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Abstract

This study tested whether attitudes toward women, social environment, psychopathology, and childhood exposure to abuse each contribute unique, nonredundant information in the prediction of men's patterns of abusing women. Individual sexual abusiveness, group rape/group sex involvement, physical abusiveness, and emotional abusiveness were examined. Data were analyzed from 255 college student men who anonymously reported their abuse of women since the age of 14. All four types of predictor variables were significantly related to total abusiveness after controlling for the other three types of predictors. However, only attitudes toward women and involvement in an alcohol-centered social environment were each related to sexual abusiveness after controlling for the other three predictor groups. With respect to emotional abusiveness, the same was true for childhood exposure to abuse and attitudes toward women, but not for involvement in an alcohol centered social environment. Physical attacks were not predicted by any variable group after controlling for all others. A stepwise discriminant function analysis differentiated (1) nonabusive men, (2) men who were sexually abusive only, (3) men who were nonsexually abusive only, and (4) men who were abusive toward women in multiple ways. Men who were sexually abusive only were distinguished by the highest levels of alcohol use, finding dates at parties and bars, and fraternity affiliation. Men who were nonsexually abusive only were distinguished by the highest levels of hostility toward women; furthermore, their levels of antisocial tendencies and cognitive-emotional disturbance were almost as high as those of the multiply abusive group. The multiply abusive group also had the highest levels of sexual arousal to rape vignettes, was the most reactive to peer pressure to put their girlfriend "in her place," and had the highest levels of childhood experiences of having witnessed their fathers behaving in disrespectful ways toward their mothers. The nonabusive group was characterized by much lower scores on all predictor variables than the other three groups on all but two of the discriminating variables. The discussion addresses implications of the findings for intervention programming, theory, and future research.
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Patterns of Sexual, Physical, and Emotional Abuse of Women by College Men:
Multivariate Examination of Attitudes Toward Women,
Social Environment, Psychopathology, and Childhood Exposure to Abuse

It is becoming increasingly evident that sexual and physical abuse of women by men, often their partners, is a problem of epidemic proportions. In 1990, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 12 rapes were reported every hour, over twice the number of rapes reported in 1970 (FBI, 1990). Taking nonreporting rates into account, Koss (1990) estimated that as many as 2 million women are raped each year in the U.S. Men who are acquainted with their victims account for approximately 85% to 89% of rapes (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988; Russell, 1984). With respect to overall levels of sexual abuse of adult women, 25% to 57% of college men report having engaged in some form of sexual behavior against a woman's will (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Powch, 1991).

The statistics for nonsexual physical abuse of adult women by men are equally grim. Estimates of the percentage of couples who have experienced at least one occurrence of physical abuse range from 30% to 60% (Gelles, 1974; Straus, 1978; Walker, 1979). According to a recent review (Browne, 1993), 17 years of empirical findings suggest that 4 million women in the U.S. are severely assaulted by male partners in an average 12-month period. The magnitude of this problem from a public health perspective can be appreciated when one considers that domestic violence is the leading cause of injuries to women aged 15-44 (Biden, 1993, citing Novello, Rosenberg, Saltzman, & Shosky, 1992); it is more common than automobile accidents, muggings, and cancer deaths combined (Biden, 1993, citing the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, 1992). According to a review by Goodman, Koss, Fitzgerald, Russo, and Keita (1993), over half (52%) of all female murder victims during the first half of the 1980s were killed

---

1 Walker's estimate refers to female victims of male perpetrators; Gelles and Straus's data do not distinguish between who was the victim and who was the assailant.
by their partners. Rates of courtship violence among male college students suggest that the pattern of violence starts early; 41% of a sample of men at a midwestern university reported having physically attacked a romantic partner at least once since the age of 14, with an average of 11 attacks reported by abusive men in that study (Powch, 1991).

Attempts to explain the violence and develop strategies for preventing further violence were limited until recently by an unproductive focus on searching for victim characteristics. In a review of the empirical research on husband-to-wife-battering, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) reported that only 1 of 16 wife characteristics was a consistent risk marker (having witnessed violence as a child or adolescent), whereas 8 out of 14 husband characteristics were consistent risk markers. These authors commented, "it is sometimes forgotten that men's violence is men's behavior," noting that fruitful attempts to explain this behavior have focused on the abuser's characteristics. Consequently, they stressed that future research should be designed to discover more about abuser characteristics and to develop stronger theory to explain it.

A similar conclusion has been drawn in the rape literature by Schewe and O'Donohue (1993), who noted that currently, the most extensive form of rape prevention "involves the self-imprisonment of women and other costly precautionary efforts undertaken by women" (p. 667), which will always leave women "vulnerable to sexual assault to the extent that there are men who will commit acts of sexual assault" (p. 668). These authors pointed out that rape prevention programs are based upon an insufficient knowledge of the causes of rape and that etiological accounts of rape have largely ignored, among other things, the development of an appropriate taxonomy of rapists.

Reviewing both sexual and nonsexual male-to-female abuse, Browne (1993) came to a similar conclusion: "Relatively little is known about what leads some men to use physical

---

2 I use the terms nonsexual violence, nonsexual abusiveness, and battering interchangeably. Unless otherwise noted, these terms refer to both physical and emotional forms of abuse of adult women.
aggressiveness as a relational tool" (p. 1082). Browne emphasized the need for research on abusive men "both as a basis for comprehensive evaluations of existing intervention strategies and for the design of more effective mechanisms for creating and maintaining change in men who direct violence against their adult intimates" (p. 1082). Priorities for research that Browne stressed include "the development of mechanisms for early identification of abusive men when they are seen in mental health settings, improved interventions for creating and maintaining change in violent behavior, and—potentially the most difficult—strategies for engaging a wider population of abusive men in interventions for abusers" (p. 1083).

In addition to the call for research focusing on abuse characteristics, there is growing recognition in both the sexual assault literature and the relationship violence literature that sexual assault (including rape3 ), battering, and other forms of abuse are unlikely to be explained by univariate models or models derived from a single theoretical perspective. Three types of integration are called for: (a) integration of forms of woman abuse studied, (b) integration of predictors or correlates of woman abuse, and (c) theoretical integration (Hall, 1990; Malamuth, 1986; Powch, 1991).

Need For Integration of Forms of Woman Abuse Studied

It has recently been recognized that little is known about the comparative or shared risk markers of different forms of abuse because of a tendency to study a single form of abuse in isolation from other forms (Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991; Powch, 1991). This is particularly problematic because many abusive men commit more than one form of abuse. For instance, 34% to 59% of battered women report that their batterers also rape or sexually assault them (Frieze, 1983; Shields & Hanneke, 1983; Walker, 1984). There is also some evidence that men who are both physically and sexually aggressive perpetrate more severe levels of nonsexual

---

3 I use the terms sexual assault and sexual abusiveness interchangeably to refer to any nonconsensual sexual activity, and the term rape to refer to the subset of unwanted sexual activity that includes vaginal, anal, or oral penetration. For a fuller discussion of these definitional issues, see Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps, and Giusti (1992).
aggression than that perpetrated by other abusers (Bowker, 1983; Shields & Hanneke, 1983; Walker, 1984).

Emotional abuse has been a relatively neglected form of abuse in the rape and battering literatures, although a recent study by Follingstad, Rutledge, and Berg (1990) suggests that emotional abuse would be an important form of abuse to study in conjunction with sexual and physical abuse. The Follingstad group interviewed 234 battered women and found that 97.9% of these battered women had experienced emotional abuse in addition to physical abuse (with ridicule, threats of abuse, jealousy, and restriction being the most common forms of emotional abuse). Moreover, the majority of these women reported that the emotional abuse had a more severe impact on them than the physical abuse (Follingstad, et al., 1990). Another study, this one focusing on college student men (Powch, 1991), found self-reported emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners to be significantly correlated .75 with self reported physical abusiveness, and .53 with self-reported sexual abusiveness. In that study sexual and physical abusiveness toward romantic partners were also significantly correlated .40 with each other. Given that previous research suggests there is considerable overlap between sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness, it is advisable to study the abuse spectrum.

Group rape (referred to as gang rape by some authors) is another form of woman abuse that has been relatively neglected in the research literature. A recent study by Sanday (1990) identified fraternity gang rape as a widespread form of sexual abusiveness toward women on college campuses. However, Koss & Gaines (1993) found that when intensity of alcohol use and degree of athletics participation are taken into account first, these variables discriminate participation in gang rapes, and fraternity involvement does not improve discrimination. Most studies of college men's sexually abusive behavior prior to the present study have not inquired about group rape (gang rape) or group sex that may have been coercive.

Need For Integration of Predictors or Correlates of Woman Abuse

Malamuth (1986) presented empirical evidence supporting his conclusion that emphasis
should be placed on analyzing crucial configurations of multiple interacting factors rather than on searching for a primary causal factor or simple additive factors. Furthermore, an evolving body of literature currently suggests that not all batterers are the same and not all rapists are the same. Consequently, some combinations of risk factors may be operative in one type of abusive man, and a different combination of risk factors may be operative in other types of abusive men.

One way of exploring the idea of subtypes of abusive men was tried by Kalichman, Szymanowski, McKee, Taylor, and Craig (1989), who used a cluster analytic technique to identify five Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Greene, 1980) profile subgroups in a sample of incarcerated sex offenders whose victims were adult women. One subtype had no significant scale elevations in the mean profile; the other subtypes differed on patterns of elevation in depression, mania, psychopathic deviance, and thought disorder. Also using a cluster analytic technique, Saunders (1987) identified three types of batterers: one that was high on anger, depression, and jealousy and moderate on alcohol use; one that was highly antisocial, extremely violent, and most likely to abuse alcohol; and another that was low on all variables measured. These studies present evidence for the existence of personality subtypes among rapists and batterers. Unfortunately, they did not compare these personality subtypes found among identified abusers with personality subtypes of nonabusive men. These studies also excluded variables that are known predictors of rape, such as acceptance of rape myths and hostility toward women (Koss et al., 1987; Malamuth, 1986; Powch, 1991). Given these shortcomings, it is not surprising that a recent review of the battering literature concluded, "the consistent finding of heterogeneity of batterers has not yet given way to meaningful typologies with specific practice and policy implications" (Tolman & Bennet, 1990, p. 111).

Need For Theoretical Integration

Arguments have recently been advanced for the value of integrating feminist/sociocultural perspectives with individual differences/psychopathology perspectives. For example, Bograd, as cited in Tolman and Bennet (1990, p. 87), considered exploration of
psychopathology in men who batter as informative only "if it is linked to other levels of analysis and explicates rather than obscures the connections between the individual behavior and important social variables, specifically the patriarchal social context, unequal power distribution, and culturally supported patterns of gender relations." Gondolf and Russell (1986) noted that anger control interventions for batterers that fail to incorporate treatment components guided by feminist/sociocultural research contributions fail to change the abuser's attitude toward his spouse or women in general, with the result being that the abuser may merely substitute other forms of domination and control for physical battering. In a very recent theoretical paper, Dutton (1994) reviewed data from a variety of sources and concluded that "patriarchy must interact with psychological variables in order to account for the great variation in power violence data" (p. 167).

Just as some authors have pointed out the shortcomings of perspectives that ignore feminist/sociocultural contributions, other authors have pointed out the shortcomings of ignoring issues that are given attention by individual differences/psychopathology perspectives. For example, Hamberger and Hastings (1988) have written, "The tendency to minimize the effect of personality factors, including psychopathology, in the etiology and continuation of spouse abuse could reduce the use of potentially appropriate treatment modalities" (p. 763). As an example of this, they cited a national survey of treatment programs for batterers that found alcoholism treatment to be underutilized or not offered by the majority of the programs even though half of those batterers had been found to have alcohol problems. Hall and Hirschman (1991) reported a similar situation with respect to intervention programs targeted at rapists. Furthermore, it is likely that programs that ignore salient personality dynamics of subtypes of abusive men will fail to engage these men in intervention. Hamberger and Hastings (1988) additionally noted that if the

---

4 Hamberger and Hastings (1988) acknowledged that psychopathology is not a necessary and sufficient cause of spouse abuse, and that most men who abuse their partners do not have identifiable personality disorders. They also advised that the concept of psychopathology applied in spouse abuse research be altered from the more traditional medical model of mental illness to "that of a disordered personality—as a deeply ingrained, highly treatment-resistant, and often perplexing set of behaviors" (p. 769).
partner of an abusive man who has a personality disorder is not informed of this and its implications, she may be misled into believing that a 10-week treatment program for batterers will substantially change him. A literature review of articles published prior to 1994 revealed no empirical studies, only one theoretical formulation (Hall & Hirschman, 1991), and one review article (Craig, 1990) that included variables drawn from both a feminist/sociocultural perspective and an individual differences/psychopathology perspective in addressing the issue of subtypes of abusive men.

The Present Study

The purpose of the present study was to address the aforementioned issues by contributing empirical data on the complex relationships of comparative and shared risk markers of different forms of men's abuse of women. This study was designed with three goals in mind: (a) to study multiple forms of abuse and differentiate as well as describe subtypes of abusive men, (b) to explicate rather than obscure the connections between individual variables such as psychopathology and important social variables such as culturally supported patterns of gender relations, and (c) to contribute information of practical significance to those who identify abusive or potentially abusive men and implement prevention or intervention programs.

With respect to the first goal, the following forms of woman abuse were examined both individually and in combination: individual sexual abusiveness, group rape/group sex involvement, physical attacks, and emotional abusiveness. With respect to the second and third goals, selection of potential risk markers of abusiveness was guided by both feminist/sociocultural and psychopathology/individual differences theory and research. Based on review of this literature, consideration of available treatment modalities, and suggestions provided by Hall and Hirschman (1991), six domains were identified as potentially important in predicting and understanding men's abuse of women: (a) culturally sanctioned attitudes toward women that serve as "justifications" for men's abuse of women, (b) sexual arousal to rape scenarios, (c) involvement in risky social environments--the party/bar pick-up environment, (d) substance
abuse, (e) childhood exposure to abuse, and (f) psychopathology. These six domains were intended as conceptual categories to guide selection of variables to be included in this study, not as prescriptions for how these variables are to be combined. Empirical and theoretical considerations guided variable reduction. Let us turn now to the six domains that were identified as important for inclusion in this study.

Attitudes And Reactions Directed Specifically at Women

**Attitudes toward women.** Russell (1975) argued that traditional sex role socialization contributes to the objectification of women and provides the background for attitudes that promote and foster rape in our society. Check and Malamuth (1983) likewise noted that a number of writers have suggested that "rape is in many respects a logical extension of our sex role socialization processes that legitimize coercive sexuality" (p. 344). Thus men are taught to take initiative and persist at obtaining sexual activity even when a woman resists, which they may discount as "token resistance." Within this sex role model, Check and Malamuth observed, rape is seen as "only one (extreme) point on a continuum of in-role, forced sexual behaviors rather than a discrete, deviant act committed by only a few mentally ill men" (p. 344). This view implicating widespread cultural attitudes is partially supported by research that finds large percentages of men and women endorsing acceptance of rape myths. For example, Burt (1980) found that over half of a random sample of 598 Minnesota adults believed that "a woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on the first date implies she is willing to have sex," that "in the majority of rapes the victim was promiscuous or had a bad reputation," and that "50% or more of reported rapes are reported as rape only because she was trying to get back at a man she was angry with or was trying to cover up an illegitimate pregnancy" (p. 229).

Rape attitudes have not only been empirically related to other pervasive societal attitudes about gender relations such as sex role stereotyping (Burt, 1980), they have also been found to differentiate sexually nonabusive men from men who reported having threatened or actually used force to gain nonconsensual sexual intercourse with female acquaintances (Koss &
Gidycz, 1985). As might be expected for a behavior that is congruent with culturally accepted role expectations, Deitz, Blackwell, Daley, and Bentley (1982) found that both students and jurors frequently expressed greater empathy toward rapists than toward victims. Furthermore, they found that rape empathy scores predicted participants' ratings of defendant guilt, recommended sentences, and self-reported desire to rape a woman. Finally, Groth and Birnbaum (1979) found that even incarcerated rapists tend to deny wrongdoing, to interpret rape as an extension of the male role, and to deny that rape can occur among friends or acquaintances.

Cultural support for the use of physical force has also been implicated in battering. For example, Straus (1976) noted that although there appears to be a cultural sanction against the use of physical force on someone who is physically weaker, the use of physical force is accepted and even expected if the weaker person is seen to "deserve it" (p. 58). Thus, the more situations in which a man feels it is justifiable to hit or use force with a woman, the more likely he is to feel entitled to be physically abusive, and presumably the more likely he is to engage in physically abusive behavior (Briere, 1987).

Aspects of male socialization in this culture teach men to view women with suspicion and mistrust—as rejecting, unpredictable, attacking, and depriving. This can be seen in sayings as common and seemingly benign as "never trust a woman" to terms such as "nymphomaniac," "lying bitch," and "Feminazi," all of which imply that a woman who does not give a man what he wants or believes he deserves or needs is either cold and hateful or "giving it" to his competitors, who probably join her in laughing at him. To the extent that men internalize such hostility directed specifically at women, one would expect their likelihood of abusing women to increase. Empirical studies that have looked at hostility directed specifically at women have found this construct to be significantly related to other cultural attitudes toward women, including acceptance of rape myths and acceptance of violence against women, but not related to belief in general violence (Check, 1984). Hostility toward women has also been found to be related to
reports of past sexual abusiveness (Check, 1984; Malamuth, 1986; Powch, 1991) and physical and emotional abusiveness (Powch, 1991).

It is implied in the theoretical formulations presented above that these sociocultural attitudes and beliefs about women are socially learned and reinforced. The idea of peer pressure toward sexual conquest is referred to in popular culture with the term "locker room talk." Evidence for the impact of peer pressure of this nature was found by Kanin (1967a, 1967b, 1985). Kanin found that sexually abusive men experienced more pressure from their peer group to engage in premarital sex than did sexually nonabusive men, and that greater peer pressure was associated with less satisfaction with one's sexual experiences. This was true even though the sexually abusive men actually had a greater variety of sexual experiences with greater frequency than did the sexually nonabusive men. Kanin's work suggests that peer pressure to abuse women might be worth investigating more systematically (his studies looked only at peer pressure to engage in premarital sex, and peer pressure to lose one's virginity, and did so with only a few single items). To my knowledge there has been no scale developed that measures the degree to which a man is directly pressured by his peers to prove his sexual prowess or to "put his woman in her place," and certainly none that measures the degree to which he feels compelled to act upon that peer pressure. This dual construct was measured for the first time in the present study.

**Sexual Arousal To Rape.** Another dimension that has been identified as potentially important in the rape literature is sexual arousal to rape (Barbaree & Marshall, 1991; Kanin, 1985; Palmer, 1988). Barbaree and Marshall theorized that there might be some subgroups of rapists who fail to lose arousal when encountering cues of nonconsent or distress, and others for whom violence itself is eroticized. This latter type would be the sadistic rapists in Groth and Birmbaum's (1979) classification of three types of rapists: those who rape to express anger, those who rape to express power over women, and those who rape for sadistic sexual gratification. No study of college students prior to the present one has looked at sexual arousal
to sadistic and typical nonconsensual sex scenarios as well as to consensual conventional sex and consensual sadomasochistic (SM) sex play for comparison.

**Disinhibiting Social Situations, Environments, and Habits**

**Party/bar pick-up.** Amick and Calhoun (1987), Craig (1990), and Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) brought attention to the role of situational components in predicting outcomes such as sexual assault. According to Craig, the situational model goes beyond trait theory and beyond person-situation interactional theory. It does so by suggesting not only that persons bring certain traits to a situation, but also that they select the situations and manipulate them to allow for expression of their dispositions. A man who lives alone, stays home, and does not meet women is unlikely to have many opportunities in which to be abusive toward women even if he has the most hostile attitudes and a high degree of psychopathology. A man who meets women primarily at large parties and bars is placing himself not only in situations where he will meet many women, but also in contexts where there is often a "meatmarket" mentality in which "getting laid" is the goal of the evening. Typically the disinhibiting effects attributed to alcohol (Lang, 1985; Lang & Sibrel, 1989) are added, and on college campuses much of this activity centers around fraternity parties and the fraternity bar (Martin, 1989). There is some evidence that suggests that it is the degree of alcohol used rather than fraternity involvement per se, that accounts for the relationship that has been occasionally found between fraternity affiliation and sexually abusive behavior (Koss & Gaines, 1993). These researchers found that when relationships between fraternity affiliation and intensity of alcohol use are taken into consideration intensity of alcohol use, and degree of athletics participation, but not fraternity affiliation, discriminate participation in gang rapes (Koss & Gaines, 1993).

**Substance Abuse.** Substance abuse and dependence, particularly of alcohol, is consistently found to be associated with both sexual assault (Koss & Dinero, 1988; Powch, 1991) and battering (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Powch, 1991; Tolman & Bennett, 1990). The importance of attending to substance abuse has been underscored in recent reviews of both the
sexual assault literature (Hall & Hirschman, 1991) and the battering literature (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Indeed, Long (1987) has written, "This issue must be confronted prior to any effective treatment for the issue of violence. As long as the chemical abuse continues, there is a 'devil-made-me-do-it' denial that is available to the abuser" (p. 307).

Most of the studies that have looked at substance abuse have focused on alcohol abuse; less is known about the association of other substance abuse to abusive behavior. There is not enough evidence to assume that alcohol abuse and other substance abuse would necessarily be related to the same risk markers, or that they would necessarily be related to the same forms of abuse to the same degree. What is known is that alcohol use is much more prevalent in the population; over 90% of high school seniors in the United States have used alcohol at least once, compared with approximately 50% for marijuana or hashish, and less than 20% for other recreational drugs (Johnston, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1988). It is possible that alcohol abuse and other substance abuse are associated with different sexual or nonsexual markers of abusive behavior. For example, on college campuses, alcohol abuse may be part of a social milieu centered around the fraternity party and bar "pick-up scene" where students go in hope of attracting a date or sex partner. This extroverted group may have less psychopathology than other groups of abusive men, but might be more inclined to accept rape myths and other cultural attitudes that justify sexual abusiveness in particular. Drug abusers might be more associated with a different subculture and might more often have psychopathology in addition to culturally held attitudes that support men's abuse of women. Because drug abuse requires breaking and hiding from the law, drug abusers may have more antisocial tendencies. These complex associations might result in alcohol and drug abuse being associated with different types of abusive behaviors.

