from the Sexual Experiences Survey were able to be classified as one of the two tactics, facilitating further analyses on tactic usage.

Additional validation for the sexually aggressive tactics derived from the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire comes from a comparison to the sexually aggressive tactics found by Cleveland and colleagues (1999). Despite some differences in factor loadings, there is a notable similarity: Overt Tactics consisted mainly of behavior that fell under Power Tactics, while Covert Tactics overlap a great deal with Drug Tactics. Thus, both factor loadings indicate that, for the most part, tactics focusing on the use of drugs and alcohol appear to be operating independently from tactics consisting primarily of overt

force. Further, factor loadings from the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire may provide a greater level of discrimination, in that it distinguishes between the tactical use of drugs and alcohol (Overt Tactics) and the perpetrator's and/or victim's use of alcohol (Covert Tactics) which may be unplanned or opportunistic. Although more research should be conducted on the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire, these preliminary findings are promising.

Prediction of Acceptance of Sexually Aggressive Tactics. A standard multiple regression demonstrated that acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics was significantly predicted by three variables: group membership, traditional gender ideology, and sensation seeking. Therefore, men who demonstrated a greater acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics were also found to have a history of sexually aggressive behavior, demonstrate a greater adherence to traditional gender roles, and endorse characteristics consistent with sensation seeking.

The current findings support previous research that men with a history of sexual aggression demonstrate a greater level of acceptance of obtaining sexual intercourse through coercion (Kanin, 1985; Koss & Dinero, 1988; Petty & Dawson, 1989). These results are also consistent with previous findings that adherence to traditional gender roles (Koss et al., 1985), and sensation seeking characteristics (Seto et al., 1995) are related to a history of sexually aggressive behavior.

The absence of significant findings for fraternity and athletic membership most likely are due to the low proportion of membership reported among the participants, resulting in a decreased ability to detect a significant relationship. Specifically, only 41 participants (14%) reported being affiliated with an all-male social fraternity, while only 46 respondents (15%) reported being a member of an intramural or varsity athletic team. A larger, more representative proportion of members from each of these groups may be

needed in order for sufficient power to exist to detect significant differences. Despite a significant correlation with acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics, psychopathy and pornography usage also failed to demonstrate significance within the regression model. A potential explanation for this finding includes the possibility that these variables are too highly correlated to other variables present, resulting in a decreased ability to predict within the model. Finally, the fact that social desirability failed to predict acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics is a positive finding, in that it indicates socially desirable responses are not a factor in the responses of acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics. In addition, the correlation matrix demonstrates that social desirability was negatively related to a history of sexually aggressive behavior, indicating that respondents reporting a history of sexually aggressive acts were significantly less likely to report socially desirable responses. Thus, it does not appear that sexually aggressive men are driven by a desire to present a socially acceptable image.

Secondary Findings

Consistent with previous research (i.e., Abbey et al., 1996; Brecklin & Ullman, 2001; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), perpetrator reports indicated a significantly high incidence of alcohol use prior to a sexually aggressive incident among both perpetrators and victims. It is notable that both heavy drinking by the perpetrator, as well as reported alcohol consumption by the victim, was more commonly endorsed by men who reported engaging in rape and attempted rape than any other group. In addition, the results offer some support for the theory that the relationship between alcohol use and aggression is not linear in nature (Abbey et al., 2002). Specifically, the majority of men who engaged in sexual contact reported either drinking 5 or more drinks or 2 or fewer drinks. Further, over half of the men who engaged in sexual coercion reported consuming 2 alcoholic drinks or fewer, while virtually all of the men who reported engaging in rape or attempted

rape reported consuming 5 or more drinks. Thus, the reported level of alcohol use among men who report a history of sexually aggressive contact is curvilinear, while heavy alcohol use among men who report a history of sexual coercion is noticeably less than that of men who report a history of rape or attempted rape. It is possible that alcohol serves to facilitate men's ability to engage in rape or attempted rape since those acts more frequently involve either force or the use of alcohol or drugs. Conversely, men who engage in sexual coercion are more likely to do so using continual arguments or pressure, lessening the need for alcohol to facilitate the act.

Limitations

Several limitations exist for the current study, including limited generalizability, low base rates, and the retrospective and self-report nature of the study. The generalizability of the study may be limited due to the nature of the sample, consisting mainly of a homogenous group of young, undergraduate college men. The lack of diversity among the participants may further limit attempts to apply the findings to groups or colleges that include greater racial and ethnic diversity.

The low base rates of men reporting having engaged in sexually aggressive behavior may result in a decreased robustness of the results. Despite obtaining data from a large sample, the generally low base rate of reporting sexually aggressive behavior ensured that many analyses would contain less than 70 participants. Efforts to increase robustness in this area could include sampling a larger number of participants and using more than one site for data collection, to ensure greater variability among the sample in addition to obtaining a larger sample overall.

The retrospective design of the study also limited the ability to use variables such as acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics to predict future behavior. However, given the exploratory nature of the study, along with limited resources, a retrospective design

was found to be appropriate. Further studies would certainly want to include at least one follow-up, in order to begin to be able to understand the predictive ability of the Sexual Strategies Questionnaire, as well as begin to detect patterns of tactic usage over time.