Childhood Exposure to Abuse

The experience or witnessing of abuse in childhood has been considered a risk marker for adult abusive behavior in both the sociocultural literature and the psychiatric literature. In the
sociocultural literature the link is most often conceptualized from a social learning perspective (Bandura, 1973), which also forms the basis of a hypothesis of an intergenerational transmission of family violence (Finkelhor, Hotaling, & Yllo, 1988; Jaffe, Wolfe, & Wilson, 1990). From a social learning perspective, boys are viewed as learning to a greater or lesser extent that violence is an effective way to resolve conflict and have their way. The exact nature of their learning would depend on what kinds of violence they experienced or observed, and on the rewards or punishments they experienced or observed the violent or abusive person receiving for perpetrating violent behavior. This learning may occur through direct experience or through vicarious experiences such as viewing pornography at an early age (Koss & Dinero, 1988; Linz, Donnerstein, & Penrod, 1987; Powch, 1991).

From this perspective one would expect to find a direct association between childhood exposure to abuse and adult abusive behavior even after controlling for other current risk markers of abuse such as psychopathology, hostile attitudes toward women, risky situations, and so on. This has not been tested in a rigorous way, although Koss and Dinero (1988), studying a nationally representative sample of 2,972 college men, found that two childhood experience variables (childhood sexual experiences at another's request, and family violence) correctly grouped 47% of the men into sexual aggression categories. In that study attitudes and current habit variables did not add to the accuracy of classification. However, Koss and Dinero did not report whether childhood experience variables would have added to the accuracy of classification if the attitudinal and current habit variables had been entered first. Therefore, it cannot be known if childhood experiences have a direct effect on sexual abusiveness, independent of whatever effect they transmit through other adulthood variables with which they might be associated. The state of knowledge from the battering literature is similar. In a review of the literature on husband-to-wife battering, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found that in 14 out of 16 separate studies, witnessing parental violence as a child was positively associated with male violence, and experiencing violence from parents or caregivers discriminated batterers from nonbatterers in 9
out of 13 studies; however, it is not known whether this would have been the case after controlling for current attitudes or psychopathology.

In the psychiatric literature, childhood experiences of abuse are seen to contribute to the development of adult psychopathology, and adult psychopathology is seen as underlying behavioral dyscontrol and abusive behavior. These links are most often conceptualized from an object relations perspective (Bowlby, 1973; Crittendon & Ainsworth, 1989). Mullen (1993) focused on the first part of the putative link between childhood exposure to abuse, adult psychopathology, and adult abusive behavior. Mullen suggested that the impairment in development that is caused by childhood experiences of abuse and lack of parental supportiveness interferes much later with adult challenges such as establishing intimacy, and that failure in these tasks of adulthood contribute to the development of mental disorders.

Links between childhood exposure to abuse and a variety of mental disturbances or disorders in adulthood have been documented. Post traumatic stress disorder, mood disorders, anxiety disorders, substance abuse disorders, dissociative disorders, and borderline personality disorder have all been linked to having been a victim of childhood sexual abuse (Briere & Runtz, 1993; Burnham et al., 1988; Craine, Henson, Colliver, & MacLean, 1988; Lindberg & Distad, 1985, Putnam, 1985), childhood physical abuse (Briere & Runtz, 1988), or both (Braver et al., 1992; Coons and Milstein, 1986; Herman, 1986). Physical abuse has also been correlated with subsequent criminality (Briere & Runtz, 1988) and anger and aggression (Briere & Runtz, 1990). Emotional abuse, in the absence of physical or sexual abuse, was not associated with elevations in depression, global psychiatric symptoms, or borderline personality features (Braver, 1992). Among men, childhood exposure to parental partner abuse was associated with post-traumatic stress symptoms, including dissociation, anxiety, depression, anger, sleep disturbance, and sexual disturbances (Silvern et al., 1995). Although most of the studies that establish a link between childhood sexual abuse and adult psychopathology were conducted on women, there is evidence suggesting that there are no gender differences with respect to symptoms of
gender differences with respect to symptoms of dissociation, anxiety, depression, anger, sleep disturbance, and sexual disturbances (Briere, Evans, Runtz, & Wall, 1988). Briere et al. found main effects for traumatization, no main effects for gender, and no gender by abuse interaction. Both men and women who had been traumatized showed significant elevations on all six trauma-related symptoms.

Psychopathology

In a subset of abusive men, psychopathology may be a risk factor in a number of ways. More violent and impersonal forms of abusiveness toward women might be associated with Antisocial Personality Disorder, which is defined in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 1994) as "a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others" (p. 649) and includes general assaultiveness, impulsiveness, lack of remorse, and is often associated with criminal behavior, sexual behavior, or substance abuse that has a high risk of harmful consequences (DSM-IV). Lohr, Hamberger, & Bonge (1988) described a subgroup of antisocial batterers who oppress, exploit, and control their victims, and Hamberger and Hastings (1988) described batterers with Antisocial Personality Disorder or tendencies, which include contempt for authority; lack of regard for the truth; shallow, manipulative charm; reckless behavior; lack of remorse; and a history of criminal and violent behavior. Gondolf (1985) reviews Martin's (1976), Pagelow's (1981), and Walker's (1979) descriptions of batterers, and concludes that each of these researchers described batterers who often are "not angry when they abuse women but are rather playfully manipulating them in a gaming fashion" (p. 314). In the rape literature, convicted rapists tend to manifest elevations on the MMPI Psychopathic Deviate scale relative to noncriminal controls, but not relative to other criminal populations (Kalichman et al., 1989; Rader, 1977). In a study of college men (Koss et al., 1985) none of three measures of antisocial tendencies differentiated rapists from otherwise sexually abusive men and nonabusive men. Whether antisocial tendencies distinguish only criminals from noncriminals, or whether they distinguish a subgroup of abusive men (e.g., men
who are abusive toward women in multiple ways) was not known prior to the present study.

Other types of psychopathology may also be risk factors in subgroups of abusive men. Elevated levels of distressing symptoms such as depression, anxiety, dissociation, paranoid thoughts, and anger-in (tendency to experience anger and harbor it by ruminating about being "wronged" rather than appropriately resolving angry feelings), as well as disturbed relatedness, might increase a man's need to find a scapegoat on whom to blame his distress, or from whom to demand relief from his distress (the choice of women as scapegoat would be influenced by cultural factors and situational factors). An example of this might be a type of batterer who is described as a man with low self-esteem who strives to live an unattainable masculine image and attributes to his partner the power to make him happy or unhappy. Thus blaming her for his negative emotions, this type of batterer lashes out at his partner in anger and despair. He is remorseful about his abusive behavior but continually repeats the pattern (Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Gondolf, 1985; Lohr, Hamberger, & Bonge, 1988).

In the case of paranoid personality disorder, which has been found elevated in one subtype of batterer (Lohr et al., 1988), an extreme and delusional jealousy seems to add fuel to whatever other factors underlie a batterer's abusive behavior. This kind of delusional jealousy is commonly described by wives of batterers (Walker, 1979).

Depression and anxiety have been inconsistently found among batterers who are in treatment (Lohr et al., 1988; Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Dissociation has been implicated only indirectly by reports of batterers describing their abusive behavior as something that they experienced "as if in a dream" or "it's as if it wasn't me" (Walker, 1979).

Elevated levels of anger and impulsiveness might also increase the likelihood that a man will act on an impulse to be abusive. Borderline Personality Disorder, whose central features are "a profound disturbance in object relations characterized by instability, isolation, sudden idealization with catastrophic devaluation, and manipulativeness" (Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1986, p. 739), and "a pervasive pattern of instability of interpersonal relationships, self-image, and
affects, and marked impulsivity" (American Psychiatric Association, 1994, p. 654) has also been linked with husband-to-wife battering in adulthood (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986). In a controlled comparison of batterers in treatment and nonbatterers in treatment for marriage and family therapy, Hastings and Hamberger (1988) found that compared with nonbatterers, batterers showed higher elevations on Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1977) measures of borderline symptomatology and negativistic, passive-aggressive tendencies. They were also described on the MCMI as more moody, sullen, and overreactive to rejection, as experiencing greater confusion about identity issues and control over affective states, and as displaying higher levels of anxiety, somatic complaints, and depression. Because the batterers in these studies have all been batterers who were in treatment (either because they were court ordered or because their wives were threatening to leave them), there has been some argument about the generalizability of these findings to the vast majority of batterers who are not in treatment (Hamberger, 1993; Pagelow, 1993).

Overall, there is moderate evidence for some association between some forms of psychopathology and subgroups of batterers, and equivocal evidence for the same in rapists. To my knowledge, there has been no attempt prior to the present study to test whether any forms of psychopathology are associated with any forms of abusiveness toward women after controlling for childhood exposure to abuse, attitudes toward women, and involvement in risky situations.

Exploratory Variables That May Be Helpful to Planning More Effective Interventions

One practical application of previous studies that identified high levels of sexual abusiveness associated with the fraternity subculture (Koss et al., 1987) is that many college campuses now target fraternities for rape intervention programs. These programs can then be tailored to that subculture and reach a large proportion of men who might be at risk for sexually abusive behavior. In the present study, I obtained information about additional group affiliations on college campuses so that if any substantial subtypes of abusive men congregate around a particular subculture, programs might be tailored to reach men within those subcultures.
Another variable that might have implications for the efficacy of interventions is locus of control (Bugental, Whalen, & Henker, 1977). Persons with an internal locus of control characteristically regard themselves as able to affect important events; persons with an external locus of control typically regard themselves as unable to affect important events, which they see as being controlled by fate, chance, or powerful people (Rotter, 1966). Bugental et al. (1977) found that a group of hyperactive and impulsive boys whose attributional styles were congruent with their treatment (high personal control with self-control training or high external control with social contingency management) evidenced better treatment effects than those in noncongruent combinations. There is also evidence that attributional style may change as a result of intervention (Bugental, Collins, Collins, & Chaney, 1978). If attributional style is related to abusiveness or subtypes of abusiveness, that would be useful to have.

**Summary of Research Questions**

This study primarily focused on the following questions:

1. Are men's (a) attitudes toward women, (b) psychopathology, (c) childhood exposure to abuse, and (d) other risk marker sets related to their patterns of abusing women (i.e., individual sexual abuse, group rape/group sex involvement, physical attack, emotional abuse, and combinations of all four types of abuse)?

2. Is each of the potential risk factors mentioned in Question 1 associated with men's abusiveness toward women independent of the other three risk marker sets?

3. After all four risk marker sets have been considered, do (a) antisocial tendencies interact with any sociocultural variable to add significantly to the prediction of men's abuse of women, and (b) behavioral disturbances interact with any sociocultural variables to significantly add to the prediction of men's abuse of women?

4. Are there some men who are sexually abusive but not physically abusive, some men who are physically and, or, extremely emotionally abusive, but not sexually abusive, some men who are both sexually and nonsexually abusive, and some men who are not sexually abusive, not
physically abusive, and much less emotionally abusive than the average man?

5. If any of the groups described above exist, can they be differentiated by different combinations of risk factors?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 364 men enrolled in introductory psychology classes. They received course credit for participating in this study. Data that met the following inclusion criteria were analyzed: (a) age 18 to 24 years, (b) heterosexual, (c) valid responding (i.e., passed several validity checks that detected random responding, extreme response biases, and failure to read questions and follow simple directions). The age and validity criteria were met by 273 individuals. Of these, 8 identified their sexual orientation as bisexual, 10 as homosexual, and 255 as heterosexual. The final sample consisted of these 255 men.

Age was restricted to the 18 to 24 year group for several reasons. Age is likely to affect the dependent variables (i.e., the more years a man has been sexually active, the more opportunities he will have had to commit acts of sexual assault or courtship violence). Age is also likely to affect recall and interpretation of childhood experiences. Finally, relations between attitudes and other variables, including dependent variables, could vary depending on age (or, more likely, depending on generation). The limit on age inclusion was set for 18 to 24 because this is the upper limit of the age range of the majority of college students, and it represents people of the same generation. This does not appear to be overly restrictive, given that the FBI (1986) reports that 45% of all alleged rapists who are arrested are under the age of 25.

Only data from men who identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual were used in this study for two reasons: (a) Sexual orientation is likely to interact with attitudinal and other variables in ways that would render results of this study difficult to interpret, and (b) the number of individuals (n = 18) who indicated sexual orientations other than heterosexual was not large enough to include sexual orientation as a separate variable.
Almost 90% of the 255 men whose data was analyzed in this study were 18 to 20 years old, and 11% were 21 to 24 years old. The sample was comprised of 85% Caucasian, 4% Asian American, 3% African American, 2% Native American, and 5% "other" racial or ethnic groups. Additional demographic information about the 255 men whose data were analyzed in this study can be found in Appendix A.

Measures

Measures of Potential Correlates of Men's Abuse of Women

Attitudes And Reactions Directed Specifically At Women

The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA). The first section of the RMA (Burt, 1980), was used in the present study; it consists of 11 items that assess respondents' beliefs in myths about rape (e.g., "In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation," keyed positively; "Any female can get raped," keyed negatively). Respondents indicate their agreement with these 11 statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Responses to items keyed negatively are reversed, and responses are summed to yield total scores ranging from 11 (least accepting of rape myths) to 77 (most accepting of rape myths). A Cronbach's alpha of .88 is reported for the entire scale (Burt, 1980), and a Cronbach's alpha of .76 is reported for the first section (Powch, 1991). Cronbach's alpha was .81 in the present study.

Empathize With Rapist (REMP). A 9-item measure was created based on the Rape Empathy Scale (RES; Deitz et al., 1982), which was originally designed to measure a jury's level of empathy toward both rapists and rape victims. The original RES included 20 paired statements, with each statement representing extreme empathy with either the rape victim or the rapist. Deitz et al. (1982) provided discriminant and predictive validity information. For purposes of simplification, RES was modified and renamed Empathize With Rapist (REMP). Item pairs that were direct opposites were split, and the one with simpler language structure was included. For example, for the pair: (a) "I believe that all women secretly want to be raped," and (b) "I
don't believe that any women secretly want to be raped," only the first item was kept. These questions were scored using a seven-point Likert scale. Responses ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7), with higher scores indicating more empathy toward the rapist than toward the victim. Scores can range from 9 to 63. Cronbach alpha in the present study was .66.

**Justify Acquaintance Rape and Hitting.** A 22-item measure with two subscales, Justify Acquaintance Rape (JAR) and Justify Hitting (JH), was created based on the Forcible Date Rape Scale (FDR; Fischer, 1986) and the Likelihood of Battering Scale (LB; Briere, 1987). JAR presents a scenario of a male and a female college student out on a date, ending with "...even though she resists his advances, [he] uses his superior strength to force her to have sexual intercourse." For each of nine conditions, the respondent or participant indicates how acceptable he considers the man's behavior. JH presents a scenario of a couple who are living together and engaged to get married at the end of the school year, ending with, "Last night when they were arguing, [he] hit [her] in the argument" (different names were used in each scenario). For each of 13 conditions, the participant indicates how acceptable he considers the man's behavior. Choices for both subscales are on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from definitely acceptable (1) to definitely unacceptable (5). All items are reverse scored such that higher scores indicate a greater sense of entitlement to use physical force with women. JAR scores can range from 9 to 45; JH scores can range from 13 to 117. In a pilot study, Cronbach's alpha for the full 22-item Justify Acquaintance Rape and Hitting scale was .95; in the current study it was .96.

**Hostility Toward Women-Revised (HTW-R).** A 21-item measure of hostility toward women was created based on the 30-item Hostility Toward Women Scale (HTW; Check & Malamuth, 1983), which was originally designed to measure hostile and cynical attitudes toward women (e.g., "Many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them"; "It is safer not to trust women"). Participants respond on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6), with higher scores indicating more hostile attitudes toward women.
Scores can range from 21 to 126. In order to minimize confounding hostile attitudes with anger-proneness, which was measured by another scale, 9 items that refer to angry, hostile, irritated, or grouchy feelings or feeling bothered or upset were removed. Because participants in a previous study complained about the complexity of HTW items with double negatives (Powch, 1991), four items were reworded to remove a double negative. For example, "I do not believe that women will walk all over you if you aren't willing to fight" was changed to "Women will walk all over a guy who isn't willing to fight," and scoring was reversed. This and one other item were also changed from the first person to third person. In a pilot study, Cronbach's alpha for the HTW-R was .83. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was .83.

Peer Pressure to Rape and Batter. A 16-item measure with two subscales, Peer Pressure to Rape (PEERR) and Peer Pressure to Batter (PEERB), was created for this study. For the PEERR, an 8-item scale was created from an item pool provided by 8 male and female undergraduate research assistants who were instructed to write items based on common social situations that might compel a guy to show his sexual prowess without regard for the consent or nonconsent of a potential female sexual partner. There are four item pairs; in each pair, one assessed the degree of peer pressure emanating from the participant's social environment, and the other assessed the degree to which the participant would feel compelled to respond to that peer pressure. An example item pair is as follows: "You're at a party at a friend's house. There's a drunk girl in the bedroom. (a) How likely is it that there will be guys at the party who would egg you on to go in and have sex with her? (b) If they do egg you on to have sex with her, how likely are you to feel you have to go in there and do it if you don't want to lose your position within your group of guy friends?" These items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from extremely likely or strongly (1) to completely unlikely or not strong (7). All items are reverse scored so that higher scores indicate greater susceptibility to peer pressure to rape. Scores may range from 8 to 56. Cronbach's alpha ranges from .75 (pilot study) to .80 (present study).

For the PEERB, an 8-item scale was created from an item pool provided by 8 male and
female undergraduate research assistants who were instructed to write items based on common social situations "that might compel a guy to put his girlfriend 'in her place' and show her 'who's boss'." There are four item pairs; in each pair, one assessed the degree of peer pressure emanating from the participant's social environment, and the other assessed the degree to which the participant would feel compelled to respond to that peer pressure. An example item pair is as follows: "You ask your girlfriend to get you a beer while you're watching a game with the guys. She tells you to get your own beer. (a) How likely are the guys to laugh at you or tease you about this? (b) How strongly would you feel that you had to do something to her to "save face" around the guys or to make sure she doesn't embarrass you like this again?" Items are scaled and scored in the same way as PEERR. Scores may range from 8 to 56. Cronbach's alpha was .80 in the present study.

Sexual Arousal to Rape. Eight vignettes depicting consensual and nonconsensual sexual activities were written with the help of four male and four female undergraduate research assistants. Nonconsensual sex vignettes included two typical (non-sadistic) rape scenarios and two sadistic rape scenarios. Consensual sex vignettes included two consensual conventional sex scenarios and two consensual SM sex scenarios. Two vignettes were written for each of the four conditions, one depicting a man and a woman who have been sexually active together for several months, and the other depicting a man and a woman who have dated only a few times and are "alone" together for the first time. Each vignette is virtually identical in length (about 300 words). All vignettes are written in the third person. In each condition, care was taken to include one vignette with approximately five sexual cues (references to breasts, genitalia, the man's sexual arousal, etc.) and one vignette with psychological arousal described using less explicit language. Participants rate each vignette on a scale ranging from not at all sexually arousing (1) to most sexually arousing (9). Scores can range from 2 to 18 on each of the four variables. In a pilot test of 43 undergraduate men, consensual conventional sex and typical rape were not significantly related \(r = -.16\), and consensual SM sex and sadistic rape were not significantly
related \( r = .06 \). Consensual conventional and SM sex scenarios were significantly related \( r = .43 \), and nonconsensual common rape and sadistic rape scenarios were significantly related \( r = .65 \). In the current study, a factor analysis of the eight items yielded two factors, with all items that depict consensual acts loading on one factor and all items depicting nonconsensual sex loading on the second factor.

**Disinhibiting Social Situations, Environments, and Habits**

**Party/bar pick-up.** Ten situational items were created that ask about choice of dating activities and dating partners. These items were based on the theoretical arguments of Craig (1990) and empirical findings of Muehlenhard and Linton (1987). The two items of interest in the present study were, "How often do you meet the people you end up dating at large parties?" and "How often do you meet the people you end up dating at bars?" These items were scored on a 4-point Likert scale. Responses ranged from almost never (1) to almost always (4).

**Fraternity involvement.** Embedded in a set of items in the demographics section of the questionnaire was an item that elicited information about how strongly the participant identified himself with "each of the following social groups?" One of the social groups listed was "Greek/Fraternity." Degree of identification was indicated on a 9-point Likert scale that ranged from not at all (1) to strongest identification (9).

**Alcohol abuse.** A 6-item scale was created to measure frequency of alcohol consumption, quantity consumed on a typical drinking occasion, and effects of alcohol consumption. Examples of items are, "How often do you drink to the point of intoxication or drunkenness (that is, feeling dizzy, feeling ill, passing out, or feeling out of control)?" and "On occasion, I have been able to drink as much as 8 beers without getting drunk". Scores can range from 6 to 32, with higher scores indicating more frequent drinking, greater amounts of alcohol consumed, and more reported effects of the alcohol. Cronbach's alpha in my pilot study was .86.

**Drug abuse.** A 6-item scale was created that measures frequency of use of various
street drugs, as well as effects of drug use. Examples of items are, "How often do you use speed, crack, or cocaine?" and "My habit of using drugs has caused me to miss work or school in the past". Scores can range from 6 to 33, with higher scores indicating more frequent drug use, greater amounts of drugs used, and more reported effects of the drugs. Cronbach's alpha in my pilot study was .91. ALC and DRUG are nonsignificantly positively related ($r = .26$).