One of the more common limitations of studies concerning sexual assault is the self-report nature of the data collection. Given the need for confidentiality, self-report questionnaires allow participants to answer freely without having to worry about consequences for their behaviors. Unfortunately, self-report questionnaires also make it more difficult to determine if participants' are underreporting their behaviors, particularly with regard to a history of sexually aggressive behaviors. Given the low incidence of reporting by men, relative to that of women, future research may need to investigate other forms of obtaining information regarding a history of interpersonal violence.

Implications

The results from the current study have both research and applied implications. With regard to research, the current study began scale construction for a measure that can be used to assess acceptance of various sexually aggressive tactics. The measure was found to be significantly related to a history of sexually aggressive behavior, and was able to be predicted using a history of sexually aggressive behavior, adherence to traditional gender roles, and sensation seeking characteristics. Future research might focus on examining college women's experiences with these tactics, as well as on better determining the reliability and validity of the measure for both men and women.

With regard to applied factors, the results could be useful in the development of both sexual assault prevention programs and intervention techniques. The ability to use adherence to traditional gender roles as a predictor for sexually aggressive tactics indicates that prevention programs should target gender stereotypes. Further, the sexual strategies questionnaire may be used as an outcome measure, to determine

acceptability of tactics before and after a prevention program. However, the data is preliminary, and further research should be conducted with the scale to refine it.

The current findings can also be applied to intervention efforts. Given the ability of sensation seeking characteristics, traditional role ideology, and a history of sexually aggressive behavior to predict acceptance of sexually aggressive tactics, it would follow that such traits and behaviors should be targeted within intervention programs. Perhaps by targeting the perpetrator's beliefs and personality characteristics, programs would have more success in preventing future aggressive behaviors.

Conclusions

Unfortunately, sexual assault remains prevalent on college campuses. In order for efforts for improving prevention and intervention programs to succeed, the processes associated with sexually aggressive behavior need to be better explained. While a great deal of progress has been made in that area over the last 25 years, there is still much that is not understood. Hopefully the current study sheds some light on the processes involved in both sexually aggressive behavior, and the acceptance of such behavior.

References

- Abbey, A., Clinton, A. M., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. O. (2002). Alcohol-involved rapes: Are they more violent? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 99-109.
- Abbey, A., Clinton-Sherrod, A. M., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. O. (2003). The relationship between the quantity of alcohol consumed and the severity of sexual assaults committed by college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 813-833.
- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 167-195.
- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 147-169.
- Alder, C. (1985). An exploration of self-reported sexually aggressive behavior. *Crime & Delinquency*, 31, 306-331.
- Ball, S. A. (1995). The validity of an alternative five-factor measure of personality in cocaine abusers. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 148-154.
- Boeringer, S. B. (1996). Influences of fraternity membership, athletics, and male living arrangements on sexual aggression. *Violence Against Women*, 2, 134-147.
- Boeringer, S. B. (1999). Associations of rape-supportive attitudes with fraternal and athletic participation. *Violence Against Women*, 5, 81-90.
- Boeringer, S. B., Shehan, C. L., & Akers, R. L. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. *Family Relations*, 40, 58-64.

- Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S. E. (2001). The role of offender alcohol use in rape attacks. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 3-21.
- Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S. E. (2002). The roles of victim and offender alcohol use in sexual assaults: Results from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*, 57-63.
- Brener, N. D., McMahon, P. M., Warren, C. W., & Douglas, K. A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 252-259.
- Brinkley, C. A., Schmitt, W. A., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (2001). Construct validation of a self-report psychopathy scale: Does Levenson's Self-report Psychopathy Scale measure the same constructs as Hare's Psychopathy Checklist-Revised? *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 1021-1038.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217-230.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 116-131.
- Caron, S. L., & Carter, D. B. (1997). The relationships among sex role orientation, egalitarianism, attitudes toward sexuality, and attitudes toward violence against women. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 137*, 568-587.
- Caron, S. L., Halteman, W. A., & Stacy, C. (1997). Athletes and rape: Is there a connection? *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 85*, 1379-1393.
- Cleveland, H. H., Koss, M. P., & Lyons, J. (1999). Rape tactics from the survivors' perspective: Contextual dependence and within-event independence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 532-547.

- Copenhaver, S., & Grauerholz, E. (1991). Sexual victimization among sorority women: Exploring the link between sexual violence and institutional practices. *Sex Roles, 24*, 31-41.
- Corcoran, K. J., & Thomas, L. R. (1991). The influence of observed alcohol consumption on perceptions of initiation of sexual activity in a college dating situation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 200-507.
- Craig, M. E., Kalichman, S. C., & Follingstad, D. R. (1989). Verbal coercive sexual behavior among college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 18*, 421-434.
- Crosset, T. W., Ptacek, J., McDonald, M. A., & Benedict, J. R. (1996). Male student-athletes and violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 163-179.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (1997). Measuring sexual abuse in Canadian university/college dating relationships: The contribution of a national representative sample survey. In M. D. Schwartz (Ed.), *Researching sexual violence against women: Methodological and personal perspectives* (pp. 43-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1993). Sexual assault and stranger aggression on a Canadian university campus. *Sex Roles, 28*, 263-277.
- Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (2002). Sexual coercion and resistance. In M. Allen, R. W. Preiss, B. M. Gayle and N. Burrell (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication research: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 315-343). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2004a). Uniform Crime Reports. Retrieved May 27, 2004 from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_02/pdf/2sectiontwo.pdf.

- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2004b). Uniform Crime Reports: Preliminary results. Retrieved May 27, 2004 from <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/2003/03prelimucr.pdf>.
- Fritner, M. P., & Robinson, L. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The influence of alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 19*, 272-284.
- Glylys, J. A., & McNamara, J. R. (1996). A further examination of validity for the Sexual Experiences Survey. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 14*, 245-260.
- Hamburger, M. E., Hogben, M., McGowan, S., & Dawson, L. J. (1996). Assessing hypergender ideologies: Development and initial validation of a gender-neutral measure of adherence to extreme gender role beliefs. *Journal of Research in Personality, 30*, 157-178.
- Horowitz, L. M., Rosenberg, S. E., Baer, B. A., Ureño, G., & Villaseñor, A. (1988). Inventory of Interpersonal Problems: Psychometric properties and clinical applications. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 885-892.
- Humphrey, S. E., & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 1313-1322.
- Jenkins, M. J., & Dambrot, F. H. (1987). The attribution of date rape: Observer's attitudes and sexual experiences and the dating situation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17*, 875-895.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika, 35*, 401-415.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). A note on the equamax criterion. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 9*, 501-503.
- Kanin, E. J. (1969). Selected dyadic aspects of male sex aggression. *The Journal of Sex Research, 5*, 12-28.

- Kanin, E. J. (1985). Date rapists: Differential sexual socialization and relative deprivation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14, 219-231.
- Kanin, E. J. (1994). False rape allegations. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 23, 81-93.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Edmunds, C., & Seymour, A. (1992). *Rape in America: A report to the nation*. Charleston, SC: National Victim Center & the Crime Victim's Research and Treatment Center, Medical University of South Carolina.
- Koss, M. P. (1989). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In M. A. Pirog-Good and J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 145-168). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Koss, M. P., & Cleveland, H. H. (1997). Stepping on toes: Social roots of date rape lead to intractability and politicization. In M. D. Schwartz (Ed.), *Researching sexual violence against women: Methodological and personal perspectives* (pp. 4-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1988). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*, 528, 133-147.
- Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 12, 1-24.
- Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 94-108.
- Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 422-423.

- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.
- Koss, M. P., & Leonard, K. E. (1984). Sexually aggressive men: Empirical findings and theoretical implications. In N. M. Malamuth and E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Pornography and sexual aggression* (pp. 213-232). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C. J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. *Sex Roles, 12*, 981-992.
- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457.
- Lalumiere, M. L., Chalmers, L. J., Quinsey, V. L., & Seto, M. C. (1996). A test of the mate deprivation hypothesis of sexual coercion. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 17*, 299-318.
- Lalumiere, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1996). Sexual deviance, antisociality, mating effort, and the use of sexually coercive behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 33-48.
- LeBeau, M. A. (1999). Toxicological investigations of drug-facilitated sexual assaults. *Forensic Science Communications, 1*. Retrieved October 11, 2002 from <http://www.fbi.gov/hq/lab/fsc/backissu/april1999/lebeau.htm>.
- Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 151-158.

- Loh, C. (1999). Recognition of risk behaviors and sexual aggression in college men. Unpublished master's thesis: Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
- Loh, C. (2002). Sexual assault perpetration in college men: Support for an integrative model of sexual assault and acquaintance rape. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
- Lynam, D. R., Whiteside, S., & Jones, S. (1999). Self-reported psychopathy: A validation study. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 73, 110-132.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. In M. A. Pirog-Good and J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 219-240). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Malamuth, N. M., Heavey, C. L., & Linz, D. (1993). Predicting men's antisocial behavior against women: The interaction model of sexual aggression. In G. C. N. Hall, R. Hirschman, J. R. Graham, and M. S. Zaragoza (Eds.) *Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 63-97). Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis.
- Malamuth, N. M., & Thornhill, N. W. (1994). Hostile masculinity, sexual aggression, and gender-biased domineeringness in conversations. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 195-193.
- Martin, P. Y., & Hummer, R. A. (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. *Gender and Society*, 3, 457-473.
- McCormick, N. B. (1979). Come-ons and put-offs: Unmarried students' strategies for having and avoiding sexual intercourse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 194-211.
- Miller, B., & Marshall, J. C. (1987). Coercive sex on the university campus. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28, 38-47.

- Mosher, D. L., & Anderson, R. D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 20*, 77-94.
- Mosher, D. L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18*, 150-163.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Falcon, P. L. (1991). Men's heterosexual skill and attitudes toward women as predictors of verbal sexual coercion and forcible rape. *Sex Roles, 23*, 241-259.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Goggins, M. F., Jones, J. M., & Satterfield, A. T. (1991). Sexual violence and coercion in close relationships. In K. McKinney and S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 155-175). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 186-196.
- Murnen, S. K., & Byrne, D. (1991). Hyperfemininity: Measurement and initial validation of the construct. *The Journal of Sex Research, 28*, 479-489.
- Norris, J., Nurius, P. S., & Dimeff, L. A. (1996). Through her eyes: Factors affecting women's perception of and resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 123-145.
- O'Donohue, W., McKay, J. S., & Schewe, P. A. (1996). Rape: The roles of outcome expectancies and hypermasculinity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8*, 133-141.
- Ohio Revised Code, 2907 § 5924.120 (1961).
- Ohio Revised Code, 2907 §§ 28907.01-2907.02 (1998).