**Childhood Exposure to Abuse**

**Childhood sex at another's request.** This is a 9-item scale that assesses the frequency and type of sexual experiences a person had before the age of 14 at another person's request. It is adapted from the Early Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Dinero, 1988). Representative items include, "Before you were 14, has another person touched or stroked your sex organs without your asking them to?" Nine individual item scores on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to more than 5 times (5) are summed to yield total scores ranging from 9 to 45. The remaining 5 items are descriptive (e.g. "How old was the oldest person with whom you had any of the above experiences?"). The descriptive items were used to create a brief measure of self-identified childhood sexual abuse (SICSA).

**Childhood exposure to pornography.** This is a 4-item author-constructed scale that assesses the frequency and intensity of childhood exposure to pornographic materials. An example item is, "Before you were 14, how many times did someone show you pornographic movies, or let you watch pornographic movies with them?" Individual item scores on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to more than 5 times (5) are summed to yield total scores ranging from 6 to 30.

**Physically beaten as child.** This is a 3-item author-constructed scale that assesses the frequency of physical abuse that a man remembers experiencing as a child at the hands of his caretakers. Items are based on physical abuse items that appear on the Child Maltreatment Scale (Briere, 1991) and in a study by Graziano and Namaste (1990). Items refer to how often parents "used each of the following methods of discipline with you" Methods that counted as
lasted a few days* to *beating that left you with physical injuries that didn't completely heal for weeks.* Individual item scores on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from **never (1)** to **several times a week (5)**, are summed to yield total scores ranging from 3 to 15. Higher scores indicate more childhood physical abuse.

**Emotionally abused as child.** Two scales were used to measure adult respondents' recollection of how each of their parents treated them during their childhood years. The Parental Rejection and Hostile Control, (PRHC) scale, is comprised of several subscales of the Parent Behavior Form (PBF; Kelly & Worell, 1976). Each item is presented once in reference to mother and again in reference to father. Examples of items include, "...thought I was just someone 'to put up with'' and "...almost always complained about what I did". The Parental Maltreatment and Ridicule (PMR), is comprised of 6 items derived from the Child Maltreatment Scale (Briere, 1991). There are three items for each parent, based on items from the Child Maltreatment Scale: "...made me feel like I was a bad person," "...ridiculed or humiliated me," and "...was unpredictable in when, how, and for what he/she punished me." Items are answered on a 3-point Likert scale, ranging from **Not like him/her (1)** to **A lot like him/her (3)**. PRHC scores can range from 36 to 108; PMR scores can range from 6 to 18.

**Witnessing parental violence.** This is a 10-item author-constructed scale that measures father-to-mother physical violence and mother-to-father physical violence that an adult child recalls having witnessed at home. Unlike other scales, which measure the frequency of different types of acts (i.e., hitting, kicking, punching, stabbing, etc.), this scale, based on descriptions of physical abuse provided battered wives interviewed by Walker (1979), also measures level of injury and degree of fear or distress. Example items include, "Your father hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your mother, causing bleeding, broken bones, or other injuries that required some kind of bandaging," and "You heard your mother cry or plead for your father to stop hitting her, twisting her arm, or whatever he was doing to physically hurt her." The 5 father-to-mother items and the 5 mother-to-father items were written in exactly the same way, simply
to-mother items and the 5 mother-to-father items were written in exactly the same way, simply
reversing who was the attacker, and who was the attacked. Items are answered on a 5-point
Likert scale, ranging from never (1) to several times a week (5). Scores on each subscale can
range from 5 to 25 for each parent, with higher scores indicating more spouse abuse.

Witnessing father's disrespect for mother and mother's subservience. This 9-item
author-constructed scale measures family situations in which children may not have witnessed
physical abuse but did witness their father behaving in disrespectful or emotionally abusive ways
toward their mother and their mother subserviently accepting this treatment. Example items
include, "How often did your mother say things like 'what your father says is law,'" "How often
did your father yell at your mother as though she were one of the kids?" and "How often did your
father say derogatory things about women in general in front of your mother or the kids?" Items
are answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from never (1) to several times a week (5).
Scores may range from 9 to 45, with higher scores indicating more disrespect for mother.

Variables Indicative of Psychopathology

Antisocial Practices Content Scale. Three separate scales will be used to tap aspects
of the antisocial personality construct. The first is the 21-item Antisocial Practices Content
Scale of the MMPI-2 (ASP; Butcher, Graham, Williams, & Ben-Porath, 1990). High scorers on
this scale are likely to have been in trouble in school or with the law, believe that there is nothing
wrong with getting around laws as long as they aren't broken, enjoy hearing about the antics of
criminals, have generally cynical attitudes, resent authority, and curse or swear. Example
items include, "I was suspended from school one or more times for bad behavior," and "If
several people find themselves in trouble, the best thing for them to do is to agree upon a story
and stick to it." Items are scored true or false; scores may range from 21 to 42, with higher
scores indicating more characteristics indicative of antisocial personality disorder. A T-score of
65 is achieved by a raw score of 35 on ASP, and a T-score of 37 is achieved by a raw score of
16. This scale was developed using a combination of rational and statistical procedures.
involved rational definition of an antisocial ideas and practices content area, independent rater selection of items, and group consensus selection of items. This process was followed by four stages of inspection and revision based on item-total correlations of these items with their own scale versus with other content scales, and evaluation of fit with conceptual definitions. In a validation study involving over 800 married couples, males who scored high on ASP were described by their partners as displaying antisocial behaviors. Test-retest reliability for males over a nine day interval is reported to be .81, and internal consistency is reported to be .78 (Butcher et al., 1990). In a pilot study (N = 43) of male undergraduates I obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .60 for this scale. Cronbach's alpha in the present study was .72.

Assault is a criterion cited for antisocial personality disorder in the DSM-III-R. This construct will be measured by the Assaultive Aggression scale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI; Buss & Durkee, 1957). The Assaultive Aggression scale contains 10 items that measure physical aggression (e.g., "I have known people who pushed me so far that we came to blows"). Items are answered True (1) or False (2). Scores may range from 10 to 20. Test-retest reliability over a five-week period was reported to be better than .72 (Buss, 1961). Cronbach's alpha in the present study was .71.

Borderline personality disorder. The Alienation subscale (ALN) of the Bell Object Relations-Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1985) will be used as an index of borderline personality disorder. This is a 22-item, true/false subscale that Bell et al. (1985) reported contains high factor loadings on the greatest number of items and appears to represent the broadest dimension of object relations measured. They describe ALN items as indicating a lack of basic trust in relationships, inability to attain closeness, hopelessness about maintaining a stable and satisfying level of intimacy, feelings of isolation, limited empathy, and tendency to misjudge or ignore the motivations and inner states of others. Social relations are described as superficial with no real sense of connection or belonging. Relationships may be stormy, dependent, and disrupted by anger or hostile withdrawal. They added that this pattern of
instability typically repeats itself from one relationship to the next (Billington & Bell, 1985). Example items are, "It is hard for me to get close to anyone" (keyed true), and "I put a lot into relationships and get a lot back" (keyed false). This subscale was selected for the present study because it has excellent known group validity. Bell, Billington, and Becker (1986) reported that 89.2% of inpatients with DSM-III diagnosed Borderline Personality Disorder scored above the 85th percentile (of a normative sample) on this subscale. This distinguished inpatients with Borderline Personality Disorder from inpatients with other Axis II disorders (57.5% scored above the cutoff), Schizoaffective Disorder, mixed features (48.2%), Affective Disorders (28.6%), Schizophrenia (33.3%), students (14.5%), and community volunteers from a board of directors of a social service agency and a business organization (1.7%). The hand scoring method (Billington & Bell, 1985) was used in the present study because this method allows ALN to be scored independently of other subscales. This involves assigning a weight to each item for each subscale in approximate proportion to the strength of the item's loading on that subscale, with items loading below .35 on a factor receiving a subscale weight of zero. In the present study, scores were calculated by computer with a simple algorithm that followed Billington et al.'s hand scoring instructions. Higher scores indicate more symptoms of Borderline Personality Disorder. The hand scored value used as a pathological cutoff by Billington and Bell is 16.5. Billington and Bell reported that the correlation of factor scores and hand scores for ALN is .98, and that the validity data are generally comparable. They reported very good test-retest correlations for ALN when hand scored: .81 up to 13 weeks between scores, and .88 up to 4 weeks between scores. They did not report internal consistency. In a pilot study (N = 43) of male undergraduates, I obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .75.

**Depression, anxiety, paranoid ideation, and dissociation.** Depression, anxiety, and paranoid ideation were measured with the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised subscales by those names (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1977). Dissociation was measured with the dissociation subscale of the Trauma Symptom Checklist-40 (TSC-40; Briere & Runtz, 1989). The SCL-90-R is
composed of 90 items describing psychiatric symptoms most commonly identified by psychiatric and medical patients. Three of its five subscales are depression, anxiety, and paranoid ideation. Example items for the depression subscale include "feeling low in energy or slowed down" and "feelings of worthlessness." Example items for the anxiety subscale include "nervousness or shakiness inside" and "heart pounding or racing." Example items for paranoid ideation include "feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles" and "feeling that you are watched or talked about by others." Respondents indicate on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from not at all (1) to extremely (5), how much discomfort each symptom has caused them during the past week.

The TSC-40 is a 40-item symptom checklist specifically designed to tap posttraumatic psychological disturbance. This measure's dissociation subscale was used in the present study. (The TSC-40 also has depression and anxiety subscales, but these were not used in the present study, because depression and anxiety were measured with the SCL-90-R, for which normative data exist on psychiatric as well as nonpsychiatric populations of men.) Example items for the dissociation subscale include "flashbacks (sudden, vivid, distracting memories)" and "feelings that things are 'unreal." The same scaling was used for the dissociation subscale as for the depression, anxiety, and paranoid ideation subscales.

Scores may range from 12 to 60 on the depression subscale, 10 to 50 on the anxiety subscale, 6 to 30 on the paranoid ideation subscale, and 10 to 50 on the dissociation subscale. Higher scores indicate more psychopathology. Ninety-three percent of a nonpatient male normative sample scores below a T-score of 65 (Derogatis, 1977). On the depression subscale, a T-score of 65 is reached by an average group score of 23; on the anxiety subscale this cutoff is reached by an average group score of 17. Reported Cronbach's alphas and one-week test-retest reliability coefficients for the SCL-90-R subscales are .90 and .82, respectively, for depression and .85 and .80, respectively, for anxiety (Derogatis, 1977). For the dissociation subscale of TSC-40, Cronbach's alpha is .75 (Briere & Runtz, 1989). In a pilot study (N = 43) of male undergraduates I obtained a Cronbach alpha of .79 for the depression subscale, .82 for the
anxiety subscale, .78 for the dissociation subscale, and .92 for the pooled items of all three subscales.

**Tendency to hold anger in.** The second anger measure used was the 8-item Anger In subscale of the self-report Anger Expression Inventory (ANGIN; Spielberger et al., 1985). This scale assesses how often a person keeps things in or is angrier than he or she is willing to admit. Example items include "I boil inside, but I don't show it" and "I tend to harbor grudges that I don't tell anyone about." Individual item scores on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from almost never (1) to almost always (4) are summed to yield total scores ranging from 8 to 32. Higher scores indicate someone who is more likely to hold anger in. Cronbach's alpha is reported as .84 (Spielberger et al., 1985). In my pilot study (N=43) I found a Cronbach's alpha of .69.

**Anger arousability.** Two measures will be used to assess the construct of anger dyscontrol. The Trait Anger subscale of the Spielberger State-Trait Personality Inventory (STPI; Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983) is a 10-item self-report instrument that measures how often a person becomes angry or furious or behaves in a hotheaded manner. Example items include "I have a fiery temper" and "I fly off the handle." Participants answer on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from almost never (1) to almost always (4). Scores can range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating more frequent occurrences of the levels of anger described in the items. Cronbach's alpha in a male college student sample is reported to be .85 (Spielberger et al., 1983). In my pilot study, Cronbach's alpha was .86. This scale was nonsignificantly positively related to tendency to hold anger in (measured as described in the previous paragraph), suggesting that these scales measure different aspects of anger, not merely the inverse of the same construct.

**Impulsivity** is typically included in conceptualizations of antisocial personality disorder (Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989; Prentky & Knight, 1991). Impulsivity is sometimes judged by the number of times that a person has quit jobs for no reason, whether he or she moves from town to town on a whim, and whether his or her offenses are committed spontaneously (Harpur,
et al., 1989). Because the college student population has generally not been independent from their families of origin long enough to have accumulated such behavioral indicators of impulsivity, I created a short scale to complement Antisocial Practices. Impulsivity (IMPULS) is an 8-item scale that elicits self-reports of impulsivity with items such as, "When I get an impulse to do something, it’s hard for me to stop and think of the consequences before acting," and "Like a master chess player, I usually plan my moves carefully" (reverse scored). Items are answered on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from completely unlike me (1) to completely like me (7), with higher scores indicating greater impulsivity. Scores can range from 8 to 56. In a pilot study this scale achieved a Cronbach's alpha of .88, and it was correlated only with Antisocial Practices (r = .37).

**Exploratory Variables**

**Social group identification.** In the same manner that information was elicited about affiliation with the fraternity subculture (described earlier), information was elicited about degree of identification with nine other social groups. The question was: "How strongly do you identify yourself with each of the following social groups?" In addition to "Greek/Fraternity" the following were listed: (a) "Football/Basketball/Team Sports," (b) "Track/Swim Team/Individual Sports," (c) "Outdoor Recreation Person," (d) "New Age," (e) "Environmental," (f) "Deadhead," (g) "Punk/Alternative," (h) "Church," and (i) "Studious." Respondents indicated affiliation with each group on separate 9-point Likert scales that ranged from not at all (1) to strongest identification (9).

**Locus of control (LC).** A 9-item Locus of Control Scale will be used (Nelson, 1978). This scale is comprised of 9 out of 12 items in Swanson's (1971) measure of internal-external locus of control. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). Scores can range from 9 to 45, with higher scores indicating more internal locus of control. Reliability and validity for Swanson's measure are reported to be comparable to Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control measure. Whereas Swanson's measure was developed and validated on a prison sample, Nelson's revision was used with a college student
sample. Nelson dropped 3 of Swanson's items that had low item-total correlations in a college student sample. The resulting 9-item scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .72.

**Measures of Men's Abuse of Women**

**Individual Sexual Abusiveness Scale.** This is a 12-item scale that asks respondents about the frequency and type of coercive sexual activity that they have engaged in since the age of 14. This scale consists of all items of the Tri-Abuse Scale (Powch, 1991) that refer to obtaining sexual contact or sexual intercourse or attempting to obtain sexual intercourse with an unwilling romantic partner, but it excludes items that refer to attempting sexual contact with an unwilling sexual partner. Representative items include, "How often have you used each of the following ways to get someone to have sexual intercourse with you when you wanted to, but they didn't want to: Overwhelming them with continual arguments? Using your superior strength to force them, or threatening to hurt them if they don't?" Participants answer Items on 5-point Likert scales ranging from more than 20 times (0) to never (4) that are reverse scored. For scoring purposes all categories other than "never" are combined, and items are summed such that total scores range from 0 to 12. A higher score indicates more adult sexual abusiveness. Cronbach's alpha for an 18-item subset of this scale was .96 in a pilot study of 43 college men.

**Group Rape/Group Sex Involvement (GROUPR).** This six-item scale was created for use in the present study, based on descriptions of gang rape in Sanday (1990) and Warshaw (1988). The first three items refer to "taking your turn" with a "party girl" in a variety of situations. The last three items refer to aspects of the situation, including the indications that respondents heard the women give regarding their nonconsent or distress about what was being done to them. Items were scaled and scored in the same manner as was described for the Individual Sexual Abusiveness Scale. Scores could range from 0 to 6.

**Physical Abusiveness Scale.** This is a 15-item scale that assesses the frequency and type of physical abuse that the respondent has inflicted, in nonsexual situations, on someone he was dating or romantically involved with since the age of 14. This scale includes all the items of
the Tri-Abuse Scale (Powch, 1991) that refer to physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner, but unlike the Tri Abuse Scale, the Physical Abusiveness Scale does not repeat violent behavior items with qualifiers referring to the degree of force with which physical abuse was perpetrated. Items were scaled on scored in the same manner as was described for the Individual Sexual Abusiveness Scale. Scores could range from 0 to 15. Representative items include, "How often have you pinned a partner down or prevented them from leaving during a fight or argument?", and "How often, when you came to blows with your partner, was the result for your partner a physical injury that left a mark (like a bruise) that lasted only a few days?"

**Emotional Abusiveness Scale.** This is a 20-item scale that assesses the frequency and type of emotional abuse that an adult has inflicted on others. This scale is composed of all the Tri-Abuse Scale (Powch, 1991) items that refer to emotional abusiveness toward an adult romantic partner, except one item that referred to doing or saying something to instill fear; that item was excluded because this wording did not clearly exclude physical assault (which is assessed by another scale). Twelve items refer to insulting or belittling the other person; for example, "How often have you intentionally tried to make someone feel inferior by calling them degrading and demeaning names such as 'slut,' 'fag,' etc.?" Eight items refer to terrorizing the other person; for example, "Have you used reckless driving to frighten someone in the car into agreeing to something you want, or to get back at them?" Items were scaled on scored in the same manner as was described for the Individual Sexual Abusiveness Scale. Scores could range from 0 to 20.

**Demographic Variables**

Demographic variables were obtained on age, ethnic and religious affiliation, self-identified sexual orientation, occupational status, income, and educational level of the participant's parents.

**Procedure**

This study was conducted in group questionnaire sessions. No more than 20
participants were allowed to sign up for any given questionnaire session. To reduce sample bias, the only information given about the study at the time students signed up for participation was that this would be a questionnaire study and that male participants were needed. Therefore, all male students in introductory psychology classes were eligible. Typically, more than 90% of students in introductory psychology classes are nonmajors filling distribution requirements, and the majority are first or second year students. Six upperclass, psychology major undergraduates were trained as research assistants and worked in pairs to run questionnaire sessions.

When participants arrived at the questionnaire session, they were seated in alternate seats to increase privacy. At that time they were given consent forms (Appendix B-1) that described the study and informed them that they could leave at any time without penalty; they were given a copy of the consent form to take home. No one left the study. One research assistant then read instructions (Appendix B-2) that included all of the information on the consent form as well as more detailed instructions regarding the study. The other research assistant collected the consent forms and placed them in an envelope that was kept separate from the questionnaires so that answers could not be identified with persons. The instructions explained to research participants how their anonymity was being protected. While one research assistant continued to read instructions, the other research assistant distributed questionnaire packets (Appendix B-3). After each group of 5 students completed answering questionnaires, one research assistant took them to an adjoining room to debrief them. The debriefing script used by research assistants is presented in Appendix B-4. At debriefing they were told about the purpose of the study, and they were given brief information about prevention of sexual assault and other forms of abusiveness along with a handout from a rape prevention workshop offered on their campus (Appendix B-5). At that time they were also provided with information about the sexual assault prevention and education center on campus, as well as with information for a free 24-hour crisis hotline and inexpensive psychological counseling services on campus. Participants were also provided with the principal investigator's name and work telephone number
in case they had any questions or concerns they wished to discuss. No calls were received.

RESULTS

Overview of Analyses

The pattern of abusive behaviors reported by this group of men was first described with
descriptive statistics for each form of abuse and correlations among the different forms of abuse.
The variables that were of interest for the potential associations with various forms of
abusiveness were then factor analyzed to combine highly related variables into more stable and
less redundant constructs.

Complex patterns of association between each type of abusiveness and four constructs
of theoretical interest (attitudes toward women, current indicators of psychopathology, childhood
exposure to abuse, and a party/bar pick-up environment) were tested using multiple regression
and planned hierarchical multiple regression analyses. These analyses refer to Research
Questions 1 to 3.

Questions 4 and 5, regarding the existence of nonabusive men and three groups of
abusive men that can be differentiated on the basis of their differential responding on risk factor
variables, was examined using stepwise discriminant function analysis. For this analysis all
variables were entered simultaneously (rather than in sets related to the predetermined
constructs that were tested with hierarchical multiple regression analyses), and the best
discriminators were empirically identified. All potential discriminators were included in this
analysis, including those that were exploratory.

Prevalence and Co-Occurrence of Different Forms of Abusiveness

Individual sexual abusiveness. At least one incident of sexual abusiveness since the
age of 14 was reported by 36% of the 255 heterosexual men in this sample. For 26% of the
men in the sample, this involved intercourse. Perpetration of rape, based on the definition of
using physical force to obtain sexual intercourse from an unwilling partner was reported by 11
men (4.3% of the entire sample). All 11 also attempted rape, and 2 additional men attempted but
never completed rape by this definition, for a total of 13 men (5.1% of the entire sample). All but one of these 13 men also used their position of authority (as a boss, teacher, camp counselor, etc.) to obtain intercourse from an unwilling partner, and an additional two men used this method without also using physical force, for a total of 15 men (5.9% of the entire sample). Thus, rape or attempted rape by physical force or coercion using positions of authority was reported by 5.9% of the entire sample. An additional 30 men raped by giving alcohol or drugs to the unwilling partner, for a total of 45 men (17.6% of the entire sample). An additional 14 men obtained intercourse from an unwilling partner by using continual arguments, for a total of 59 men (23% of the entire sample), and an additional 33 men were sexually abusive in any of the other ways measured in this study, for a total of 92 men (36% of the entire sample).

**Group rape/group sex involvement.** At least one incident of group rape/group sex involvement was reported by 33% of the sample; 19% of the sample reported more than one type of group rape/group sex involvement. It was also 19% of the sample that took "their turn" with a "party girl" at least once. Fewer (8% of the sample) indicated recognizing that the victim indicated that she did not want to be participating in this; all of these men also indicated that they "took their turn" with her. Eighteen men (7% of the sample) indicated that 3 or more men had been involved; of these 18 men, 9 (3.5% of the sample) indicated that 5 or more men had been involved.

**Physically abusive behavior.** At least one incident of a behavior that was physically abusive, or could easily have become physically abusive (including throwing things and stopping short of hitting) was reported by 38% of the men in this sample. More than one incident was reported by 25% of the men in this sample. The same number (25%) reported at least one incident of actually physically attacking their partner's body; 15% described more than one such incident. Actually physically attacking the partner's body (physical assault) was the variable that was used in all of the analyses in the present study.

**Emotionally abusive behavior.** Because 95.3% of the men in this sample engaged in an
emotionally abusive behavior at least once, Table 1 presents data on men who engaged in multiple types of emotional abusiveness. Nine or more out of 20 types of emotionally abusive behavior were endorsed by 31% of the sample; 11 or more types were endorsed by 20% of the sample. Nine or more out of 12 insulting or belittling types of emotionally abusive behavior were endorsed by 19% of the sample, and three or more out of 8 types of terrorizing emotionally abusive behavior were reported by 14% of the sample.

Descriptive statistics and psychometric properties of the scales and subscales measuring major categories of abusive behavior are summarized in Table 1. The categories that were used as dependent measures in multiple regression analyses are underlined; intercorrelations among these four variables are presented in Table 2. A factor analysis of these four variables yielded a two factor solution as indicated by a scree plot of the eigenvalues (1.9, 1.0, 6.0, and .51). After varimax rotation, actual physical abuse and emotional abuse loaded on Factor 1 with loadings of .74 and .59, respectively. Group rape/group sex involvement and individual sexual abusiveness loaded on Factor 2 with loadings of .85 and .46, respectively. The largest crossloading was a .32 loading for individual sexual abusiveness on Factor 1. Figure 1 presents the overlap among individual sexual abusiveness, group rape/group sex involvement, and physical abusiveness; it also presents the number of men who engaged in high, medium, and low levels of emotional abusiveness without engaging in any of the other forms of abusiveness.
### Table 1

**Abusiveness Measures: Descriptive Statistics and Psychometric Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abusiveness measures</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Actual range</th>
<th>Any occur</th>
<th>&gt;1 Type of occur</th>
<th># items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexual abusiveness</td>
<td>1.39 (2.5)</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Involving intercourse</td>
<td>.86 (1.9)</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group rape/group sex</td>
<td>2.60 (1.8)</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Took &quot;their turn&quot;</td>
<td>.84 (1.6)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Despite victim protests</td>
<td>.18 (0.7)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical abusiveness</td>
<td>1.9 (2.7)</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Physical attack</td>
<td>1.06 (1.9)</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 255 except Despite victim protests could only be calculated for 249 individuals. Victim protests reflects the number of group rape/group sex involvement items endorsed by men who have ever participated in a group rape/group sex situation despite their perception of the woman as indicating her objections to being sexually violated. Actual range is the same as possible range for all variables except Emotional abusiveness, which had a possible range of 20.

### Table 2

**Pearson Correlations Among Abusiveness Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexual abusiveness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group rape/group sex</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical attack</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotional abusiveness</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** A factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded two factors, one incorporating sexual forms of abusiveness, and the other incorporating nonsexual forms of abusiveness. See text for details.
Figure 1

Percentage of Men Who Have Engaged in Various Combinations of Abusive Behaviors

Note. Overlap of emotional abusiveness with other forms of abusiveness is not presented in this chart. Percentage overlap of emotional abusiveness with other forms of abusiveness ranged from 28% (with group rape/group sex) to 75% (with sex, and also with physical, sex, group rape/group sex involvement). The following number of people counted in each abuse category is: group rape/group sex involvement (18), individual sexual, and group rape/group sex involvement (22), individual sexual (16), physical, individual sexual, and group rape/group sex involvement (24), physical and individual sexual (31), physical (29), physical and group rape/group sex involvement (22), score 9 and above on emotional abusiveness (15), score 5 to 8 on emotional abusiveness (34), score 1 to 4 on emotional abusiveness (32), score 0 on all four abusiveness scales (12).
Data Reduction Procedures For Predictor Variables

First, all 42 predictor variables—those related to attitudes toward women, psychopathology, childhood exposure to abuse, party/bar pick-up involvement, and the exploratory variables—were factor analyzed using a principal components analysis and varimax rotation. A 12 factor solution was chosen in the following manner: First, eigenvalues of the unrotated solution were examined. Twelve factors produced eigenvalues greater than 1. Next, a scree plot of the eigenvalues indicated reasonably steep drop-offs after 8 factors, 10 factors, and 12 factors, and a very small drop-off after 16 factors. An orthogonal rotation method (varimax) was then used to examine 8, 10, and 12 factor solutions. A twelve factor solution fit the conceptual framework most closely. The 12 factors are summarized in Table 3. Variables with factor loadings of .5 or greater were combined by standardizing and summing. Variables with factor loadings between .4 and .5 were included in the factor on which they loaded if three additional criteria were met: (a) there was less than a .15 difference between the variable's factor loading and the smallest factor loading of variables already included on the factor in question, (b) its factor loading was not more than .10 less than the average factor loading of variables that are already included in the factor, and (c) the variable was theoretically related to the factor on which it loaded. One variable—drug abuse—met these criteria and was included in a factor of antisocial indicators. There were no crossloading problems. There was one exception to the rule of combining items with factor loadings of .5 or greater. In the case of Factor 4, which included five different social group affiliations, these five variables were submitted to a separate factor analysis specifying a three factor solution; the three factors that resulted are labeled A1 to A3 in Table 3. This was done because I was interested in exploring the potential association of reasonably distinct social groupings on abusiveness variables; a single variable comprised of five different social group affiliations was not of interest.

Other variables with factor loadings less than .5, such as anger, stand alone. These data reduction procedures resulted in 17 variables from among the 32 related to attitudes and
reactions directed specifically at women, psychopathology, childhood exposure to abuse, and party/bar pick-up involvement, and 7 variables from among the 10 that had been viewed as exploratory predictor variables. Thus, some of the new variables are composites and some are not. The variables that resulted from these data reduction procedures are summarized in Table 4. The 17 hypothesized risks for abusiveness are presented in four theoretically derived sets: Current Attitudes Toward Women, Current Indicators of Psychopathology, Childhood Exposure to Abuse, and Party/bar pick-up.

Intercorrelations among the variables in the reduced data set may be examined in Appendix C. Correlations with Total Abusiveness and Sexual Abusiveness are also provided in Appendix C. Appendix D provides means, standard deviations, ranges, and Cronbach alphas; for a number of variables this appendix also presents information related to normative data for the original variables before they were combined with other variables because of data reduction. Not all 42 original variables are presented; only the 32 variables that were composed of more than 2 items are included in Appendix D. Appendix D also lists the items that comprise each of the 32 scales that are comprised of more than 2 items.

---

5 For convenience, “Attitudes and reactions directed specifically at women” will be referred to simply as “Attitudes toward women.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and variables they are comprised of</th>
<th>% Variance accounted</th>
<th>Highest loading</th>
<th>Composite variable names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Depression</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>.88a</td>
<td>Cognitive-emotional disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid ideation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-in</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48b</td>
<td>Borderline alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rape myth acceptance</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>.71d</td>
<td>Male entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify acquaintance rape</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify hitting girlfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathize w/ rapist</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41e</td>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parental rejection &amp; hostile control</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>.93f</td>
<td>Physically &amp; emotionally abused child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental maltreatment &amp; ridicule</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically beaten</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Punk/alternative</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>.46g; .59 A1</td>
<td>Alternative music scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56g; .52 (A1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoorsy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44h; .63 (A2)</td>
<td>Environmental/outdoorsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71h; .50 (A2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newage</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60i; .71 (A3)</td>
<td>Newage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bar pick-up</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>.83j</td>
<td>Find dates at party/bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party pick-up</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47k</td>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with fraternity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>Identification with fraternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Father violent toward mother 5.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>.98m</td>
<td>Witness parental violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother violent toward father</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness father disrespect mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40n</td>
<td>Witness father disrespect mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Team sport</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>.80o</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48p</td>
<td>Church affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assault</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>.53q</td>
<td>Antisocial indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32r</td>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.30s</td>
<td>Studiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Peer pressure to batter</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.64t</td>
<td>Peer pressure to abuse women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure to rape</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sadistic rape scenario</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>.65u</td>
<td>Sexual arousal to rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common rape scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hostility toward women</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.81v</td>
<td>Hostility toward women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood exposure to pornography</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.34w</td>
<td>Childhood exposure to porn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood sex at other's request</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38x</td>
<td>Childhood sex at other's request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=255. A 12-factor solution was determined by considering interpretability, yet not allowing eigenvalues to fall below 1. Variables were combined if they loaded on the same factor .5 or greater, except (a) drug abuse, with a loading of .43, was included in a factor of antisocial tendencies because it is theoretically related to this construct, and (b) Five different group affiliations that loaded on Factor 4 were submitted to a separate factor analysis specifying a 3-factor solution and were then combined into three factors into which they sorted. Variables with the same subscripts were combined; these composite variables were used in subsequent analyses.
Table 4
Composite Variables Based on Factor Analysis And Theory and Their Cronbach Alphas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized risks for abusiveness</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SET 1. Current attitudes toward women</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Peer pressure to abuse women</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure to batter + Peer pressure to rape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male entitlement</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape myth acceptance + Justify acquaintance rape + Justify hitting + Empathize w/rapist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hostility toward women</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sexual arousal to rape</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadistic rape scenario + Common rape scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SET 2. Current Indicators of Psychopathology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Antisocial indicators</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault + Antisocial practices + Drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Borderline alienation</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cognitive-emotional disturbance</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression + Anxiety + Dissociation + Paranoid ideation + Anger-in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anger</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Impulsiveness</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SET 3. Childhood Exposure to Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Witness father disrespect mother</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Childhood exposure to pornography</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Physically &amp; emotionally abused child</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental rejection &amp; hostile control + Parental maltreatment &amp; ridicule + Physically beaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Childhood sex at other’s request</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Witness parental violence</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father violent toward mother + Mother violent toward father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SET 4. Alcohol &amp; Party Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Find dates at party/bar</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar pick-up + Party pick-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Identification with fraternity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exploratory Variables**

**Other Interests and Affiliations**

1. Alternative music scene                                                                            two items
   Deadhead + punk/alternative                                                                         |
2. Environmental/outdoorsy                                                                            two items
   Environmental + outdoorsy                                                                          |
3. Newage                                                                                                single item
4. Athletics                                                                                           two items
   Team sport + Individual sport                                                                      |
5. Church affiliation                                                                                 single item
6. Studious                                                                                            single item

**Locus of Control**

7. Internal locus of control                                                                           74

**Note:** Rules for combining variables are outlined in Table 23 note.
Relationships of Predictors to Abusiveness

Simple relationships of each predictor set. When examined without regard to the other three predictor sets, each of the four predictor sets (current attitudes toward women, current indicators of psychopathology, childhood exposure to abuse, and involvement in an alcohol and party culture) explained significant percentages of the variance for all forms of abusiveness except nonsexual physical attacks. Nonsexual physical attacks were explained by all predictor sets except current attitudes toward women. These results are summarized in Table 5. Table 5 also presents the semipartial correlations of the variables that were included within a given predictor set. For example, after controlling for male entitlement, hostility toward women, and sexual arousal to rape, peer pressure to abuse women still explained a significant and moderately large (semipartial correlation of .23) portion of variance in total abusiveness.
Table 5

Semipartial Correlations Within Each Predictor Set and Adjusted Multiple Correlation For Each Predictor Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of abusive behavior</th>
<th>Total abuse</th>
<th>Sex abuse</th>
<th>Group rape/sex attack</th>
<th>Physical abuse</th>
<th>Emotional abuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PREDICTOR SET**

**Set 1: Current attitudes toward women**

1. Peer pressure to abuse women  
   - Current illtitudes \( .23** \)  
   - Group \( .14* \)  
   - Physical \( .06 \)  
   - Emotional \( .09 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .41*** \)

2. Male entitlement  
   - Current \( .14* \)  
   - Group \( .19** \)  
   - Emotional \( .24** \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .32*** \)

3. Hostility toward women  
   - Current \( .09 \)  
   - Group \( -.02 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .30*** \)

4. Sexual arousal to rape  
   - Current \( .03 \)  
   - Group \( .06 \)  
   - Emotional \( .05 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .40*** \)

**Set 2: Current indicators of psychopathology**

5. Antisocial indicators  
   - Current \( .27*** \)  
   - Group \( .20** \)  
   - Emotional \( .16** \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .47*** \)

6. Borderline alienation  
   - Current \( -.21** \)  
   - Group \( -.11 \)  
   - Emotional \( -.12* \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .22** \)

7. Cognitive-emotional disturbance  
   - Current \( .20** \)  
   - Group \( .16* \)  
   - Emotional \( .15 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .19** \)

8. Anger  
   - Current \( .14* \)  
   - Group \( .08 \)  
   - Emotional \( .05 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .19** \)

9. Impulsiveness  
   - Current \( .01 \)  
   - Group \( -.03 \)  
   - Emotional \( .01 \)  
   - Adjusted R \( .01 \)

**Set 3: Childhood exposure to abuse**

10. Witness father disrespect mother  
    - Current \( .19** \)  
    - Group \( .20** \)  
    - Emotional \( .10 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .18** \)

11. Childhood exposure to pornography  
    - Current \( .13* \)  
    - Group \( .09 \)  
    - Emotional \( .05 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .01 \)

12. Physically & emotionally abused child  
    - Current \( .11 \)  
    - Group \( -.04 \)  
    - Emotional \( .12* \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .11 \)

13. Childhood sex at other's request  
    - Current \( .11 \)  
    - Group \( -.04 \)  
    - Emotional \( .10 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .07 \)

14. Witness parental violence  
    - Current \( .08 \)  
    - Group \( -.02 \)  
    - Emotional \( .07 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .07 \)

**Set 4: Alcohol and party culture**

15. Party/bar pick-up  
    - Current \( .26*** \)  
    - Group \( .20** \)  
    - Emotional \( .15 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .37*** \)

16. Alcohol abuse  
    - Current \( .18** \)  
    - Group \( .15** \)  
    - Emotional \( .10 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .02 \)

17. Identification with fraternity  
    - Current \( -.01 \)  
    - Group \( .03 \)  
    - Emotional \( -.12 \)  
    - Adjusted R \( .00 \)

**Note.** This table reports separate regression analyses for each predictor set, not steps in a hierarchical analysis. Total abuse was created by standardizing and summing sexual abusiveness, group rape/group sex involvement physical abusiveness, and emotional abusiveness. Each set is considered separately, not controlling for the other sets. Within a set, each variable is examined after controlling for all other variables within that set. Adjusted R values attempt to correct R to more closely reflect the goodness of fit of the model in the population.

*\( p < .05 \)*, **\( p < .01 \)**, ***\( p < .001 \).
Each predictor set’s unique relationship to abusiveness. Each predictor set’s unique relationship to each type of abusiveness was determined by entering that predictor set as the last step in a hierarchical multiple regression analysis with a given type of abusiveness as the dependent variable. As summarized in Table 6, each predictor set explained unique variance for total abusiveness, but only attitudes toward women and involvement in an alcohol and party culture explained unique variance in sexual abusiveness and group rape/group sex involvement. None of the four variable sets explained unique variance in physical attacks after controlling for the other three variable sets. All sets except involvement in an alcohol and party culture explained unique variance in emotional abusiveness.

Table 6

Each Predictor Set’s Unique Relationship to Each Type of Abusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTOR SETS</th>
<th>Total abusiveness</th>
<th>Sexually abusive</th>
<th>Group Rape/sex</th>
<th>Physical attack</th>
<th>Emotionally abusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj Rch P</td>
<td>Adj Rch P</td>
<td>Adj Rch P</td>
<td>Adj Rch P</td>
<td>Adj Rch P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to women</td>
<td>.17 (.005)</td>
<td>.24 (.0004)</td>
<td>.20 (.005)</td>
<td>---- (.99)</td>
<td>.17 (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathology</td>
<td>.20 (.006)</td>
<td>---- (.95)</td>
<td>---- (.20)</td>
<td>---- (.31)</td>
<td>.24 (.0002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood exposure to abuse</td>
<td>.17 (.02)</td>
<td>---- (.26)</td>
<td>---- (.31)</td>
<td>---- (.33)</td>
<td>.14 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; party culture</td>
<td>.22 (.0002)</td>
<td>.24 (.0001)</td>
<td>.24 (.0003)</td>
<td>---- (.22)</td>
<td>---- (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table reports the results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which the predictor set listed was entered as the last step. Separate analyses were run for each dependent variable. Adj Rch = Adjusted R change. Attitudes to women, Psychopathology, Childhood exposure to abuse, and alcohol & party culture blocks are comprised of the variables listed in Table 4. All abusiveness variables were formed by adding the number of items individuals endorsed with any response other than "never." Sample size is 255.
A model including interactions and exploratory predictors. Starting with the percentage of variance that is explained by childhood exposure to abuse, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis for each type of abusiveness presents the incremental variance that is explained by current indicators of psychopathology, current attitudes toward women, current involvement in an alcohol and party culture, and four other variables (two interaction terms, a set of all group affiliations listed in Table 4 as "Exploratory Variables," and a locus of control variable). The first of the four other variables that was explored was an interaction between antisocial indicators and peer pressure to abuse women. This interaction was of interest because of Dutton's (1994) conclusion on theoretical grounds that patriarchy and psychological variables must interact. Antisocial indicators was chosen as a psychological variable of interest for reasons indicated in the introduction and also because the analyses presented in Table 5 indicated that of the psychological variables tested in this study, antisocial indicators is the strongest predictor of all types of abusive behavior measured in this study. Peer pressure to abuse women was chosen as a sociocultural variable (related to patriarchy) because of the reasons indicated in the introduction and because of the variables in the current attitudes toward women block, peer pressure to abuse women was one of the strongest predictors of a variety of abusive behaviors. It was thought that when peer pressure to abuse women is high, antisocial indicators will be more strongly associated with abusiveness toward women than when peer pressure to abuse women is low. A peer pressure to abuse women by antisocial indicators interaction was significantly related to total abusiveness after controlling for all predictor sets, which include the peer pressure variable and the antisocial indicators variable. Interpretation of this interaction by the graphical method described by Aiken and West (1991) revealed that the slope between antisocial indicators and total abusiveness was greater if scores on peer pressure to abuse women were high than if those scores were moderate. If scores on peer pressure to abuse women were low, then the slope between antisocial indicators and total abusiveness was almost flat (slightly negative). This is presented graphically in Figure 2.
Figure 2

[Graph showing the relationship between antisocial behavior and total abusiveness for different peer groups.]
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The second interaction term that was explored was an interaction between cognitive-emotional disturbance and the party/bar pick-up environment. This interaction was of interest for reasons similar to those outlined above. It was thought that men who have more cognitive-emotional problems might be more likely to use the party/bar pick-up environment in a misguided attempt to fill unmet emotional needs by demonstrating (to themselves or others) that they are sexually successful. The more they go out to meet women in this way, the more opportunities they are likely to have to be sexually abusive. Thus, it was thought that at higher levels of cognitive-emotional disturbance there would be a stronger relationship between abusiveness and preferentially finding dates at large parties or bars than at lower levels of cognitive-emotional disturbance. After controlling for all aforementioned variables, which included cognitive-emotional disturbance and finding dates at parties and bars, an interaction between the latter two variables was significantly related to total abusiveness and group rape/group sex involvement.

Interpretation of this interaction by the graphical method described by Aiken and West (1991) revealed that the slope between the party/bar variable and total abusiveness was greater if scores on cognitive-emotional disturbance were high than if those scores were moderate. If scores on cognitive-emotional disturbance were low, then the slope between the party/bar variable and total abusiveness was almost flat. The same pattern was found when group rape/group sex was the dependent variable. These interactions are presented graphically in Figures 3 and 4.