- Petty, G. L., & Dawson, B. (1989). Sexual aggression in normal men: Incidence, beliefs, and personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10*, 355-362.
- Quinn, K., Sanchez-Hucles, J., Coates, G., & Gillen, B. (1991). Men's compliance with a woman's resistance to unwanted sexual advances. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17*, 13-31.
- Quinsey, V. L., Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Actuarial prediction of sexual recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 85-105.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*, 119-125.
- Rozee, P. (1999). Stranger rape. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *The psychology of sexual victimization: A handbook* (pp. 97-115). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 127-139.
- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, M. D., & Nogrady, C. A. (1996). Fraternity membership, rape myths, and sexual aggression on a college campus. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 148-162.
- Seto, M. C., Khattar, N. A., Lalumiere, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1997). Deception and sexual strategy in psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 22*, 301-307.
- Seto, M. C., Lalumiere, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1995). Sensation seeking and males' sexual strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 669-675.

- Seto, M. C., Maric, A., & Barbaree, H. E. (2001). The role of pornography in the etiology of sexual aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*, 35-53.
- Shotland, R. L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46*, 220-232.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.
- Spence, J. T., Losoff, M., & Robbins, A. S. (1991). Sexually aggressive tactics in dating relationships: Personality and attitudinal correlates. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10*, 289-304.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75-88.
- Struckman-Johnson, D., & Struckman-Johnson, C. (1991). Men and women's acceptance of coercive sexual strategies varied by initiator gender and couple intimacy. *Sex Roles, 25*, 661-676.
- Testa, M., & Parks, K. A. (1996). The role of women's alcohol consumption in sexual victimization. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 217-234.
- Theilade, P., & Thomsen, J. L. (1986). False allegations of rape. *Police Surgeon, 30*, 17-22.
- Thornquist, M. H., & Zuckerman, M. (1995). Psychopathy, passive-avoidance learning and basic dimensions of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 525-534.
- Ullman, S. E., & Brecklin, L. R. (2000). Alcohol and adult sexual assault in a national sample of women. *Journal of Substance Abuse, 11*, 405-420.

- Ullman, S. E., & Siegel, J. M. (1993). Victim-offender relationship and sexual assault. *Violence and Victims, 8*, 121-134.
- Welner, M. (2001). The perpetrators and their modus operandi. In M. A. LeBeau and A. Mozayani (Eds.), *Drug facilitated sexual assault: A forensic handbook* (pp. 39-71). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zuckerman, M. (2002). Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (ZKPQ): An alternative five-factorial model. In B. De Raad and M. Perugini (Eds.), *Big Five assessment* (pp. 377-396). Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Zuckerman, M. & Kuhlman, D. M. (2000). Personality and risk-taking: Common biosocial factors. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 999-1029.
- Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D. M., Joireman, J., Teta, P., & Kraft, M. (1993). A comparison of three structural models for personality: The big three, the big five, and the alternative five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 757-768.

Appendix A-1

Ohio University
Human Subjects Consent Form (Time 1)

Title of Research: Men's Social Experiences and Beliefs

Principal Investigator: Jennifer Warkentin

Department: Psychology

- I. Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the statement in II below, you will indicate your consent by completing the following packets.

II. Statement of Procedure:

Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time. These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society and unwanted sexual experiences. Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences. Some of the surveys are sexually explicit in nature. Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials. Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires on two separate occasions, once today, and once during Session II, two days from today. Your participation will take approximately two hours: one hour for Session I, and one hour for Session II. You will receive two experimental credit points toward your psychology class at the end of Session II.

All answers are anonymous. You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number. The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting number can in no way be used to identify you. You will be asked to calculate this number at both sessions.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. However, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.

As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research, and your answers will help the field of psychology better understand these issues. In addition, you will receive 2 experimental credits for your participation at the end of Session II. If you choose not to complete the study today, you will receive one experimental credit point. Also, if you choose not to return for Session II you may contact the researcher to obtain your experimental credit point for Session I.

If you have any questions or concerns the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to contact the principle investigator, Jennifer Warkentin at 592-4008 or jw154901@ohio.edu, or her faculty advisor, Dr. Christine Gidycz at 593-1092 or gidycz@ohiou.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

By completing the following surveys, I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Appendix A-2
Debriefing Form (Time 1)

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate men's knowledge, beliefs, social experiences and sexual behavior. The relationships between each of these variables were also examined. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between various different constructs.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researcher: Jennifer Warkentin
Porter Hall – Office 044-P
592-4008

Faculty Advisor: Christine A. Gidycz
Porter Hall - Room 231
593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services: 593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services: 592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline): 593-3344

Appendix A-3

Ohio University
Human Subjects Consent Form (Time 2)

Title of Research: Men's Social Experiences and Beliefs

Principal Investigator: Jennifer Warkentin

Department: Psychology

- I. Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the statement in II below, you will indicate your consent by filling out the following packets.