After controlling for all aforementioned variables, including interaction terms, a set of all other group affiliations listed in Table 4 under "Exploratory Variables" was significantly related to total abusiveness, physical abusiveness, and emotional abusiveness. After controlling for all the aforementioned variables, locus of control was entered; it did not reach significance in the prediction of any form of abusiveness. This variable also failed to reach significance when it was entered before the other exploratory group affiliations. The final model explained 40% of the variance in total abusiveness. These results are summarized in Table 7.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor blocks</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Step 6</th>
<th>Step 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused as child</td>
<td>Adj R</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
<td>Adj Rch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>.90 (.0000)</td>
<td>.66 (.0000)</td>
<td>.20 (.003)</td>
<td>.20 (.0005)</td>
<td>.10 (.04)</td>
<td>.10 (.04)</td>
<td>.15 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>.17 (.04)</td>
<td>.14 (.07)</td>
<td>.26 (.0003)</td>
<td>.24 (.0002)</td>
<td>---- (.13)</td>
<td>---- (.08)</td>
<td>---- (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; party</td>
<td>.20 (.009)</td>
<td>.20 (.02)</td>
<td>.20 (.01)</td>
<td>.22 (.001)</td>
<td>---- (.16)</td>
<td>.13 (.02)</td>
<td>---- (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology X antisociala</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groupsb</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** This table reports each step of five hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Childhood exposure to abuse, current indicators of psychopathology, current attitudes toward women, and alcohol & party culture blocks are comprised of the variables listed in Table 4. HLC was added as a last step, but did not approach significance for any type of abusiveness. Sample size is 255. aInteraction between Cognitive-Emotional Disturbance and Finding dates at parties and bars. bInteraction between Peer Pressure to Abuse Women and Antisocial Indicators. cVariables listed under Other Interests and Affiliations in Table 4.
Three Related Ways of Identifying Profiles of Abusive Men

The task of identifying profiles of subtypes of abusive men compared with nonabusive men was approached by synthesizing the information obtained from three related ways of examining the data. This might be described as analogous to moving a camera to take shots of an elephant from different angles. The first approach involved forming four groups based on apriori criteria: a nonabusive group, a sexually abusive group, a nonsexually abusive group, and a group that was abusive in both sexual and nonsexual ways. An alternate approach involved a two-way analysis of variance, with physical abusiveness (Y/N), and sexual abusiveness (Y/N) as independent variables. An advantage of this method is that a physical abuse by sexual abuse interaction can be tested directly. A disadvantage is that if the cutoff criterion for emotional abusiveness is so stringent that a clean nonabusive group can be created, the cell that defines a group that is sexually abusive but not nonsexually abusive might be exceedingly small because it is unlikely that men who are sexually abusive would be much less emotionally abusive than the average man; if the emotional abuse criterion is relaxed, however, the nonabusive group might contain emotionally abusive individuals. A third approach is to do a three-way analysis of variance. This has the advantage of allowing separation of three components of abusiveness—sexual, physical, and emotional. The disadvantage is similar to that of the second approach; some of the cells could be exceedingly small if a stringent cutoff criterion were used for emotional abusiveness. Therefore, even though the three methods of examining the data are similar, they each offer unique advantages; the first allows for a cleaner comparison group; the second allows the sexually abusive by nonsexually abusive interaction to be examined directly, and the third unlinks the emotional and physical abusiveness variables, allowing all combinations of sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness to be examined. Convergence of the interpretations derived from these three interrelated ways of slicing up the data contributes to confidence in the stability of the overall conclusions drawn. Thus, all three approaches were used to arrive at a richer description of the profiles of different subtypes of abusive men in this
Nonabusive men and three types of abusive men. A total of 129 men who met inclusion criteria for any of the following four groups was included in the analyses reported in Tables 8 and 9. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) nonabusive group: no sexual abusiveness, no group rape/group sex involvement, no physical attacks, and 4 or fewer emotional abusiveness items endorsed (half of a standard deviation below the mean for emotional abusiveness); (b) nonsexually abusive group: no sexual abusiveness, no group rape/group sex involvement, but 2 or more physical attack items endorsed, or 10 or more emotional abusiveness items endorsed (approximately a standard deviation above the mean for emotional abusiveness); (c) sexually abusive group: no physical abusiveness, but 2 or more sexual abusiveness items or 2 or more group rape/group sex involvement items, or 1 of each endorsed; (d) both Sexually and nonsexually abusive group: 1 sexual abusiveness or 1 group rape/group sex involvement item endorsed; and 2 or more physical attack items, or 1 physical attack and 6 or more emotional abusiveness items endorsed, or 10 or more emotional abusiveness items endorsed.

All predictor variables presented in Table 4, and also sexual arousal to mutual sex vignettes, which is not presented in Table 4, were examined for their ability to differentiate the four groups. First, univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed to determine whether there were significant differences among the four groups on any of the variables. Then a multivariate stepwise discriminant function analysis was performed to determine what combination of variables most efficiently differentiated the 129 men into the abusiveness group to which they belong. Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations for the 13 variables identified as discriminators that together correctly classified 75.38% of the 129 men. All 13 variables also reached significance in the univariate ANOVAs. Classification errors are summarized in Table 9. Profiles of the four groups are presented in Figure 5. Scores on the

---

6 It should be noted that the percent of correct classifications in the discriminant analysis would be likely to decrease if replicated with a new sample.
Figure 5
Three Subtypes of Abusive Men Compared to Nonabusive Men

Note. This is a visual representation of the data presented in Table 8. The four means presented for each variable have been rescaled on a percentage scale such that the lowest mean anchors the bottom and the highest mean anchors the top of the scale.
following variables indicated group differences in the univariate ANOVAS, but not in the
multivariate discriminant analysis: experiences of emotional and physical abuse as a child,
having witnessed parental violence, current levels of anger, external locus of control, and degree
of identification with the New Age subculture. The group that was abusive both sexually and
nonsexually scored the highest on all of these variables, and the nonabusive group scored
lowest. The fact that these variables achieved significance at the univariate level but not the
multivariate level indicates that although they are important variables in and of themselves, the
information they provide is redundant with the information provided by other variables included in
the stepwise analysis. Therefore, after those other variables have been included in the analysis,
these variables do not provide new or unique information and therefore do not achieve
significance. For example, if we know a man's level of general anger, our prediction of his
abusiveness toward women would be better than random. If we know his level of hostility
toward women our prediction of his abusiveness toward women would be better than random.
But if we have already made a prediction based on his level of hostility toward women, knowing
his level of general anger would not help us make a significantly better prediction because his
level of anger gives us information that is largely redundant with the information we already
obtained from our knowledge of his level of hostility toward women.
Table 8

Scores on Variables That Differentiated the Four Groups of Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Nonabusive (n = 51)</th>
<th>Nonsexually abusive (n = 18)</th>
<th>Sexually abusive (n = 21)</th>
<th>Both (n = 39)</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Univ F</th>
<th>Univ Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male entitlement</td>
<td>-1.0 (2.4)</td>
<td>-0.5 (2.6)</td>
<td>1.0* (3.5)</td>
<td>2.2** (3.5)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility to women</td>
<td>55.5 (13.9)</td>
<td>74.3* (15.5)</td>
<td>61.5 (14.4)</td>
<td>67.9 (11.4)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure to abuse</td>
<td>51.0 (14.9)</td>
<td>65.3* (12.2)</td>
<td>63.0 (11.5)</td>
<td>67.6* (11.9)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual arousal to rape</td>
<td>6.9 (3.8)</td>
<td>8.0 (4.2)</td>
<td>8.2 (3.9)</td>
<td>10.6* (6.4)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial indicators</td>
<td>-1.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>1.2* (1.7)</td>
<td>.3 (2.4)</td>
<td>1.3* (2.0)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td>25.9 (7.3)</td>
<td>27.6 (5.7)</td>
<td>29.4 (6.9)</td>
<td>30.7 (6.6)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-emotional disturbance</td>
<td>-1.2 (4.3)</td>
<td>.9* (3.0)</td>
<td>-1.5 (3.1)</td>
<td>1.5** (4.0)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathr disrespct mother</td>
<td>10.9 (2.5)</td>
<td>13.1 (3.6)</td>
<td>13.1 (3.4)</td>
<td>15.4* (5.0)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child exposed to pornography</td>
<td>10.6 (3.1)</td>
<td>13.4 (4.6)</td>
<td>13.9 (4.4)</td>
<td>12.6 (3.2)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>14.0 (6.2)</td>
<td>19.7 (4.8)</td>
<td>22.5* (5.0)</td>
<td>19.7 (6.5)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find dates at party/bar</td>
<td>2.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>4.3* (1.6)</td>
<td>4.0* (1.8)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with fraternity</td>
<td>2.4 (2.7)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.1)</td>
<td>5.9* (3.0)</td>
<td>3.7 (3.1)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative music scene</td>
<td>4.4 (2.9)</td>
<td>4.0 (2.4)</td>
<td>6.1* (3.6)</td>
<td>6.6* (4.6)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All variables presented in Table 4 were used in this analysis, but this table presents only those variables that reached significance in a stepwise multivariate discriminant function analysis, which correctly grouped 75.38% of the cases. The group with the highest value on any given variable is marked with an asterisk, or with a double asterisk if there is a second group with a score that is much higher than the scores of the remaining two groups.
Table 9

**Discriminant Function Classification of Men With Different Patterns of Abusiveness Toward Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Nonabusive</th>
<th>Sexually</th>
<th>Physically</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonabusive</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43 (84%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically or emotionally</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (18%)</td>
<td>26 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 75.38% of cases were correctly classified.
Sexual abusiveness by physical abusiveness interaction. A sexual abusiveness variable was coded 1 if two or more individual sexual abusiveness items were endorsed, if two or more group rape/group sex items were endorsed, or if one of each was endorsed. The sexual abusiveness item was coded 0 if no individual sexual abusiveness items were endorsed and no group rape/group sex items were endorsed. A nonsexual abusiveness variable was coded 1 if two or more actual physical attacks were reported or one actual physical attack and 6 or more emotional abusiveness items were endorsed. The nonsexual abusiveness variable was coded 0 if no actual physical attacks were reported, and fewer than 6 emotional abusiveness items were endorsed. Using these criteria to form groups, the nonabusive group was comprised of 58 individuals, the dually abusive group was comprised of 38 individuals, the sexually abusive group was comprised of 23 individuals, and the nonsexually abusive group was comprised of 10 individuals. A MANOVA that included all 25 predictor variables indicated significant main effects for both sexual \((p = .03)\) and nonsexual \((p = .001)\) forms of abuse. Univariate ANOVAs revealed that different variables were responsible for the sexual abusiveness main effects than for the nonsexual abusiveness main effects. ANOVA main effects for sexual abusiveness were found for entitlement to abuse women, the party/bar variable, sexual arousal to rape scenarios, and identification with New Age culture. ANOVA main effects for nonsexual abusiveness were found for hostility toward women, peer pressure to abuse women, father disrespecting mother, extent of childhood sexual experiences at another's request, degree of childhood exposure to pornography, antisocial indicators, cognitive-emotional disturbance, anger, alcohol, and identification with outdoorsy/environmentalist subcultures. More abusiveness was associated with higher scores on the aforementioned variables. Although there was no interaction at the multivariate level \((p = .67)\), there was a significant sexual by nonsexual abusiveness interaction for degree of identification with fraternities \((p = .02)\). Among men who were nonsexually abusive, those who were also sexually abusive identified only slightly more with the fraternity culture \((mean = 3.61)\) than those who were not also sexually abusive \((mean = 3.57)\). However, among...
men who were not nonsexually abusive (i.e., among those who were low in physical and in emotional abusiveness), those who were sexually abusive identified much more strongly with fraternity culture ($M = 5.30$) than those who were not sexually abusive ($M = 2.38$).

**Sexual abusiveness, physical abusiveness, and emotional abusiveness main effects.**

The same 25 dependent variables and the same cutoff criteria for forming groups were used as were described in the previous section. The only difference is that for the analyses reported in this section, three dichotomous variables were created: sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness. Consistent with the multiple regression analyses presented in an earlier section, significant MANOVA main effects were found for sexual abusiveness ($p = .002$) and emotional abusiveness ($p = .001$), but not for physical abusiveness ($p = .25$). As expected because of small cell size, no significant two-way or three-way interactions were found (all three MANOVA $p$ values above .60). Univariate ANOVAs were explored for all three variables because the pattern of significant main effects was of interest with respect to the goal of describing profiles of abusive men. Different sets of variables had main effects on each of the three abusiveness variables, with very few redundancies. The pattern of significant main effects is presented in Table 10.
### Table 10
Significant Main Effects on Abusiveness Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Sexual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostility toward women</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally &amp; Physically abused as child</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-emotional disturbance</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement to abuse women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal to rape scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree identify with New Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure to abuse</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness father disrespect mother</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree identify with fraternity</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial tendencies</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table lists p values associated with the ANOVA main effect of each dependent variable on each dichotomously coded abusiveness variable.
DISCUSSION

The prevalence of overall rate of any self-reported sexual abusiveness since the age of 14 was comparable to that found in other studies of college men. This study's rate of 36% is between the Koss et al. (1987) rate of 25% for a national sample of college students and Muehlenhard and Linton's (1987) rate of 57% in sample of college students from a campus similar to that of the present sample. The present study's rate of self-reported rape by use of physical force (4.3%) is also higher than Koss et al.'s rate of 2%. The differences may be attributable to sampling differences, differences in restrictiveness of the definitions used (Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps, & Giusti, 1992), and reporting differences. Given that the present study's definitions of overall sexual abusiveness were most similar to Koss et al.'s, the higher rates found in the present study might be the result of more honest reporting in response to two features that were introduced for this purpose. The first feature was scaling that allowed more choices than abusive or nonabusive. In the present study "once" might be less difficult to admit on a scale that ranged to "more than 20 times" than it would on a dichotomous scale as was used in the Koss et al. study. The second feature was considerable effort to convey the care that was being taken to ensure anonymity for the express purpose of making candid responding safe.

A 33% rate of group rape/group sex involvement implies that groups of men taking turns having sex with a "party girl" is so common and socially accepted on campus that a third of first and second year college men have been present in such a situation at least once. That 19% took "their turn" (14% were present but did not take "their turn"), and 8% of those present coded and reported the victim's active indications of nonconsent and distress implies that far from being viewed as a shameful act to be engaged in secretly, group rape falls along a continuum of sexual behaviors that are socially accepted by a sizable group of college men. This finding lends support to the importance of the cultural (not only individual) determinants of rape that are the focus of feminist analyses.
A 38% rate of overall physical abusiveness, including kicking and throwing things not directly at the woman being abused, implies that a very substantial percentage of women are confronted by men who display their potential to do physical harm. The effects of such displays of potential to harm on women’s fear of "eliciting" that capacity in men, and the effects of this on maintaining a power differential between men and women in intimate relationships has far-reaching implications—particularly when this pattern is found in a group so young.

A 25% rate of actually physically assaulting an intimate partner obviously also has implications for the health and safety of the much larger percentage of women that these men are likely to become involved with over their lifetimes, and possibly also their future children.

The high levels of emotional abusiveness found in this sample, and the high degree of overlap of emotional abusiveness with sexual and physical abusiveness suggest that sexual abusiveness is not just the result of uncontrollable sexual arousal and that physical assaults are not just impulsive or random lapses of self-control but part of a larger pattern that includes intimidation and an intention to hurt, humiliate, or control.

**Overlap Among Types of Woman Abuse**

Whereas the rate reported for any one form of abusiveness since the age of 14 was roughly a third of the sample, the rate reported for any form of abusiveness since the age of 14 was 64% (that is, when only emotional abuse scores of 9 and above are counted; otherwise the rate would be 95.3%; see Figure 1). The implication of this finding is threefold. First, it should alert researchers to the high probability that when they inquire about only one form of abusive behavior, their "nonabusive" comparison group is likely to have almost as many abusive men as their group of identified abusers. Second, although the percentages are small (under 12%), the existence of men who engage in only one specific form of abuse raises the issue of whether different forms of abusive behavior are mediated by different factors that might operate in addition to any global risks for abusiveness. Third, the magnitude of these numbers draws attention to the importance of including societal levels of explanation when attempting to
understand and influence the problem of violence against women. Certainly, 61% of the men in this sample are not raping women or putting their girlfriends in the hospital with broken bones or lacerations, but difficult questions are raised: How does a man decide what is an "acceptable level of abuse" in terms of his own behavior and in terms of what he will tolerate as a member of society? What would it take for the majority of men in this society to reject woman abuse in any form or degree if they have themselves engaged in some form or degree of woman abuse? And in what ways do men who cross the boundaries of "acceptable" degrees of woman abuse differ from those who do not?

**Variables Related to Sexual Forms of Woman Abuse**

Sexual forms of woman abuse are significantly associated with each of the predictor sets examined: attitudes toward women, indicators of psychopathology, childhood exposure to abuse, and involvement in a party/bar social environment. However, only attitudes toward women and social environment remain significantly associated with sexual forms of woman abuse after controlling for the other three predictor sets. This is different from the pattern found for nonsexual forms of woman abuse. An implication of this finding is that research on sexual forms of woman abuse that considers only psychopathology and childhood experiences of abuse is missing information that is not subsumed by the individual differences variables included in those studies. The implication for intervention is a warning that interventions that do not target attitudes toward women and a social environment centered around alcohol, parties, and bars as a central focus may not be effective.

Examination of semipartial correlations within the attitudes toward women set of variables reveals that entitlement to abuse women (including acceptance of rape myths, empathy toward rapists, justifying acquaintance rape, and physical assault) is more uniquely associated with sexual forms of abuse than are hostility toward women and sexual arousal to rape. Interestingly, peer pressure to abuse women is also uniquely associated with sexual abusiveness, but not with group rape/group sex involvement. Overall, these results argue even
more strongly for the importance of sociocultural variables to explain sexual forms of woman abuse. With respect to social environment, semipartial correlations indicate that the toxic element is not identification with fraternities per se, but rather the related tendency to use large parties and bars to meet the women one "ends up dating." Additionally, for sexual abusiveness alcohol is highlighted as risky even after controlling for its association with other elements of the environment in which it is socially abused.

Although neither psychopathology nor childhood exposure to abuse are associated with sexual forms of woman abuse after controlling for the other three risk factor sets, they are associated with sexual abuse when each set is considered separately. This would explain why studies that look only at psychopathology do often find significant associations. An interesting unique finding is that an association between abusiveness (both total abusiveness and group rape/group sex) and picking up dates at large parties and bars holds true for men with high levels of cognitive-emotional disturbance, and not for men with low levels of cognitive-emotional disturbance.

Variables Related to Nonsexual Forms of Woman Abuse

The pattern of associations found for nonsexual forms of woman abuse is different from that just described for sexual forms of woman abuse. It is also more heterogeneous in that the patterns of variables related to emotional abusiveness and physical assault are less similar to each other than are the patterns of variables related to sexual abusiveness and group rape/group sex involvement. Emotional abusiveness appears to be more generally predicted by the risk factors considered in this study. In fact, for emotional abusiveness, the only association not found was one with an alcohol and party/bar social environment after controlling for the other three risk sets. By contrast with what was found with respect to emotional abusiveness as well as to sexual forms of abuse, the current attitudes toward women set was not significantly associated with actual physical attacks, even when it was the only set considered. In fact, no predictor set remained significantly associated with the actual physical attacks after controlling
for the other predictor sets, although when considered separately, psychopathology, childhood exposure to abuse, and involvement in an alcohol and party/bar centered social environment were each associated with physical attacks.

Whereas childhood exposure alone and current psychopathology alone each explain as much total variance in physical attacks as they do for both forms of sexual abusiveness, and an alcohol centered environment explains about a third as much, the final model including all predictor sets explains less than half as much variance in physical assault as it does in sexual and physical forms and less than a fourth as much variance as it explains for emotional abusiveness. Taken together, these results argue that men's nonsexual physical attacks of women are much more difficult to predict than other forms of woman abuse, and that they are not at all predicted by attitudes toward women. Furthermore, a look at semipartial correlations of variables comprising each predictor set, where that set is considered without regard to other sets, reveals that no form of childhood exposure to abuse stands out from the others, but with respect to psychopathology, antisocial indicators are uniquely associated with more risk for physically attacking a woman, and borderline alienation is uniquely associated with less risk. The negative correlation of the borderline alienation scale is probably due to its focus on the anxious rather than impulsive features of the borderline personality construct. As such, it may be describing men who are somewhat socially anxious and withdrawn as compared with men whose high scores on antisocial qualities might indicate a nonanxious, noncaring, predatory stance. With respect to the alcohol-centered social environment, the toxic variable was using large parties and bars as places to "pick up" women. The most "dangerous" qualities with respect to nonsexual physical assault appear to be antisocial qualities and a highly impersonal way of selecting dating partners—at large parties and bars.

The interactions found in the case of group rape/group sex involvement was not found in the case of the nonsexual forms of abuse. Unlike the sexual forms of abuse, however, both forms of nonsexual abusiveness were associated with group affiliations other than fraternity.
involvement, after controlling for all other variables mentioned thus far in this discussion. This suggests an area for further exploration that has not been previously examined in the abuse literature.

Subtypes of Abusive and Nonabusive Men

Primarily Sexually Abusive Men

A group of men was identified who were clearly sexually abusive as indicated by self-reported sexually abusive behavior on at least two items from either the sexual abusiveness scale or the group rape/group sex involvement scale, or at least one from each scale. To be in this group absolutely no physical attacks on women could be reported. This group was distinguished by having the highest alcohol consumption, selection of the women they date in large parties and bars, and as much involvement in the alternative music culture (i.e., groups such as Nirvana, Pearl Jam, Bush, and the Grateful Dead) as men who were abusive both sexually and nonsexually, which is in marked contrast to both nonabusive men and men who were only nonsexually abusive.

Studies of sexually abusive college men (i.e., Koss et al., 1988; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987) are probably focusing mostly on this type of abusive man. As previous studies have suggested, intervention programs might maximize their effectiveness with this type of sexually abusive man by enlisting the help of fraternities on campuses to get educational programming out to their members, and to change the social climate, particularly around the impersonal "pick-up" mentality at large parties and bars that serve alcohol. The present study suggests that these subgroups might also be more generally reached, perhaps while still in high school, by enlisting the help of radio stations, clubs, and businesses or hangouts that cater to young people who identify with alternative music; this is likely to capture a portion of abusive men who are unlikely to be reached through efforts focused exclusively on the fraternity culture.

Physically or Emotionally Abusive Men

This subgroup has the highest degree of hostility toward women and has nearly as much
antisocial tendencies and general psychopathology as the subgroup that is both sexually and nonsexually abusive, which is much higher than in the nonabusive comparison group. Alcohol abuse, peer pressure to abuse women, and having witnessed one’s father disrespecting one’s mother feature as prominently in this group as they do in the sexually abusive only group. Interestingly, this subgroup has as little involvement in the alternative music subculture as does the nonabusive group, which is in marked contrast to the other two abuse groups.

This subtype of abusive man appears most similar to those described in studies of typical batterers both in and out of treatment. Of note is the divergence between hostility toward women and other forms of entitlement to abuse women, because, with the exception of Briere (1987), these variables have been neglected in the battering literature. The major implication for intervention programs is that a merger of sociocultural and psychopathology perspectives seems warranted. The hostility specifically toward women needs to be addressed, but if this hostility is part of a picture of elevations in general psychopathology, programs that disregard the antisocial tendencies and general psychological disturbance may be disregarded by this subtype of abusive man. Additionally, since these men have not been sexually abusive, they are unlikely to be reached by programs that target sexually abusive behavior.

Both Sexually and Physically or Extremely Emotionally Abusive Men

In addition to having as much antisocial tendencies and general psychopathology as the nonsexually abusive group, and as much affiliation with the alternative music culture as the sexually abusive group, this group has the greatest sense of entitlement to abuse women, the highest degree of having witnessed their mothers being disrespected by their fathers, and the highest degree of sexual arousal to rape scenarios. All three abusive groups are substantially higher on peer pressure to abuse than is the nonabusive group.

This group appears to be distinguished by sexualizing violence. This is evident not only in their perpetration of both sexual and nonsexual forms of violence, but also in their significantly higher levels of self-reported sexual arousal to rape scenarios. Qualitatively, they might bear
resemblance to the sadistic type of rapist described by Prentky and Knight (1991). This group
might be the most dangerous type of woman abuser because this group might not "restrict" their
physical abuse to times of anger, and their focus on their own sexual arousal to violence may
lead to their grossly minimizing the degree of harm they inflict on their victims.

**Theoretical Issues and Directions For Future Research**

An interesting theoretical question is whether sexual abusiveness and nonsexual
abusiveness might develop by different developmental pathways. The pattern of results found in
the present study suggest possible pathways that could be tested in future research. Sexual
abusiveness might develop along a fairly "normal" developmental pathway that is not impacted by
childhood abuse or cognitive-emotional disturbance. Instead, boys along this pathway might
grow up identifying strongly with an image of a "real man" as someone who has sexual prowess
and a sense of entitlement over women, particularly in the sexual domain. Whether through the
media, peer group experiences, or other means, these boys might come to believe that women
like a sexually aggressive man and that men who “go too far” sexually with a woman are probably
justified in doing so. This type of boy is likely to be extroverted, a party goer, and drinker, and
someone who aggressively competes for social rank within his peer group.

Nonsexual abusiveness might develop along a different pathway. Childhood experiences
of emotional or physical abuse might impair the development of healthy object relations. Some of
these boys might never learn to trust an intimate other and may vacillate between overwhelming
longings to “merge” with an intimate other and intense anxiety about rejection; they may interpret
the other’s behavior as rejecting or withholding, and respond with jealousy and rage. Childhood
abuse, disturbed object relations, and cognitive-emotional disturbances, which might include
PTSD, would tend to influence their perceptions and behavior in ways that could cause them to
behave in emotionally abusive ways toward their intimate others. The degree to which they were
also impulsive and involved in an antisocial lifestyle could influence their likelihood of crossing the
boundary from emotionally to physically abusive behavior. This pathway might take an even
more toxic turn if various conditions were present during development that served to sexualize them in ways that are objectifying of and devaluing of their sexual partner. Pornography, MTV images, peer pressure to abuse women, or a boy's observation of his father's chronically disrespectful and abusive behavior toward his mother could all contribute to extreme sexualization of violence. This developmental pathway would be likely to produce a man who is both physically and sexually abusive in addition to being emotionally unstable. If future research finds support for different developmental pathways along the lines suggested, this conceptualization might contribute toward bringing together previously separate lines of research and opening possibilities for more integrated and tailored interventions at various stages of development along different pathways.

Summary

In sum, this study highlighted the utility of examining sexual abusiveness, physical abusiveness, group rape/group sex involvement, and emotional forms of abuse simultaneously or comparatively, rather than studying each form in isolation. Different sets of variables were associated with each form of men's abuse of women. Additionally, men who are sexually abusive only, men who are physically or highly emotionally abusive but not sexually abusive, and men who are both sexually and nonsexually abusive were found to differ not only from a nonabusive comparison group, but also from each other in ways that allow different subtypes of abusive men to be described. The pattern of differences found among the subtypes suggests different developmental pathways that might be further investigated in future research.
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### Appendix A

**Demographics of This Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>28%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>85%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Student</th>
<th>Not International Student</th>
<th>77%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid East &amp; Africa</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion Raised In</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundamental Christian</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents Education</th>
<th>Both BA, 1 or both grad/prof</th>
<th>32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One BA</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both BA</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales/manager</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own business</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Occupation</th>
<th>Homemaker</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales/manager</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own business</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Income</th>
<th>40-100K</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-40K</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-25K</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 15K</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 100K</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father/Father Figure in Home, Early Childhood</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the time</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father/Father Figure in Home, Mid Childhood</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the time</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father/Father Figure in Home, Adolescence</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>76%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the time</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Status</th>
<th>Casual Dating</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Relationship</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohabitating</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same Sex Sexual Experiences&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Any</th>
<th>17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Co-ed, On Campus</th>
<th>45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-campus, Shared</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-campus, Alone</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Rape Education</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Fraternity</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at KU</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Psych 104</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>8</sup>This refers to same sex sexual experience among the 255 men who identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual. An additional 10 men who identified their sexual orientation as homosexual and 8 men who identified their sexual orientation as bisexual were not included in the analyses reported here.
Informed Consent

The Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human participants in research. We therefor provide the following information for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

We are interested in studying how aspects of men's childhood experiences, personality, attitudes, interactions with society, and current habits, are related to how different men interact with women in both sexual and nonsexual situations. You will be participating in a one session that will involve filling out some questionnaires, and reading some short vignettes of sexual situations. It is estimated that this will take no more than two hours of your time, equaling two Psych 104 research participation credits.

Because your feeling that you can be completely candid is important to the validity of this study, we assure you complete anonymity. Your consent form will be collected before the questionnaire packet is distributed, and there will be no identifying information on the questionnaire or scantron itself. Please do not write in the month or day of your birth on the demographics sheet; only write your age in years. Please also do not write in your name or student ID anywhere on the questionnaire packet or scantron.

Although it is not likely, there is a chance that you might feel slightly uncomfortable with some of the questions and parts of the vignettes. If you feel that you need to talk about issues that were raised for you because of your participation in this study, there are several resources for you to use in Lawrence and at KU. You may call the KU Psychological Clinic at 864-4121 for counseling or for referral to other resources, some of which are free (for example, Headquarters). Please also feel free to call the Principal Investigator.

Your participation is solicited although strictly voluntary. We assure you that your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. Although participation will not directly benefit you, we believe that the information will be useful in gaining a greater understanding of important factors that influence gender relations.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is complete, please feel free to contact me by phone or mail. A copy of this consent form will be given to you.

Sincerely,

I. G. Powch, M.A., Principal Investigator
426 Fraser Hall, University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045
913-864-4131

Signature of subject agreeing to participate
By signing the participant certifies that he is at least 18 years of age.
Appendix B-2

Instructions For Running Subjects

I. Take time to read this over, take all the materials with you to an empty classroom several times, and go through all the motions as though it were real. Record yourself giving the instructions, and refine your delivery to the point where you sound natural and comfortable, while at the same time not straying from the standardized script. (You should probably do 2 to 4 practice recordings).

All persons who are running subjects should arrange to meet for 2 to 5 hours outside of research group meetings to listen to each other's practice runs and help each other refine their deliveries. It is important that you all work together so that you develop maximally similar styles, down to the details.

Remember that you are the only representatives of the research team with whom the participants will have contact—and what they see in you will strongly impact what they think of the study—how seriously they will take it, how much confidence they will feel in our promise of anonymity, and our ability to make good and ethical use of the information they give us. This will impact how carefully they will read the questions, and how honestly they will answer them. That is what the study depends on.

II. Pick up materials 20 minutes before session: arrive at session 5-10 minutes before participants are due, PUT CONSENT FORMS ON ALTERNATE CHAIRS and write the following on the blackboard:

POWCH STUDY

SIT IN DESK WITH CONSENT FORMS, & READ CONSENT FORM

YOU'LL NEED A #2 PENCIL

IF YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY AT A PREVIOUS SESSION, YOU SHOULD NOT BE HERE BECAUSE YOU WILL NOT GET ANY RESEARCH CREDIT FOR PARTICIPATING TWICE IN THE SAME STUDY.
MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE THE FOLLOWING WITH YOU, AND ORGANIZED:

1. List of persons who participated in this study at all previous sessions
   ** Check your list against the master list to make sure no one who has already participated is trying to participate again.
2. Consent forms (DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS EXPECTED)
3. Scantrons
4. Questionnaires
5. Debriefing sheets
6. Research credit slips and pen (do not use pencil)
7. A box of sharpened #2 pencils, which you are to keep out of sight, and use only if someone needs a pencil after the session has already begun; make sure you collect back any pencils that you loan out.
8. Manilla envelopes
9. After all instructions have been given, one of you should go to get the sign-up sheet, and check names against names on consent forms and list of previous participants. Call up NO SHOWS and give them ONE chance to make it up; if they don’t then dock them a point for the no show.
10. Immediately after session, code scantrons, and page numbers of scantrons
11. A box in which to put the envelopes containing the questionnaires.

Hello everyone! My name is _______ and this is _______.
We're members of the research team for the Powch study on personality, attitudes, and relationships. We appreciate your being here and would like to thank you for taking part in this study.

Is everyone sure that you have not participated in this study before? You'd want to leave if you've already participated in this study because you would not receive credit for participating in it a second time. If this information written on the board looks familiar, you've probably already participated in this study--even if we weren't the people running it. If you're not sure, come up before we pass out the questionnaires, and we'll check your name against our list.
Also, before we begin, we'd like you to know that we understand that circumstances come up that might make it real difficult for you to concentrate. For this study it's very important that you pay close attention to each question, and this takes at least the full hour and a half. So, if you have circumstances that would make it difficult for you to give your full attention to this study, we'd like to give you an opportunity to reschedule for another day. If you take this option, it's very important that you do reschedule because if you fail to do so you will be docked for a NO SHOW. Is there anyone at this time who would like to reschedule for another day? (pause and look)

This study basically consists of a set of questionnaires, with instructions that you can read as you go along, following the set of instructions for each individual section. If you come across anything that is confusing, please don't hesitate to come and ask either of us to explain it. It may be something that others in the group are confused about as well, so please, let us know if there is anything that is unclear to you.

This study takes most people an hour and a half, so you'll be out by approximately _____, but you can have longer if you need it. (Note that if someone stays into the next half hour, they would get 2 research credits). If you need to take a break at some point, feel free to, but please don't discuss the questionnaire outside the room.

We anticipate that it will take you the full hour and a half to finish answering all the questions. If you finish early, please remain in your seat because we have a short 3-minute presentation at the end that we'll need you to stay for.

You'll receive one and a half research credits at the end of the hour and a half.
Has everyone gotten a consent form and had a chance to read it? (Pause, and wait for people who look like they're reading it then to finish). Are there any questions about the consent form? (pause). OK, if you're participating in this study, sign one copy and pass it forward, and keep one copy for yourself. (Note: Participation is voluntary and if someone decides to leave, one of you needs to go outside with them so you can give them credits because nobody is to be penalized if they decide not to participate at any point)

(The research assistant who is not talking at the moment should collect and check to make sure there are the same number of signed consent forms as there are participants in the room.)

(One assistant should now start passing out the scantrons and questionnaires while the other continues to speak--announce that they should not turn them over until the other assistant gives the instruction to begin. LAY THEM FACE DOWN ON THE PARTICIPANT'S DESK)

When you get your questionnaire, please don't turn it over until you are told. Once you're told to turn them over you'll see that there are instructions for each section that you can read as you go along. I won't read these instructions, but I will point out two very important things right now.

For this study to be valid and useful, it's essential that two things happen:

First, it's important that you feel safe enough to be totally honest with yourself and with answering these questions.

- We want you to know that we're going all the way to insure total anonymity. That's why we're asking you NOT to put your name, ID, or date of birth anywhere--not on the test forms and not on the scantrons.

- That's also why we're giving you envelopes in which you'll put your completed scantrons, and drop them in the slot of this box. This way we have no way of matching your scantron with your name or face.

- That's also why we have seated you in every other seat, so you will have privacy in answering the questions honestly.
The second very important thing I will point out is that you read every question and are very careful to make sure you're on the right number on the scantron (explain shifting by one). As you read the questions you’ll notice some that detect if you’re reading carefully and on the right item number. If these aren’t answered correctly, the computer would kick out all of your data and you would have done this for nothing. If your experience doesn't get counted, then it would bias our findings toward other people's experiences.

So, please--I know it's a long questionnaire--but try hard to read each item carefully, and periodically check to make sure you're on the same number on the scantron as on the test form. Also, sometimes even people who are being conscientious might get to a section where they feel like "Oh, all my answers to this section will be the same" but we really urge you to resist this temptation and read each item carefully because some will be different.

While you should take time to read each item carefully, once you have read and understood them, it's best to answer it quickly, with your first impulse.

Again, thank you for participating in this study. Each of you are contributing to important research that may show up in textbooks and influence what gets taught in classes like Psych 104.

Are there any questions before you begin? (Pause and answer any questions)

(Give blank sheet of paper and tell participants that we would appreciate any comments they might have about the study)
OK. Mark one scantron #1 and the other #2 in the section marked codes (SHOW THEM ON A SCANTRON). Then you can begin, using scantron 1 first. Please don't write on the test forms, because we'll need to use them again with the next group.

After about 50 minutes:

We know this is a long questionnaire and you may be getting tired by now . . . so if you need to take a stretch, feel free to . . . and we just want to remind you how important it is to continue to read each item carefully.

WHILE STUDENTS ARE FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRES, ASSISTANTS SHOULD ARRANGE THE CONSENT FORMS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER. THEN CHECK THE NAMES AGAINST THE LIST WE HAVE FROM PREVIOUS SESSIONS TO MAKE SURE NO ONE IS DOING THE SAME STUDY TWICE.

IV. After an hour and 45 minutes (or earlier if everyone is finished earlier), have them put scantrons in envelopes and put them in a box.

The other research assistant should ask participants to pass forward their test forms. After all scantrons have been collected, pass out the debriefing sheet, and give the 3-minute debriefing verbally (you'll get another instruction sheet for that). Tell them that you will be available to answer questions after you have given everybody their credits for participating.

After debriefing ask participants to come forward for their research credits after they have handed in both the scantron and the test form.

PROCEDURE FOR GIVING RESEARCH CREDITS:
1. Ask the person for their name.
2. Write 2 credit slips.
   Make sure you fill out everything (do this while participants are filling out questionnaires)
   Make sure you do it in ink.
   Sign your name, and print "for I. Powch"
3. Give the participant the smaller end of the slip; keep the larger end of the slip
4. Make sure that the part of the slip that you collect gets put in the box in the Heider Room (423 Faser) within 2 days of the session.

V. 1. Put everything away neatly where it belongs in the cabinet.
2. Check to see what materials you are low on, and replace them (if you're doing an evening session, you should check earlier during the day before your session, and stock up on anything that will be low after you use a bunch in your session)

GOOD JOB!!
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Thank you for contributing to growth in psychology's understanding of people and relationships.

Please do not write on the test form, so that we can re-use it. Please do not write your name or ID on the scantrons, or on the test form, so that everything is anonymous. We protect your anonymity because your ability to be completely honest is essential to the validity of this study.

We are all different, with different experiences, beliefs, and attitudes. This set of questionnaires attempts to capture that diversity to help us better understand different kinds of people. There are no right or wrong answers, just answers that reflect what is generally true for you and what is not. Please answer the questions to reflect what is generally true for you. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

This set of questions is designed to assess the conflicting feelings people sometimes have about relationships. Answer the following questions according to your most recent experience. If a statement tends to be true for you, mark 1 for True. If a statement tends to be false for you, mark 2 for False.

The Alienation subscale of the Bell Object Relations-Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1985) was deleted from this document at Dr. Bell's request.

Most people have been "in trouble" at one time or another. This set of questions asks about those kinds of situations and your ideas and feelings about them. On your scantron, please blacken 1 for True or 2 for False for each of the following items as it applies to you.

24. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I am in trouble. T F
25. Sometimes when I was young I stole things. T F
26. It would be better if almost all laws were thrown away. T F
27. I think most people would lie to get ahead. T F
28. I was suspended from school one or more times for bad behavior T F
29. Most people are honest chiefly because they are afraid of being caught. T F
30. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for bad behavior T F
31. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than lose it. T F
32. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it. T F
33. I don't blame people for trying to grab everything they can get in this world. T F
34. I have seen several UFO's in the past year. T F
35. At times it has been impossible for me to keep from stealing or shoplifting something. T F
36. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of people who leave themselves open to it. T F
37. At times I have been so entertained by the cleverness or some criminals that
   I have to get away with it. T F
38. Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them. T F
39. I have never been in trouble with the law. T F
40. If several people find themselves in trouble, the best thing for them to do is
   to agree upon a story and stick to it. T F
41. The person who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is
   about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it T F
42. I think nearly everyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble. T F
43. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to get ahead in life. T F
44. When I was young I often did not go to school even when I should have gone. T F
45. It is alright to get around the law if you don’t actually break it. T F

Here are some other dimensions on which people might describe their personalities. Using the scale,
please indicate how descriptive of you each of the following items is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Unlike Me</th>
<th>Moderately Unlike Me</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlike Me</th>
<th>Somewhat Like Me</th>
<th>Moderately Like Me</th>
<th>Completely Like Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set A
46. When I get an impulse to do something, It’s hard for me to stop and think of the consequences before acting. 1 2 3 4 5 6
47. I do things “in the heat of the moment” much more often than most people 1 2 3 4 5 6
48. Like a master chess player, I usually plan my moves carefully 1 2 3 4 5 6
49. If I plot to do something, I usually can carry it out very methodically 1 2 3 4 5 6
50. I’ve done stupid things on impulse 1 2 3 4 5 6
51. If you’re still paying attention, mark 6 1 2 3 4 5 6
52. I’m very spontaneous 1 2 3 4 5 6
53. I get away with things because I don’t take any stupid chances or act without planning first 1 2 3 4 5 6
54. I’m pretty impulsive 1 2 3 4 5 6

Set B
55. I think I experience guilt feelings more easily than most people 1 2 3 4 5 6
56. I can never get away with anything because my conscience wouldn’t let me 1 2 3 4 5 6
57. If I accidentally rear-ended a parked car, and could sneak away without anyone noticing I wouldn’t feel too guilty about doing that. 1 2 3 4 5 6
58. Having a guilty conscience is one of the most uncomfortable things I know 1 2 3 4 5 6

Set C: A number of statements that people have used to describe themselves in relation to anger are given below.
Read each statement and then blacken the appropriate space on the answer sheet to indicate how you generally feel.
There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which
seems to describe how you generally feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. I am quick tempered 1 2 3 4
60. I have a fiery temper 1 2 3 4
61. I am a hotheaded person 1 2 3 4
62. I get angry when I’m slowed down by others’ mistakes 1 2 3 4
63. I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work 1 2 3 4
64. I fly off the handle 1 2 3 4
65. When I get mad, I say nasty things 1 2 3 4
66. It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others 1 2 3 4
67. When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone 1 2 3 4
68. I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get a poor evaluation. 1 2 3 4
The statements below describe ways in which people sometimes respond when provoked. If the statement is True or mostly true for you, mark 1 for True; if the statement is false, or mostly false for you, mark 2 for False. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Therefore do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems most true of you.

69. I seldom strike back, even if someone hits me first              T F
70. Once in a while I cannot control my urge to harm others.       T F
71. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting anyone          T F
72. If somebody hits me first, I let him have it.                  T F
73. Whoever insults me or my family is asking for a fight          T F
74. People who continually pester you are asking for a punch in the nose       T F
75. When I really lose my temper, I am capable of slapping someone T F
76. I get into fights about as often as the next person            T F
77. If I have to resort to physical violence to defend my rights, I will T F
78. I have known people who pushed me so far that we came to blows  T F

Below is a list of complaints that people sometimes have. Please indicate how much discomfort each of the following has caused you DURING THE PAST WEEK, INCLUDING TODAY. Please use the following scale:

Not at all  A little bit  Moderately  Quite a bit  Extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79. Feeling low in energy or slowed down</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Heart pounding or racing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Nervousness or shakiness inside</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Headaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Crying easily</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Feeling of being caught or trapped</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Feeling that most people can not be trusted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Trembling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Stomach problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Feeling lonely</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Feeling blue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. &quot;Flashbacks&quot; (sudden, vivid, distracting memories)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Feeling tense or keyed up</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Loss of sexual interest or desire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. &quot;Spacing out&quot; (going away in your mind)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Worrying too much about things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Feeling fearful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Having ideas or beliefs that others do not share</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Feeling no interest in things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dizziness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Feeling hopeless about the future</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Feeling everything is an effort</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Feelings of worthlessness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Memory problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Suddenly scared for no reason</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Spells of terror or panic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Passing out</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Thoughts of ending your life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. I'm still paying attention. If you read this, mark 5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Feelings that things are &quot;unreal&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. The feeling that something bad is going to happen to you</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Thoughts and images of a frightening nature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Feelings that you are not always in your body</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Having trouble breathing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Feeling that people will take advantage of you if you let them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is one of a number of questionnaires designed to assess men's and women's relations and feelings toward each other. This particular form assesses male's feelings toward females. Thus, all of the statements on this page refer to women. Please read each statement carefully and circle how much you agree or disagree with it. Thank you.

### Following are some common scenarios about which different people have different opinions. Please read each scenario, and indicate your opinion about the actions of the characters.