- II. Statement of Procedure:

Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time. These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society and unwanted sexual experiences. Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences. Some of the surveys are sexually explicit in nature. Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials. Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

Your participation during Session II today will take approximately one hour. You will be asked to complete a packet of questionnaires. You will receive two experimental credit points toward your psychology class at the end of the session.

All answers are anonymous. You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number. The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting number can in no way be used to identify you.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. However, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.

As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research, and your answers will help the field of psychology better understand these issues. In addition, you will receive 2 experimental credits for your participation at the end

of today's session. If you choose not to complete the study today, you will still receive two experimental credit points.

If you have any questions or concerns the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to contact the principle investigator, Jennifer Warkentin at 592-4008 or jw154901@ohio.edu, or her faculty advisor Dr. Christine Gidycz at 593-1092 or gidycz@ohiou.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

By completing the following surveys, I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Appendix A-4

Debriefing Form (Time 2)

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate men's knowledge, beliefs, social experiences and sexual behavior. The relationships between each of these variables were also examined. Additionally, this study was also assessing the acceptance of using various tactics when a woman appears to not want to have sexual contact. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between various different constructs.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researcher: Jennifer Warkentin
Porter Hall – Office 044-P
592-4008

Faculty Advisor: Christine A. Gidycz
Porter Hall - Room 231
593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services: 593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services: 592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline): 593-3344

Appendix B-1

Subject Number Calculation Form

Please write down the **last 4 digits**
of your social security number:

Record the **month** and **day** of your birth date.
Add this **4 digit** figure to your SS # above.
If the month or day is only 1 digit, please put a '0'
in the first space. For example, if you were born on
January 1, you should record it as '01/01':

+ $\frac{\text{M}}{\text{M}} / \frac{\text{D}}{\text{D}}$

= _____

Add the number of letters in your mother's **FULL**
FIRST name. Do not use nicknames. For example, if
your mother's first name is Christine, but she goes by
the nickname Chris, you should record it as '09', the
number of letters in CHRISTINE.:

+ _____

Please put this sheet back in the manila envelope provided. Fill out all questionnaires
on the scantron sheets. If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter.

Appendix C-1

Demographics Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Please choose the best response for each question.

1. What is your age?
 - A. 18
 - B. 19
 - C. 20
 - D. 21
 - E. 22
 - F. 23
 - G. 24
 - H. 25
 - I. Over 25
2. What is your current marital status?
 - A. Never married
 - B. Co-habiting
 - C. Married
 - D. Divorced
 - E. Widowed
3. What is your current year in school?
 - A. Freshman
 - B. Sophomore
 - C. Junior
 - D. Senior
 - E. Graduate student
 - F. Other
4. Where do you currently live?
 - A. College dormitory or residence hall
 - B. Fraternity house
 - C. Other University/college housing
 - D. Off-campus house or apartment
 - E. Parent/Guardian's home
 - F. Other
5. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. Caucasian, Non-Hispanic
 - B. African American
 - C. Latino
 - D. Asian or Pacific Islander
 - E. American Indian or Alaska Native
 - F. Other

6. What is your religion?
 - A. Catholic (Christian)
 - B. Protestant (Christian)
 - C. Jewish
 - D. Nondenominational
 - E. Muslim
 - F. None
 - G. Other
7. Approximately what is your parents' yearly income?
 - A. unemployed or disabled
 - B. \$10,000 – \$20,000
 - C. \$21,000 - \$30,000
 - D. \$31,001 - \$40,000
 - E. \$41,000 - \$50,000
 - F. \$51,000 - \$75,000
 - G. \$76,000 - \$100,000
 - H. \$100,000 - over
8. What is your current dating status?
 - A. I do not date.
 - B. I date casually.
 - C. I am involved in a long-term relationship
 - D. I am engaged
 - E. I am married
9. How old were you when you first willingly had sexual intercourse?
 - A. I have never willingly had sexual intercourse
 - B. 13 years or younger
 - C. 14
 - D. 15
 - E. 16
 - F. 17
 - G. 18
 - H. 19 or older
10. How many consensual sex partners have you had?
 - A. 0
 - B. 1 or 2
 - C. 3 or 4
 - D. 5 or 6
 - E. 7 or 8
 - F. 9 or 10
 - G. 11 or more

The following three questions ask about fraternity membership.

11. Are you a member of an all-male social fraternity?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

12. Are you a member of a coed fraternity?
A. Yes
B. No
13. Are you a member of a professional fraternity?
A. Yes
B. No

The following seven questions ask about sports team membership.

14. Are you a member of an all-male sports team?
A. Yes
B. No
15. Are you a member of a club sports team?
A. Yes
B. No
16. Which, if any, of the following sports do you play as part of a club sports team? (If you play more than one, please choose the sport you play most often)
A. Baseball
B. Boxing
C. Crew
D. Ice hockey
E. Lacrosse
F. Rugby
G. Soccer
H. Mixed martial arts
I. Mountain bike
J. I do not play any of these sports as part of a club sports team
17. Are you a member of an intramural sports team?
A. Yes
B. No
18. Which, if any, of the following sports do you play as part of an intramural sports team? (If you play more than one, please choose the sport you play most often)
A. Flag football
B. Soccer
C. Basketball
D. Volleyball
E. Broomball
F. Softball
G. Floor hockey
H. Ultimate Frisbee
I. Tennis
J. I do not play any of these sports as part of a club sports team

19. Are you a member of a varsity sports team?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
20. Which, if any, of the following sports do you play as part of a varsity sports team? (If you play more than one, please choose the one sport you play most often)
- A. Baseball
 - B. Basketball
 - C. Cross country
 - D. Football
 - E. Golf
 - F. Swimming and diving
 - G. Track and field
 - H. Wrestling
 - I. I do not play any of these sports as part of a varsity sports team
21. What best describes your sexual orientation?
- A. Heterosexual
 - B. Homosexual
 - C. Bisexual
22. Which of the following best describes how often you watch MTV?
- A. At least once a day
 - B. At least once a week
 - C. At least once a month
 - D. At least once last year
 - E. Once or more, but not in the past year
 - F. Never
23. Which of the following best describes how often you exercise?
- A. At least once a day
 - B. At least once a week
 - C. At least once a month
 - D. At least once last year
 - E. Once or more, but not in the past year
 - F. Never
24. Which of the following best describes how often you view pornographic materials (magazines, movies, etc)?
- A. At least once a day
 - B. At least once a week
 - C. At least once a month
 - D. At least once last year
 - E. Once or more, but not in the past year
 - F. Never

25. Which of the following best describes how often you talk on the phone with a friend?
- A. At least once a day
 - B. At least once a week
 - C. At least once a month
 - D. At least once last year
 - E. Once or more, but not in the past year
 - F. Never
26. About how often would you say that you drank alcoholic beverages in the past 6 months?
- A. Every day or nearly every day
 - B. At least once a week but not every day
 - C. At least once a month but not every week
 - D. 7-11 times in the past 6 months
 - E. 3-6 times in the past 6 months
 - F. 1-2 times in the past 6 months
 - G. Did not drink in the past 6 months
27. When you drank alcoholic beverages in the past 6 months, about how many drinks did you have typically on a single occasion?
- A. More than 10 drinks
 - B. 8-10 drinks
 - C. 5-7 drinks
 - D. 3-4 drinks
 - E. 1-2 drinks
 - F. Did not drink in the past 6 months
28. During the past 6 months, how often would you say you consumed 5 or more alcoholic beverages in a single day?
- A. 5 or more days per week
 - B. 3-4 days per week
 - C. 1-2 days per week
 - D. Less than once a month
 - E. Never
29. During the past 6 months, how often would you say you consumed enough alcohol to feel drunk or intoxicated?
- A. 5 or more days per week
 - B. 3-4 days per week
 - C. 1-2 days per week
 - D. Less than once a month
 - E. Never

30. Select the number that represents the maximum number of alcoholic beverages that you might consume on any one occasion.
- A. 19 or more drinks
 - B. 16-18 drinks
 - C. 13-15 drinks
 - D. 11-12 drinks
 - E. 9-10 drinks
 - F. 7-8 drinks
 - G. 5-6 drinks
 - H. 3-4 drinks
 - I. 2 or less drinks
 - J. 0 drinks

Appendix C-2

Hypergender Ideology Scale

DIRECTIONS: Below are some statements regarding attitudes about men and women. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your opinion. Please choose only one option for each item to indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement and fill in the corresponding circle on the scantron sheet provided, using the scale below.

A	B	C	D	E	F
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

1. A true man knows how to command others.
2. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.
3. Men should be ready to take any risk, if the payoff is large enough.
4. No wife is obliged to provide sex for anybody, even her husband.
5. Women should break dates with female friends when guys ask them out.
6. Men have to expect that most women will be something of a prick-tease.
7. A real man can get any woman to have sex with him.
8. Women instinctively try to manipulate men.
9. Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she'll let you do whatever you want.
10. Men should be in charge during sex.
11. It's okay for a man to be a little forceful to get sex.
12. Women don't mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.
13. Homosexuals can be just as good at parenting as heterosexuals.
14. Gays and lesbians are generally just like everybody else.
15. Pickups should expect to put out.
16. If men pay for a date, they deserve something in return.
17. Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
18. Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
19. I believe some women lead happy lives without having male partners.

Appendix C-3

Sexual Experiences Survey

DIRECTIONS: The following questions are about your sexual experiences from age 14 on. Please choose only one option for each item and fill in the corresponding circle on the scantron sheet provided. Answer all questions. If you did not have the experience listed in any particular item, please choose the response "I have not had this experience".

Have you ever had any of these experiences from age 14 on?

1. Have you ever had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn't want to because you overwhelmed her by your continual arguments and pressure? (from age 14 on)
 - A. No
 - B. Yes
2. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
 - A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
3. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
 - A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
4. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
 - A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience

5. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
6. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
7. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
8. Have you had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn't want to because you used your authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make her? (from age 14 on)
 - A. No
 - B. Yes
9. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
 - A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
10. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
 - A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience

11. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
 - A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
12. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
13. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
14. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
15. Have you had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn't want to because you threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) to make her? (from age 14 on)
 - A. No
 - B. Yes
16. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
 - A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
17. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
 - A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse

- H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
18. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
19. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
20. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
21. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

The following questions are about sexual intercourse. By sexual intercourse we mean penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis. Ejaculation is not required. Whenever you see the words sexual intercourse, please use this definition.