#### Scenario #1: A male and a female college student go out on a date. Afterwards, they go to his apartment and sit in front of the fireplace for a while and sip a glass of wine. He kisses her and, even though she resists his advances, uses his superior strength to force her to have sexual intercourse. Please use the following scale to answer the questions that follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely acceptable</th>
<th>Mildly acceptable</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Mildly unacceptable</th>
<th>Definitely unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the conditions below, indicate how acceptable you consider the male's behavior in the above example:

139. If he had spent a lot of money on her. A B C D E
140. If she had gotten him sexually excited. A B C D E
141. If she let him touch her breasts. A B C D E
142. If they had dined together for a long time. A B C D E
143. If she was drunk. A B C D E
144. If she was going to have intercourse with him and then changed her mind. A B C D E
145. If she had intercourse with other males. A B C D E
146. If he led her on. A B C D E
147. If he was so sexually excited he couldn't stop. A B C D E
Scenario 2: Jake and Debra are two college students who have been in a committed relationship for 3 years, and are engaged to get married at the end of the school year. Since they moved in together 5 months ago, they have been getting into a lot of arguments. Last night when they were arguing, Jake hit Debra in the argument. Please use the following scale to answer the questions that follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Acceptable</th>
<th>Mildly Acceptable</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Mildly Unacceptable</th>
<th>Definitely Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the conditions below, indicate how acceptable you consider Jake's behavior in the above example:

148. If she had refused to cook and keep the house clean

149. If she had sex with another man

150. If she refused to have sex with him

151. If she made fun of him at a party

152. If she told friends that he was sexually pathetic

153. If she hit him first, even if she was not capable of hurting him.

154. If she had started "cussing like a man" in the argument

155. If she was acting hysterical and wouldn't shut up

156. If she had been "asking for it" for a long time

157. If he warned her first and gave her a chance to get in line and avoid getting hit.

158. If he hit her only hard enough to teach her a lesson, but not hard enough to injure her

159. If she took advantage of her knowledge about him to say something she knew would really hurt him.

160. If she provoked him to the point where he just could not control himself anymore.

STOP!!!
GO ON TO THE NEXT SCANTRON.
The next set of questions deals with the importance of the opinions of other guys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
<th>Moderately likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely</th>
<th>Moderately unlikely</th>
<th>Completely unlikely</th>
<th>NEVER HAD A GIRLFRIEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or strongly</td>
<td>or strongly</td>
<td>or strongly</td>
<td>or not strong</td>
<td>or not strong</td>
<td>or not strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A B C D E F G

You ask your girlfriend to get you a beer while you're watching a game with the guys. She tells you to get your own beer.

1. How likely are the guys to laugh at you or tease you about this?__ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ ___
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Not like him/her  A little like him/her  A lot like him/her

1  2  3  4  5  6

Was never interested in meeting with or talking to my friends
Almost always complained about what I did
Ridiculed or humiliated me
Didn't show that she/he loved me
Told me I was immature
Didn’t seem to think of me very often
Often blew his/her top when I bothered her/him
Changed her/his mind to make things easier for herself/himself
Whenever we got into a discussion, she/he treated me more like a child than an adult
Didn’t get me things unless I asked over and over again
When I didn’t do as she/he wanted, said I wasn’t grateful for all she/he had done for me
Asked other people what I did away from home
Told me all the things he/she had done for me
Almost always wanted to know who phoned me and who wrote to me and what they said
Was less friendly with me if I didn’t see things his/her way
Was unpredictable in when, how, and for what he/she would punish me

There are many different methods of discipline that parents use with their children.
How often did your parents use each of the following methods of discipline with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Several times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in my life</td>
<td>a year</td>
<td>a month</td>
<td>a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Grounding, time out, or removal of privileges</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Yelling or threatening to spank you</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Mid-spanking</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Spanking or beating that left you with welts or other marks that lasted only a few hours</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Spanking or beating that left you with welts, bruises, or other marks that lasted a few days</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Beating that left you with physical injuries that didn’t completely heal for weeks</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Which of the following best reflects your feelings about the kind of disciplining your parents used with you?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) It was the best for me in the long run, and I’ll probably do the same when I have children</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) It was a little severe, but I turned out OK and I probably won’t be much different with my children when I’m a parent.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) It caused me a lot of pain—both emotional and physical—and I don’t ever want to do that to my future children.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) It was abusive, it caused me a lot of emotional and physical pain, and I’ve worked hard to be different so I won’t treat my future children like that.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children learn about sex in many different ways. How often were you exposed to the following sexual materials before you were 14?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Up to 10 times</th>
<th>10 to 30 times</th>
<th>Over 30 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Someone showed you pornographic movies or let you watch pornographic movies with them</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. You tuned into a pornographic movie on the TV or a video tape that you somehow got a hold of</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Someone gave you pornographic magazines or pictures to look at</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. You somehow got a hold of pornographic magazines or pictures</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Someone created a situation where you watched them having sex with someone else</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Someone tried to get you turned on with some kind of pornographic material</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many people have sexual experiences as children either with friends or with people older than themselves. The following questions ask about any experiences you may have had BEFORE YOU WERE 14. Please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>3-5 times</th>
<th>More than 5 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. Another person showed his/her sex organs to you without you asking them to
77. A request by someone older than you to do something sexual
78. You showed your sex organs to another person at his/her request
79. Another person fondled you in a sexual way without your asking them to
80. Another person touched or stroked your sex organs without your asking them to
81. You touched or stroked another person's sex organs at his/her request
82. Attempted intercourse (the other person got on top of you, attempted to insert his penis in you, but penetration did not occur)
83. Attempted intercourse (you complied with another person's request to attempt to insert your penis in them, but penetration did not occur)
84. At the other person's request, you had intercourse (oral, anal or vaginal) with any amount of penetration (ejaculation not necessary)

85. How old was the oldest person with whom you had any of the above experiences before you were 14?
   (A) Didn't have any of these experiences
   (B) Same age or younger than you
   (C) Up to 2 or 3 years older
   (D) 4 or 5 years older
   (E) 6 or more years older

86. Who did any of the above to you?
   (A) Didn't have any of these experiences
   (B) Males only
   (C) Females only
   (D) Both males and females

87. Which of the following is the highest number description that applies to any of your sexual experiences before you were 14?
   (A) Didn't have any of these experiences
   (B) It was completely mutual.
   (C) The other person took advantage of me
   (D) The other person tricked me into it
   (E) The other person coerced or forced me into it

88. How old were you the first time any of the above sexual experiences happened to you?
   (a) 4 or younger
   (b) 5 to 8
   (c) 9 to 11
   (d) 12 to 14
   (E) One of the above

89. Did you have any of the above experiences before age 14 when you requested or initiated it?
   A B C D E

4. Physical blows (like hitting, kicking, throwing someone down) sometimes occur between family members. How often did you see any of the following between your parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Several times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in my life</td>
<td>a year</td>
<td>a month</td>
<td>a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. Your father threatened to hit your mother, and she seemed afraid
91. Your mother threatened to hit your father, and he seemed afraid
92. Your father hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your mother without causing any injury
93. Your mother hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your father without causing any injury
94. Your father hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your mother, causing a minor injury to her, like a slight bruise or a slight scratch.
95. Your mother hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your father, causing a minor injury to him, like a slight bruise or a slight scratch.
96. Your father hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your mother, causing bleeding, broken bones, or other injuries that required some kind of bandaging.
97. Your mother hit, threw, or otherwise physically attacked your father, causing bleeding, broken bones, or other injuries that required some kind of bandaging.
98. You heard your mother cry or plead for your father to stop hitting her, twisting her arm, or whatever he was doing to physically hurt her
99. You heard your father cry or plead for your mother to stop hitting him, twisting his arm, or whatever she was doing to physically hurt him
5. There are some role patterns that couples often start playing out. How often did you see each of the following role patterns in your parents' relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pattern</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Several times a month</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People have different reactions to alcohol and drugs, based on their beliefs and on their body chemistry. This set of questions asks about your experiences with alcohol and drugs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People have different reactions to alcohol and drugs, based on their beliefs and on their body chemistry. This set of questions asks about your experiences with alcohol and drugs.

109 On occasion, I have been able to drink as much as 8 beers without getting drunk
110 When I go out drinking, I drink as much as I want to no matter what I have to do the next day
111 Alcohol definitely has the effect of making me horny and giving me "liquor courage"
112 I've been able to use pot or speed and still function fine
113 My habit of using drugs has caused me to miss work or school in the past
114 My use of street drugs have gotten me into a good deal of trouble in the past
115 I'm paying attention. If you read this, mark 1

116 How often do you drink alcohol? (Check one)
   (a) Not at all in the past year
   (b) Less than once a month, but at least once in the past year
   (c) One to three times a month
   (d) One to two times a week
   (e) More than twice a week

117 On a typical drinking occasion, how much do you usually drink? (Check one) *
   (a) I don't drink at all
   (b) Usually no more than 3 cans of beer (or 2 glasses of wine or 2 drinks of hard liquor)
   (c) Usually no more than 5 or 6 cans of beer (or 4 glasses of wine or 4 drinks of hard liquor)
   (d) Usually more than 6 cans of beer (or 5 or more glasses of wine or distilled spirits)

118 How often do you drink to the point of intoxication or drunkenness (that is feeling dizzy, feeling ill, passing out, or feeling out of control?) (Check one)
   (a) I never drink to the point of being drunk
   (b) I get drunk less than once a month but at least once a year
   (c) I get drunk 1-3 times a month
   (d) I get drunk 1-2 times a week
   (e) I get drunk more than twice a week

119. How often do you use marijuana? (Check one)
   (a) Never tried it
   (b) Less than 2 or 3 times a year
   (c) One to three times a month
   (d) One to two times a week
   (e) More than twice a week

120. How often do you use speed, crack, or cocaine? (Check one)
   (a) Never tried it
   (b) Less than once or twice a year
   (c) More than twice a year but less than once a month
   (d) Two or more times a month, but less than once a week
   (e) Once a week or more

121. How often do you use acid, or other street drugs besides marijuana, speed, crack, or cocaine? (Check one)
   (a) Never tried it
   (b) Less than once or twice a year
   (c) More than twice a year but less than once a month
   (d) Two or more times a month, but less than once a week
   (e) Once a week or more
THIS SECTION ASKS ABOUT YOUR DATING EXPERIENCES SINCE YOU WERE 14 YEARS OLD

People have different dating experiences. Please indicate how often yours are like the ones described below, using the following scale:

Almost Never Sometimes Often Almost Always
1 2 3 4

122. How often are you the one who initiates a date? 1 2 3 4
123. How likely are you to pay all the expenses on the date? 1 2 3 4
124. How likely are you to be the one driving on a date? 1 2 3 4
125. How likely are you to take your date to a movie? 1 2 3 4
126. How likely are you to take your date to your apartment? 1 2 3 4
127. How likely are you to take your date on a moonlight stroll by a secluded lake or field? 1 2 3 4
128. How often do you meet the people you end up dating in classes, at work, or while doing daily activities like laundry? 1 2 3 4
129. How often do you meet the people you end up dating through activities you share in common, like volunteer work, clubs, etc.? 1 2 3 4
130. How often do you meet the people you end up dating through mutual friends? 1 2 3 4
131. How often do you meet the people you end up dating at large parties? 1 2 3 4
132. How often do you meet the people you end up dating at bars? 1 2 3 4

The following section asks you about your sexual experiences FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON:

Sexual contact = Any sexual contact other than intercourse (e.g., kissing, sexual touching, fondling, etc.)
Sexual intercourse = Oral, anal, or vaginal, even if penetration was very brief and even if you did not ejaculate
Attempted intercourse = Oral, anal, or vaginal, but penetration did not occur for whatever reason

More than 20 times 6 to 20 times 2 to 5 times Once Never
(A) (B) (C) (D) (E)

How often have you had SEXUAL CONTACT with someone who clearly wanted it just like you did? A B C D E

How often have you used each of the following ways to get someone to have sexual contact with you when you wanted to, but they didn’t (consider they didn’t want to if they indicated this in any way—by saying so, or by pushing you away or backing away, etc.)?

134. Overwhelming them with continual arguments A B C D E
135. Giving them alcohol or drugs A B C D E
136. Using your superior strength to force them, or threatening to hurt them if they don’t A B C D E
137. Using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, etc.) A B C D E

How often have you had SEXUAL INTERCOURSE with someone who clearly wanted it just like you did? A B C D E

How often have you used each of the following ways to get someone to have sexual intercourse with you when you wanted to, but they didn’t want to?

138. Overwhelming them with continual arguments A B C D E
139. Giving them alcohol or drugs A B C D E
140. Using your superior strength to force them, or threatening to hurt them if they don’t A B C D E
141. Using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, etc.)? A B C D E
More than 20 times | 6 to 20 times | 2 to 5 times | Once | Never
---|---|---|---|---
(A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E)

143. How often have you had ATTEMPTED SEXUAL INTERCOURSE with someone who clearly wanted it just like you did? How often have you used each of the following ways to get someone to have sexual intercourse with you when you wanted to, but they didn’t want to?
- Overwhelming them with continual arguments
- Giving them alcohol or drugs
- Using your superior strength to force them, or threatening to hurt them if they don’t
- Using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, etc.)
- How carefully are you reading? If you read this, mark A on your answer sheet.

149. In the previous three sets of questions, when you encountered the phrase "when you wanted to, but they didn’t" what did you count as situations where "they didn’t" want to?
- (A) Any situation where they didn’t actually tell you they wanted it, or draw you closer, or lead in the activity?
- (B) Only situations where they at least said "I don’t want to do this" or verbalized something of that nature?
- (C) Only situations where they backed up what they said with emotion like yelling angrily, or with a "don’t mess with me" attitude, or with crying or something of that nature.
- (D) Only in situations where they backed up what they said with something physical, like pushing you away, backing away from you, or running out of the room, etc.

150. How often did any of these situations happen when you became uncontrollably horny?

151. How often did any of these situations happen after you simply decided that "today I want to get some"?

152. How often have you "taken your turn" with a "party girl" when you were too drunk to know what was going on?

153. How often have you "taken your turn" with a "party girl" when she was too drunk to know what was going on?

154. How often have you "taken your turn" with a "party girl" when neither of you were terribly drunk?

155. What is the largest number of guys who were involved in any of the above 3 situations?
- A = 2; B = 3; C = 4; D = 5; E = more than 5; F = not asked

156. How many times were you present when something like this was going on, even though you did not have sex with her?

157. How many times when you were present in one of these situations, did the female give some indication that made you suspect that she might not really want to be participating in this?

158. How many times when you were present in one of these situations, did the female cry, struggle, or give some other strong indication that she did not want to be participating in this?

STOP!!!

LEAVE THE NEXT 2 SPACES BLANK, AND GO ON TO THE NEXT SCANTRON
With how many people in the following categories did you engage in any of the sexual activities mentioned in the previous section, counting only situations where the other person did not want to engage in the sexual activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 20 people</th>
<th>6 to 20</th>
<th>2 to 5</th>
<th>one</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlfriends or spouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female friends or acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female first dates, females you got together with at a party or bar, or female strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriends, male friends or acquaintances, or guys you just got together with at a party or bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Physical blows (like hitting, kicking, throwing someone down) sometimes occur between people who are dating. How often did any of the following occur in NON-sexual situations WITH SOMEONE YOU WERE DATING OR ROMANTICALLY INVOLVED WITH? Count only experiences FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 20 times</th>
<th>6 to 20 times</th>
<th>2 to 5 times</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you smacked someone you were dating or romantically involved with while pretending to just be playing around?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you smashed or thrown a heavy or sharp object in your partner’s presence during a fight or argument?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you pushed, grabbed, shoved, shaken, twisted the arm, or stopped a partner during a fight or argument—and you used a great deal of force</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you pushed, grabbed, shoved, shaken, twisted the arm, or stopped a partner during a fight or argument—but you did not use a great deal of force?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you threatened to slap, shove, or shake a partner?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you pinned a partner down, or prevented them from leaving during a fight or argument?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How carefully are you reading? If you read this, mark A on your scantron</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you choked, or hit a partner with a hard object during a fight or argument?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you had a strong urge to do any of the above, but stopped yourself?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you yanked a partner by the hair, punched or burned them, thrown a heavy or sharp object directly at them, or otherwise inflicted injury on them during a fight or argument?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you used a weapon such as a knife or gun on a partner during a fight or argument?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you threatened to do any of the above?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often, when you came to blows with your partner, was the result for your partner a physical injury that left a mark (like a bruise) which lasted only a few days</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often, when you came to blows with your partner, was the result for your partner a physical injury that required some kind of bandaging or left a mark (like a bruise or scar) that lasted longer than a few days?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did physical incidents occur when you were intensely angry or enraged?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did physical incidents occur when you were not angry, just putting the other person in their place?</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering all the occasions where you engaged in any of the activities from all of the items in the previous section, how many people of each of the following categories did you do these activities with (now we're not limiting it just to people you were dating or romantically involved with).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 20 people</th>
<th>6 to 20 times</th>
<th>2 to 5 times</th>
<th>one</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Girlfriends or spouses
25. Female friends or acquaintances
26. Female first dates, females you got together with at a party or bar, or female strangers
27. Boyfriends, male friends or acquaintances, or guys you just got together with at a party or bar
28. Male strangers
29. Male relatives
30. Female relatives

The following section asks about EMOTIONAL acts FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON. These items refer to NON-sexual situations that happened WITH SOMEONE YOU WERE DATING OR ROMANTICALLY INVOLVED WITH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 20 times</th>
<th>6 to 20 times</th>
<th>2 to 5 times</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Have you tried to make someone insecure by criticizing and belittling their physical appearance, intelligence, opinions, values, etc.?
32. Have you given someone the "silent treatment" (for example, sulked and/or refused to talk about it)?
33. Have you made someone feel that their feelings, opinions, or wishes are of no importance by completely disregarding their feelings, opinions, or wishes?
34. Have you intentionally tried to make someone feel inferior by calling them degrading and demeaning names such as "slut," "bitch," etc.?
35. Have you done or said something to hurt someone's feelings?
36. Have you stomped out of the room?
37. Have you been unreliable in terms of commitments? (For example, promise to meet the person and not show up?)
38. Have you tried to make someone feel inferior by ridiculing or insulting their family, friends, religion, gender, race, or sexual orientation?
39. Have you tried to dictate to someone what they should do in every aspect of their life (what to wear, whom to associate with and whom not, what activities to engage in, etc.)?
40. Have you kept tabs on someone (followed them around or had someone else follow them around so that you always knew where they were, what they were doing, and who they were with)?
41. Have you used reckless driving to frighten someone in the car into agreeing to something you want, or to get back at them?
42. Have you made harassing phone calls?
43. Have you coerced someone into doing something that would make them feel humiliated?
44. Have you humiliated someone in public?
45. Have you tried to get someone to do what you wanted by graphically describing how you have been violent in the past?
46. Have you tried to control someone or get back at someone by hurting an animal (for example, a pet)?
47. Have you broken into someone's house?
48. Have you threatened to harm yourself in order to get someone to do something or prevent them from doing something?
49. Have you threatened to harm someone else in order to get someone to do something or prevent them from doing something?
50. Have you intentionally destroyed or defaced someone's personal belongings (for example, cut up their clothes, burned their notes before an exam, etc.)?
A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves when they feel angry or furious are given below. Please indicate how often you feel or act in the manner described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>When angry or furious, I keep things in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>When angry or furious, I pout or sulk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I withdraw from people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I boil inside, but don't show it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I tend to harbor grudges that I don't tell anyone about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I am secretly quite critical of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I am angrier than I am willing to admit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I am irritated a great deal more than people are aware of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section asks you about your attitudes on a cultural issue that has received a lot of media publicity in recent years. On the answer sheet, please blacken in the box that indicates your opinion on the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she's willing to have sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Any female can get raped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops they are just asking for trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>A woman who is stuck up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered &quot;fair game&quot; to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Things always get more complicated when a person is asked to consider more than one perspective. For each of the following items, if you had to agree with one person's perspective over another's, which would it be?

70. a) In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape.  
b) In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape.

71. a) I can really empathize with the helplessness a rapist might feel during a rape, since he's at the mercy of forces beyond his control. 
b) I can really empathize with the helplessness a victim might feel during a rape if all her attempts to resist the rape have failed.

72. a) I can understand a wife's humiliation and anger if her husband forced her to have sexual relations with him.  
b) A husband has every right to determine when sexual relations with his wife occur, even if it means forcing her to have sex with him.

73. a) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the woman's testimony than the man's, since it takes a lot of courage on the woman's part to accuse the man of rape.  
b) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the man's testimony than the woman's, since rape is a charge that is difficult to defend against, even if the man is innocent.
The following questions are similar to those in the previous set, but should be answered with the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is an unjustifiable act under any circumstances. | A B C D E F G |
75. In general, I feel that rape is an act that is not provoked by the rape victim. | A B C D E F G |
76. I would find it easier to imagine how a rape victim might feel during an actual rape than how a rapist might feel. | A B C D E F G |
77. I cannot understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman under any circumstances. | A B C D E F G |
78. I would find it easier to empathize with the shame and humiliation a rape victim might feel during a trial to prove rape than with the feelings a rapist might have during the trial. | A B C D E F G |
79. If a man forces sex on a sexually active woman, he would probably be justified in his actions by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men. | A B C D E F G |
80. I don't believe that any women secretly want to be raped. | A B C D E F G |
81. I believe that it is possible for a rape victim to enjoy the experience of being raped, whether she admits it or not. | A B C D E F G |
82. After a rape has occurred, I think the man would suffer more emotional torment in dealing with the police than the woman would. | A B C D E F G |
83. If a rape trial were publicized in the press, I feel the rape victim would suffer more emotional trauma from the publicity than the rapist. | A B C D E F G |

In this set of questions we have listed a number of statements about yourself and how you get along in life. We would like you to show your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Each question should be answered by itself. Don't worry about how you have marked other questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84. Most of the unhappy things in my life have happened because I was unlucky enough to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
85. Getting what I want out of life really depends on whether the right people like me or not. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
86. Getting what I want out of life depends mainly on getting the breaks and having the right people on my side. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
87. Luck has very little to do with what I have gotten out of life. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
88. In the long run what I do doesn't really determine what happens to me. | 1 2 3 4 |
89. What happens to me is really a matter of luck. | 1 2 3 4 |
90. I know that if the right people don't like me, it doesn't matter what I'll do, I'll never win. | 1 2 3 4 |
91. Getting what I want out of life depends upon working to get it. | 1 2 3 4 |
92. I sometimes say things happen to me because of the breaks, but luck has little to do with what happens to me. | 1 2 3 4 |
STOP!!!

TAKE A MINUTE TO CLOSE YOUR EYES, BREATHE DEEP, AND RELAX

WHEN YOU ARE RELAXED, CONTINUE...

There are a variety of scenes and different kinds of sex that people may find sexually arousing at times. Following is a description of 8 different scenes. Use your imagination as much as you can to experience the scene actually occurring. After each scene please indicate on a scale of 1 to 9, how sexually arousing you found the scene.