22. Have you attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (get on top of her and insert your penis) when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) but intercourse did not occur? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes

23. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
24. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
25. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
26. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
27. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
28. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

29. Have you attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (get on top of her and insert your penis) by giving her alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
30. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
31. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
32. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
33. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
34. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

35. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
36. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with your continual arguments and pressure? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
37. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
38. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
39. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
40. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
41. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

42. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
43. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you used your position of authority (boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor)? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
44. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
45. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
46. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
47. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

48. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
49. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
50. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you gave her alcohol or drugs? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
51. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
52. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
53. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
54. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

55. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
56. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
57. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you threatened to use some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) to make her? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
58. About how many times has it happened (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
59. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience
60. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience

61. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
62. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
63. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
64. Have you had sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) with a woman when she didn't want to by using threats or some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? (from age 14 on)
- A. No
 - B. Yes
65. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 on)?
- A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5 or more
 - F. I have not had this experience
66. Think about the most recent episode: what was your relationship prior to this event?
- A. Stranger
 - B. Acquaintance
 - C. Friend
 - D. Casual Date
 - E. Steady Dating Partner
 - F. Spouse
 - G. Ex-Spouse
 - H. Other
 - I. I have not had this experience

67. Think about the most recent episode: how much alcohol were you drinking at the time?
- A. 5 or more drinks
 - B. 3-4 drinks
 - C. 1-2 drinks
 - D. I was not drinking
 - E. I have not had this experience
68. Think about the most recent episode: were you using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
69. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using alcohol at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience
70. Think about the most recent episode: was the other person using drugs at the time?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I have not had this experience

Appendix C-4

Sexual Strategies Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Please carefully read the scenario below and respond to the following questions using the scales provided. There are no right or wrong answers. Please choose only one option for each item and circle your answer and fill in the corresponding answer on your scantron.

A twenty-year old man meets a twenty-year old woman at a popular bar uptown. The man asks her out and she accepts. One night they go to a party together and then go to the man's apartment to listen to music. The man says he would like to have sex, but the woman says that she would not.

Please read the following descriptions of how the evening could have ended and use the following scale to indicate how acceptable you think it is for a man to obtain sex in this manner.

- 1 = Always Unacceptable**
- 2 = Frequently Unacceptable**
- 3 = Often Unacceptable**
- 4 = Sometimes Unacceptable/ Sometimes Acceptable**
- 5 = Often Acceptable**
- 6 = Frequently Acceptable**
- 7 = Always Acceptable**

1. The man promises her that he really likes her and wants her to be his girlfriend until she gives in and they have sex.
2. The man proceeds to have sex with the woman and then warns her that she had better not tell anyone.
3. The man invites the woman to his room and locks the door. Then the man proceeds to have sex with her.
4. The man and the woman continue to drink alcohol until they are both very drunk. Then the man proceeds to have sex with her.
5. The man continues to drink alcohol until he is very drunk. Then the man proceeds to have sex with her.
6. The man gives the woman alcohol until she eventually passes out. Then the man proceeds to have sex with her.
7. The man slips a drug into the woman's drink and eventually she passes out. Then the man proceeds to have sex with her.

8. The man threatens to come back and harm the woman until she gives in and they have sex.
9. The man holds the woman down and then proceeds to have sex with her.
10. The man pulls out a weapon and threatens to harm the woman. He then proceeds to have sex with her.

Appendix C-5

Self-report Psychopathy Scale

DIRECTIONS: Please read each of the following statements carefully and indicate how much you agree with them using the following scale.

A	B	C	D
Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly

1. Success is based on survival of the fittest; I am not concerned about the losers.
2. I quickly lose interest in tasks I start.
3. When I get frustrated, I often "let off steam" by blowing my top.
4. My main purpose in life is getting as many goodies as I can.
5. Before I do anything, I carefully consider the possible consequences.
6. Making a lot of money is my most important goal.
7. For me, what's right is whatever I can get away with.
8. I am often bored.
9. I enjoy manipulating other people's feelings.
10. I often admire a really clever scam.
11. I would be upset if my success came at someone else's expense.
12. People who are stupid enough to get ripped off usually deserve it.
13. I tell other people what they want to hear so that they will do what I want them to do.
14. I feel bad if my words or actions cause someone else to feel emotional pain.
15. Looking out for myself is my top priority.
16. Most of my problems are due to the fact that other people just don't understand me.
17. Cheating is not justified because it is unfair to others.
18. I find myself in the same kinds of trouble, time after time.
19. Even if I were trying very hard to sell something, I wouldn't lie about it.
20. In today's world, I feel justified in doing anything I can get away with to succeed.
21. I don't plan anything very far in advance.

- 22. I let others worry about higher values; my main concern is with the bottom line.
- 23. I find that I am able to pursue one goal for a long time.
- 24. I make a point of trying not to hurt others in pursuit of my goals.
- 25. I have been in a lot of shouting matches with other people.
- 26. Love is overrated.

Appendix C-6

**Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire- Impulsive
Sensation Seeking Subscale**

DIRECTIONS: Please read each of the following statements and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer on the scantron.

If you agree with a statement or decide that it describes you then answer true. If you disagree with the statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, answer false.

A	B
True	False

1. I tend to begin a new job without much advance planning on how I will do it.
2. I am an impulsive person.
3. I'll try anything once.
4. I usually think about what I am going to do before doing it.
5. I tend to change interests frequently.
6. I like to explore a strange city or section of town by myself, even if it means getting lost.
7. I prefer friends who are excitingly unpredictable.
8. I like doing things just for the thrill of it.
9. I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.
10. I often get so carried away by new and exciting things and ideas that I never think of possible complications.
11. I would like to take off on a trip with no preplanned or definite routes or timetables.
12. I would like the kind of life where one is on the move and traveling a lot, with lots of change and excitement.
13. I often do things on impulse.
14. I like to have new and exciting experiences and sensations even if they are a little frightening.
15. I very seldom spend much time on the details of planning ahead.

16. I enjoy getting into new situations where you can't predict how things will turn out.
17. I tend to change interests frequently.
18. Before I begin a complicated job, I make careful plans.
19. I like "wild" uninhibited parties.

Appendix C-7

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

DIRECTIONS: Listed below are thirteen statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

A	B
True	False

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt somebody.

Appendix C-8

Filler Items

Conflict Tactics Scale (selected questions):

DIRECTIONS: No matter how well parents get along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also may use different ways of trying to settle their differences. Listed below are some things that your parents might have done when you had a dispute. Try and remember what went on when your parents had a disagreement with each other.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scantron sheet to show approximately how often your father/step-father/father figure did these things to your mother/step-mother/mother figure.

- A Never
- B Almost Never
- C Some of the time
- D About half of the time
- E Most of the time
- F Almost all of the time
- G Always

1. My father discussed the issue calmly.
2. My father got information to back up his side of things.
3. My father brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.
4. My father insulted or swore at my mother.
5. My father sulked or refused to talk about it.
6. My father stomped out of the room or house.
7. My father cried.
8. My father did or said something to spite my mother.
9. My father threatened to hit or throw something at my mother.
10. My father threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.
11. My father threw something at my mother.
12. My father pushed, grabbed, or shoved my mother.

Social Support Questionnaire (selected questions):

The following questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, choose the person listed whom you can count on most for help or support in the manner described and fill in the corresponding number on your answer sheet. For the second part, choose the number that best identifies how satisfied you are with the overall support you have in the manner described and fill in the corresponding number on your scantron.

If you have had no support for a question, select the option "No one," but still rate your level of satisfaction.

Please answer all the questions as best you can.

1. Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help? (Please choose only one)

- A. Mother
- B. Father
- C. Brother
- D. Sister
- E. Friend
- F. Other
- G. No one

2. How satisfied are you with the overall support you have?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Fairly satisfied
- C. A little satisfied
- D. A little dissatisfied
- E. Fairly dissatisfied
- F. Very dissatisfied

3. Whom can you really count on to make you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or are tense? (Please choose only one)

- A. Mother
- B. Father
- C. Brother
- D. Sister
- E. Friend
- F. Other
- G. No one

4. How satisfied are you with the overall support you have?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Fairly satisfied
- C. A little satisfied
- D. A little dissatisfied
- E. Fairly dissatisfied
- F. Very dissatisfied

5. Who accepts you totally, including your best and worst points? (Please choose only one)
- A. Mother
 - B. Father
 - C. Brother
 - D. Sister
 - E. Friend
 - F. Other
 - G. No one
6. How satisfied are you with the overall support you have?
- A. Very satisfied
 - B. Fairly satisfied
 - C. A little satisfied
 - D. A little dissatisfied
 - E. Fairly dissatisfied
 - F. Very dissatisfied
7. Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you? (Please choose only one)
- A. Mother
 - B. Father
 - C. Brother
 - D. Sister
 - E. Friend
 - F. Other
 - G. No one
8. How satisfied are you with the overall support you have?
- A. Very satisfied
 - B. Fairly satisfied
 - C. A little satisfied
 - D. A little dissatisfied
 - E. Fairly dissatisfied
 - F. Very dissatisfied
9. Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset? (Please choose only one)
- A. Mother
 - B. Father
 - C. Brother
 - D. Sister
 - E. Friend
 - F. Other
 - G. No one

10. How satisfied are you with the overall support you have?
- A. Very satisfied
 - B. Fairly satisfied
 - C. A little satisfied
 - D. A little dissatisfied
 - E. Fairly dissatisfied
 - F. Very dissatisfied

Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (selected questions):

DIRECTIONS: Here is a list of problems that people report in relating to other people. Please read the list below, and for each item, consider whether that problem has been a problem for you with respect to any significant person in your life. Then use the scale to select the number that describes how distressing that problem has been, and circle that number on your scantron sheet.

1	=	Not at all
2	=	A little bit
3	=	Moderately
4	=	Quite a bit
5	=	Extremely

For Example:

How much have you been distressed by this problem?

It is hard for me to:

00. Get along with my relatives.

It is hard for me to:

- 1. trust other people
- 2. say "no" to other people
- 3. join in on groups
- 4. keep things private from other people
- 5. let other people know what I want
- 6. tell a person to stop bothering me
- 7. introduce myself to new people
- 8. confront people with problems that come up
- 9. be assertive with another person
- 10. let people know when I'm angry
- 11. make a long term commitment to another person
- 12. be another person's boss
- 13. be aggressive towards others when the situation calls for it
- 14. socialize with other people
- 15. show affection to other people