1 = Not at all sexually arousing
5 = Average amount of sexual arousal
9 = Most sexually arousing

Laura and Don have been dating and sexually active together for several months. Recently, they've been experimenting with new ways of having sex together. Tonight they happen to be house-sitting, and so have a large, unfamiliar house in the country all to themselves. They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

As she kisses back he realizes just how hot he is for her right now... and he knows he will have her tonight. He pours her another glass of wine. His excitement grows as she becomes tipsy and leans on him, eyes half closed, giggling about some nonsense. He makes his move now, caressing her breasts and deftly undoing the buttons on her shirt, no problem with the bra hook. She squirms away as he reaches under her skirt to get past the underwear, and that turns him on even more. He grabs her and rips off the panties in one powerful stroke. He realizes his power as she comes alive and whimpers "no, please don't do this... I don't want to do anymore... please stop... please stop!" He goes crazy at that moment and it doesn't take long after he enters her to have the best orgasm he's had in a long time.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Lisa and Jake have been dating and sexually active together for several months. Recently, they've been experimenting with new ways of having sex together. Tonight they happen to be house-sitting, and so have a large, unfamiliar house in the country all to themselves. They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

As she kisses back ever so softly, his body tingles. He touches her hair lightly, tentatively, feeling electricity. Their eyes meet and lock, pouring out their souls without words. They are drawn together, almost as if in a hypnotic trance... she feels his warm, strong, hands gently caressing her back as they embrace. Those almost imperceptible movements of his hands as he holds her send seismic waves of passion through her entire being, and her hands moving slowly along his waist do the same to him. Everything around them disappears as they move together like one spirit, shedding their clothes and making love like this, slowly, hypnotically, savoring every moment of their shared ecstasy.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Kathy and Nick met at a party two weeks ago and have dated a few times since then. They haven't been alone together yet, so "sex" was limited to flirting like crazy, and dropping hints about what turns them on. Tonight is their chance, because it's a small get-together at his house, and the last person is leaving...

They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

She kisses back and then playfully jumps on him and wrestles him to the floor. He feels strangely turned on by the wild and mischievous look on her face as she pins him and threatens to bite his nose. He offers a counter threat "You bite my nose and I'll spank you." Rather than backing down, her eyes gleam with excitement as she slowly moves forward while he lies still, and bites his nose—hard. His arousal soars as he jumps on, pulls down her pants, and gives her a good spanking with his hand on her bare bottom. He knows how turned on she is by this when she begins moving her hips rhythmically. After they find an excuse for her to give him a spanking, and they both become so turned on that it takes nothing for them to be overtaken by wild orgasmic convulsions.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Michelle and Joe met at a party two weeks ago and have dated a few times since then. They haven't been alone together yet, so "sex" was limited to flirting like crazy, and dropping hints about what turns them on. Tonight is their chance, because it's a small get-together at his house, and the last person is leaving...

They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

As she kisses back, he can feel his urge to hurt her overtake him. The surprised and alarmed look on her face when he slaps her hard without warning makes his blood race. As she cries and makes an attempt to get off the couch to run away, he slaps her a couple more times, and commands her to shut up. He is intensely excited by the sight of her trembling, terror stricken form, cowing on the floor. He torments her in this way until she begs him not to kill her, then he comes in the way he likes best.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
97 Elane and Ralph met at a party two weeks ago and have dated a few times since then. They haven't been alone together yet, so "sex" was limited to flirting like crazy, and dropping hints about what turns them on. Tonight is their chance, because it's a small get-together at his house, and the last person is leaving...

They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

She kisses back—he's hot and wastes no time undoing her buttons and zipper...sitting off her bra...feeling her full breasts and hard nipples...and with a sense of urgency he tears off her panty hose and her sexy bluine underwear. Now she comes alive and cries "Wait—stop—this is not what I want!" He laughs "This is what you owe me for dinner!" and continues, taking for himself what he wants, rocking back and forth in his own ecstasy as his penis probes deeper and deeper into her. She protests again "what are you doing? Stop!" and with an explosion he comes inside her vagina.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

98 Marcia and Steve have been dating and sexually active together for several months. Recently, they've been experimenting with new ways of having sex together. Tonight they happen to be house-sitting, and so have a large, unfamiliar house in the country all to themselves...They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

She kisses back, excitement building, as he undoes his belt—playing with it suggestively and stretching out beneath him, her bottom writhing in anticipation...and the fantasy begins to take form as he stylys grins and picks up the smooth, leathery belt and begins whipping her bare bottom—lightly, just enough to make the cheeks red—playing out orgasm after orgasm as she laughs with pleasure—and trading places, she deftly handcuffs his wrists, binds his ankles, and climbs over his naked body to give him a tantalizing whipping that brings him to wild orgasmic convulsions.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

99 Cassandra and John met at a party two weeks ago and have dated a few times since then. They haven't been alone together yet, so "sex" was limited to flirting like crazy, and dropping hints about what turns them on. Tonight is their chance, because it's a small get-together at his house, and the last person is leaving...They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

As she kisses back with a deep, wet kiss, their passion unleashes and their bodies are freed from shirts, pants, bra...her breasts fall across his chest as he stretches out beneath her. She kisses and licks his stomach, sliding down his body and gasping as he fills her vagina. She rolls onto his warm, tight skin as his penis probes deeper and deeper into her. They clench each other tightly as the first hints of orgasm shudder through their bodies. She quivers—feeling his wetness as he comes inside her. She screams with pleasure—coming again and again, collapsing on his chest...laughing and kissing him.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

100 Ann and Larry have been dating and sexually active together for several months. Recently, they've been experimenting with new ways of having sex together. Tonight they happen to be house-sitting, and so have a large, unfamiliar house in the country all to themselves...They are sitting on the couch, sipping wine, and he leans over and starts kissing her...

As she kisses back, his sudden attack takes her totally by surprise. In cold silence he throws her to the floor. She screams in pain as he forscse handcuffs onto her wrists and binds her ankles. Her eyes plead with him in terror as he shoves a rag into her mouth. Her fear turns him on. He rips the clothes from her body and rolls her onto her stomach, whipping her back—becoming intrigued by the blood trickling down her side, onto her shaming breasts. He enters her vagina from behind, thrusting back and forth in his own ecstasy. Losing all control, he pulls his throbbing member out to come all over her back.

How sexually arousing did you find this scene? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
The following are demographic variables that will help us give a general description of the college students participating in this study. We need everyone to answer these in order to estimate how generalizable the findings of this study are.

Thank you for your help.

101. How old are you?  
(a) 18  
(b) 19 to 20  
(c) 21 to 24  
(d) 25 to 30  
(e) over 30

102. Which of the following best describes your cultural affiliation?  
(a) Caucasian American or European  
(b) Native American  
(c) African American  
(d) Asian American  
(e) Hispanic American  
(f) Other

103. Which of the following best describes you (leave blank if you are not an international student)?  
(a) International Student from Europe  
(b) International Student from Middle East  
(c) International Student from Asia  
(d) International Student from Latin America  
(e) International Student from Africa

104. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?  
(a) Heterosexual orientation  
(b) Homosexual orientation  
(c) Bisexual orientation

105. Many people with a heterosexual orientation have had sexual experiences with members of their own gender. How many such experiences have you had in your life since the age of 14?  
(a) More than 10  
(b) 5 to 10  
(c) 2 to 5  
(d) Only 1  
(e) None

106. Which of the following best describes the religious affiliation you were RAISED WITH AT HOME  
(a) No organized religion  
(b) Catholics  
(c) Jews  
(d) Protestant (not fundamentalist)  
(e) Fundamentalist Christian  
(f) Islam  
(g) Mormon

107. Which of the following best describes the highest level of education of either of the parents who raised you?  
(a) Highschool or less for both parents  
(b) Trade school or some college for at least one parent  
(c) College degree for one parent  
(d) College degrees for both parents  
(e) College degrees for both parents, and graduate or professional degree for at least one parent.

108 Which of the following best describes your father’s occupation while you were a child?  
(a) Blue collar work (mechanic, factory, truck driver, food services, etc.)  
(b) Sales, or manager  
(c) Worked in his own business  
(d) Professional (professor, psychologist, doctor, lawyer, engineer, teacher, etc.)  
(e) Stayed home to raise the children

109 Which of the following best describes your mother’s occupation while you were a child?  
(a) Blue collar work (mechanic, factory, truck driver, food services, etc.)  
(b) Sales, or manager  
(c) Worked in her own business  
(d) Professional (professor, psychologist, doctor, lawyer, engineer, teacher, etc.)  
(e) Stayed home to raise the children

110. Which of the following is closest to your parents average yearly combined income while you were a child?  
(a) under 15,000  
(b) 15,000 to 25,000  
(c) 25,000 to 40,000  
(d) 40,000 to 100,000  
(e) over 100,000

111. Have you had a father or father-figure living in the home during early childhood (Approx. birth to age 7 or 8)?  
(a) All of that time  
(b) Most of that time  
(c) None of that time

112. Have you had a father or father-figure living in the home during middle childhood (Approx. age 7 or 8 to approx. age 12 or 13)?  
(a) All of that time  
(b) Most of that time  
(c) None of that time

113. Have you had a father or father-figure living in the home during adolescence (Approx age 13 or 14 to age 18)?  
(a) All of that time  
(b) Most of that time  
(c) None of that time

114. What is your current marital status?  
(a) Married  
(b) cohabiting  
(c) seriously attached but live separately  
(d) dating casually  
(e) not dating at all
115. Which of the following best describes your current living situation?
(a) Co-ed campus housing
(b) Fraternity housing
(c) Off-campus house shared with others
(d) Off-campus house or apartment to yourself

116. Do you have sisters?
(a) Both older and younger sisters.
(b) Older sisters(s) only
(c) Younger sisters(s) only
(d) No sisters

How strongly do you identify yourself with each of the following social groups?

Use a scale of 1 to 9, where
1 = Not at all  5 = Average identification  9 = Strongest identification

117. Environmental
118. New Age
119. Outdoor recreation person (i.e., mountain biking, hiking, skiing, etc.)
120. Punk/Alternative
121. Deadhead
122. Greek/Frat family
123. Football/Basketball/Team sports
124. Track/Swim Team/Individual sports
125. Church
126. Studious

127. Have you heard any programs on campus about acquaintance rape?
(a) Yes, in a dorm or fraternity, and it was a good program
(b) Yes, in a dorm or fraternity, and it was not a good program
(c) Yes, guest speaker in Psych 104, and it was a good presentation
(d) Yes, guest speaker in Psych 104, and it was not a good presentation
(e) Yes, somewhere else, and it was a good program
(f) Yes, somewhere else, and it was not a good program
(g) No
Appendix B-4

Powch Study Debriefing Script

Thank you for participating in this study. We hope that you'll leave here feeling good about having contributed to research, and also feeling that you've learned something about research. That's why we'll tell you what this study is about.

As you might have guessed from reading the items, the main thing we're interested in understanding better is what combination of factors result in some men being more violent than other men. For example, childhood experiences, personality characteristics, and belief in stereotypes may be important things to consider. We were especially interested in learning about the kinds of violence that occur in heterosexual relationships between men and women--that is, sexual, physical, and emotional violence.

What we're doing here by telling you about this study is called a "debriefing." As we already mentioned, one purpose of a debriefing is to give you an opportunity to learn something about research and the study you took part in. Another purpose of a debriefing is to try to undo negative effects of misinformation that might have been created by the study. We realize that you were just exposed to a lot of material having to do with sex role stereotypes and upsetting topics such as abuse and rape. This may be upsetting if it happened to you (like if you were abused as a child), or if someone you love was raped, or if you think that you are at risk to be abusive in some of your relationships. We feel it's important for us to give you accurate information and support. At the bottom of a handout on acquaintance rape prevention is the number and campus location of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Program. This is for men as well as women, and they have a lot of good information--like what to expect, and how to be helpful if someone you care about was sexually assaulted. If you want to talk or ask questions, but want to remain anonymous, there's a free 24-hour hotline called Headquarters that's great. Their number is 841-2345. If you're interested in exploring more professional support, two excellent places on campus are CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services) on 2nd Floor Watkins, and the KU Psychological Clinic on third floor Fraser. Even if you have no interest in using these services for information or support at this time, they are good references to have on hand.

Again, we thank you for taking part in this study, and we hope that it has been a worthwhile experience for you also.

Please don't discuss this survey with other students because they may participate in this study later.

We're handing out blank white paper where you can give us some feedback that might help us to improve the questionnaire, our instructions in the beginning, our debriefing, or any other part of the study. Again, thanks for your help.
ACQUAINTANCE RAPE PREVENTION: INFORMATION FOR WOMEN AND MEN

People are most often raped by friends, dates, relatives, co-workers, and other people they know. This is called acquaintance rape, and it is the most common form of rape. On college campuses, acquaintance rapes account for approximately 90% of all rapes.

Preventing rape does not involve telling women to restrict their activities while ignoring the role of men. To prevent acquaintance rape we must promote change in societal norms for how men and women are supposed to act.

FOR MEN:

* It is NEVER okay to force someone to have sex, even if...
  You think she's leading you on.
  You paid for the date.
  She asked you out.
  She dresses provocatively.
  You think she enjoys or expects some force.
  You've had sex with her before.
  She agrees to have sex, then changes her mind.

* Whenever a woman is coerced to submit to unwanted sexual relations, it is rape, not successful seduction. If a woman is unable to consent (for example, is drunk) it is still rape.

* Be aware of sex roles stereotypes that encourage you to use force, such as "aggressive behavior is manly" or "the man should always be in charge." Force includes physical force, threats, and even continual verbal arguments and pressure.

* No means no. Listen to and respect the needs, feelings, and decisions of others.

* Physical affection does not always have to lead to sex.

FOR WOMEN:

* You have the right...
  To be concerned about yourself.
  To dress as you please.
  To be treated with respect.
  Agree to have sex but then change your mind.
  To say no.

* If you feel threatened by an acquaintance or by a stranger, stand up for yourself. Be willing to make a scene if necessary.

* Trust your instinct. Be aware of situations in which you do not feel relaxed and in charge of yourself.

* Be aware of sex role stereotypes that prevent you from expressing yourself (for example, "anger is unfeminine") and define women as passive, weak, or irrational.

* Make decisions for yourself. Decide what your own limits are.

* Support your friends. If a friend asks you to leave with her from a party then help her out.

FOR EVERYONE

Be aware of your feelings and communicate them respectfully, honestly, and assertively. Being assertive is standing up for yourself without violating the basic rights of another person.

Rape is an act of violence during which sex is used to dominate, control, and degrade another person. No one "asks for" rape or deserves to be raped. Rape is never the fault of the person who has been raped. Only rapists can be blamed for rape.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Program, 864-3600
A program of the Emily Taylor Women's Resource Center, 115 Strong Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045. 864-3552
### Appendix C

#### Intercorrelation of Potential Predictor Variables And Correlation With Total Abusiveness and Sexual Abusiveness

| 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | TOT | SEX  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Peer Press to Abs Wom | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Male Entitlement  | 32** | .00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Hostility Toward Women | 38** | .42** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Sexual Arousal to Rape | 17** | .43** | .26** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Antisocial Indicators | 23** | .23** | .33** | .18** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Borderline Alienation | .09 | .15** | .48** | .07 | 21** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Cop-Emotl Disturbance | 27** | .24** | .45** | .06 | 30** | .50** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Anger | 28** | .20** | .36** | .10 | 36** | .31** | .30** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Impulsiveness | 17** | .10 | .14** | .02 | .36** | .08 | .25** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Sex Father Disrep Mothr | 31** | .38** | .18** | .18** | .13** | .12 | .29** | .16** | .12 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Child Expos to Porn | 07 | .11 | .09 | .26** | .08 | .07 | .07 | .18** | .13 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Phys & Emotl Abused Child | .10 | .26** | .32** | .08 | .26** | .32** | .36** | .17** | .07 | .34** | .03 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |
| Child Sex at Oth's Request | .04 | .04 | .12** | .05 | 24** | .05 | .13** | .05 | .03 | .08 | .30** | .19** | 1.00 |    |    |    |
| Witness Parental Violence | 18** | .22 | .17** | .18** | .09 | .10 | .20** | .18** | .01 | .41** | .04 | .39** | .12 | 1.00 |    |    |
| Find Dates at Party/Bar | .10 | .16 | .10 | .05 | .34** | .14** | .04 | .15** | .10 | .08 | .08 | .04 | .09 | .03 |    |    |
| Alcohol Abuse | 20** | .02 | .16** | .00 | .49** | .05 | .18** | .22** | .22** | .09 | .22** | .07 | .10 | .10 |    |    |
| Identification with Frat | .11 | .12 | .08 | .03 | .10 | .10 | .02 | .19** | .07 | .08 | .08 | .05 | .02 | .11 |     |    |
| Alternative Music Scene | .03 | .07 | .06 | .09 | .27** | .01 | .04 | .07** | .24** | .04 | .10 | .10 | .18** | .04 | .14 | .12 |
| Environmental/Outdoorsy | .05 | .21** | .14** | .02 | .05 | .22** | .11 | .14** | .16** | .02 | .12 | .11 | .08 | .02 |    |    |
| New Age | .12 | .10 | .12 | .12 | .22** | .03 | .07 | .23** | .16** | .13** | .08 | .07 | .09 | .18** | .20 | .13 |
| Athletic | 17** | .06 | .08 | .11 | .07 | .18** | .07 | .04 | .04 | .06 | .05 | .06 | .02 | .02 | .08 | .07 |
| Church Affiliation | .17** | .00 | .05 | .00 | .23** | .10 | .01 | .01 | .07 | .19** | .12 | .09 | .16 | .06 |    |    |
| Studious | .04 | .10 | .04 | .08 | .23** | .16** | .06 | .01 | .20** | .05 | .07 | .05 | .01 | .02 | .05 | .05 |
| Internal Locus of Contl | .04 | .14** | .23** | .15** | .18** | .23** | .17** | .12 | .14** | .14** | .01 | .12 | .12 | .15 |    |    |
| Arousal to Mutual Sex | .14 | .16 | .13 | .08 | .04 | .02 | .01 | .13** | .10 | .10 | .02 | .05 | .14** | .03 | .05 | .01 |
| Arousal to SM Play | .10 | .10 | .01 | .19** | .04 | .01 | .00 | .04 | .12 | .18 | .02 | .04 | .06 | .10 |    |    |
| Find Dates at Party/Bar | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Alcohol Abuse | .40* | .10 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Identification with Frat | .39** | .00 | .02 | .10 | .00 | .10 | .02 | .10 | .00 | .10 | .02 | .10 | .02 | .10 |    |    |
| Alternative Music Scene | .20** | .25** | .02 | .10 | .00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Environmental/Outdoorsy | .15** | .15** | .07 | .36** | .10** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| New Age | .24** | .15** | .19** | .33** | .42** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Athletic | .09 | .03 | .25** | .19** | .13** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Church Affiliation | .09 | .10 | .12 | .18** | .09 | .03 | .37** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Studious | .00 | .12 | .13** | .01 | .11 | .07 | .17** | .29** | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Internal Locus of Contl | .05 | .11 | .08 | .04 | .02 | .18** | .03 | .08 | .03 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Arousal to Mutual Sex | .09 | .08 | .03 | .15** | .17** | .19** | .04 | .00 | .13** | .01 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |
| Arousal to SM Play | .10 | .14 | .11 | .18** | .20 | .19** | .11 | .02 | .11 | .02 | .01 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |

Note: SEX = Sexual abusiveness. TOT is formed by standardizing and summing Sexual Abusiveness, Gang Rape, Physical Attacks, and Emotional Abusiveness.

*p < .05  **p < .01
### Appendix D

**Items Comprising Scales Used In This Study, Internal Consistency, and Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percent Over Listed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rape Myth Acceptance</td>
<td>C59-C69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>11-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justly Acquaint Rape</td>
<td>A139-A147</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Justify Hitting GC</td>
<td>A146-A160</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>(9.9)</td>
<td>13-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathize w/ Rapist</td>
<td>C74-76, C78-83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>10-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td>A118-A138</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>34-97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Peer Pressure to Better</td>
<td>B1-B8</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>8-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Peer Pressure to Rape</td>
<td>B9-B16</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sadistic Rape Scenario</td>
<td>C96, C97</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>2-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Common Rape Scenario</td>
<td>C63, C100</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>2-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depression</td>
<td>A79, B4-B6, A97,</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>12-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100, 104-110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anxiety</td>
<td>A60-61, A67, 98,</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>(6.8)</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106-108, 113-114,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dissociation</td>
<td>A83, 88, 92, 101,</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>10-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105, 109, 112, 115, 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Paranoid Ideation</td>
<td>A82, 86, 90, 94, 99, 117</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>6-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Anger-</td>
<td>C51-C58</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>8-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Anger</td>
<td>A59-A68</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assault</td>
<td>A69-A78</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Antisocial Practices</td>
<td>A24-A25, A34-A45</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>22-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Drug Abuse</td>
<td>B112-114, B119-121</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>6-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>B109-111, B115-118</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>6-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Impulsiveness</td>
<td>A44-A50, A52-A54</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
<td>12-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Parental Reject &amp; Ho Cntrl</td>
<td>B19-22, 25-28, 31-34, 37-60</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
<td>36-89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Parental Malt &amp; Ridicule</td>
<td>B59, 30, 35, 36, 61, 62</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>8-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Physically Beaten as Child</td>
<td>B66-B68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>3-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Child Exposure to Porn</td>
<td>B70-B75</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>6-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Child Sex at Others Request</td>
<td>B76-B84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Fathr Violent To Mothr</td>
<td>B99-B98 (even)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Mothr Violent To Fathr</td>
<td>B91-B99 (odd)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>5-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. See Fathr Disrespct Mothr</td>
<td>B100-B106</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
<td>9-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Internal Locus of Cntrl</td>
<td>C84-C92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>13-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Standardized Cronbach alphas were used. All percentages are percent of entire sample of 255.