

The Relationships Among, and Predictors of,  
Men's Sexual, Physical, and Emotional  
Abusiveness Toward Romantic Partners and  
Others

by

Irene G. Powch  
B.A., Brown University, 1986

Submitted to the Department  
of Psychology and the Faculty  
of the Graduate School of the  
University of Kansas in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Redacted Signature

Committee Chair

Redacted Signature

Committee Member

Redacted Signature

Committee Member

October 1, 1991

Date of Acceptance

## Abstract

In recent years there has been growing interest in men's sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness, particularly toward their girlfriends and wives. However, research on one form of abusiveness has typically been conducted in isolation from research on other forms of abusiveness. This fragmentation has resulted in unclear "non-abusive" comparison groups that may have included men who were abusive in ways not measured. One goal of the present study was, thus, to compare highly sexually abusive men with men who were sexually nonabusive and also virtually non-abusive physically and emotionally toward everyone -- romantic partners and others. When the clean comparison group was used, greater mean differences were found between the groups on all risk-factors than when the traditional comparison group (only sexually nonabusive) was used. However, thirteen risk-factors significantly differentiated the highly sexually abusive group from the comparison group regardless of which comparison group was used. One risk-factor differentiated the highly sexually abusive group from the comparison group only when the clean comparison group was used. This risk-factor was having (as a child) witnessed physical violence between one's parents.

A further goal of this study was to explore the prevalence, frequencies, and relations among the different forms of abusiveness and their correlates. Some degree of sexually abusive behavior was reported by 48.8% of the men in this study, some degree of emotionally abusive

behavior toward a romantic partner was reported by 98.9%, and some degree of physically abusive behavior toward a romantic partner was reported by 87.3% (at least one actual physical attack on a romantic partner was reported by 41.3% of this sample). Physical and emotional abusiveness were more related to each other than they were to sexual abusiveness, and whereas the target of sexual abusiveness was more often a romantic partner, the target of physical and emotional abusiveness was more often someone other than a romantic partner. After attitudes and habits were considered, childhood risk factors contributed significant additional prediction to physical and emotional abusiveness but not to sexual abusiveness. After childhood risk factors were considered, current attitudes and habits contributed less additional prediction to physical and emotional abusiveness toward others than to sexual abusiveness or than to physical and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners. Alcohol by attitude interactions explained significant additional variance only for sexual abusiveness.

A final goal of this study was to identify "anti-risk factors" that might make some men less abusive than others even if they had childhood experiences that would typically lead to abusiveness as an adult. The ability to derive a great deal of satisfaction from earning someone's trust was identified as an anti-risk factor.

Theoretical implications are discussed within the context of the social learning/cognitive behavioral perspective and the social control/social conflict perspective. Implications for prevention and intervention efforts are also discussed.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to express my appreciation toward everyone who contributed to this project. Special thanks to Charlene Muehlenhard, my mentor and committee chair for kindling my interest in this area of research, and for her steady support and guidance throughout this project. Special thanks also, to my committee members, B. Kent Houston and Sam Green for their insights and helpful suggestions, particularly on methodological and statistical issues. I truly appreciated their open-door policy, and generosity with time, especially when my "quick questions" turned out not to be so quick. Thanks also to my research assistants for their help with the many details of conducting this study, and thanks to the two computer consultants, Rose Winters and Micki Waxman for their help with programming. Special thanks also, to Marilyn Sliski, whose patience and humor eased the process of deadlines, scheduling and related details, and to Sharon Danoff-Berg, Mary Goggins, and Pat Hearney for their interest in this project and their encouragement when I needed it most.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank three influential teachers, D. Thorpe, B. Kroohs, and J. K. Waage for encouraging and nurturing my intellectual development to the point where I could be excited about embarking on graduate work. I also wish to thank all the nonabusive, gentle, caring men who have touched my life because they have helped me to remain optimistic while studying a sad but important topic. And finally, I wish to thank Stan Pafford for being with me through it all.

## Table of Contents

Title . . . . .	i
Abstract . . . . .	ii
Acknowledgement . . . . .	iv
Table of Contents . . . . .	v
Introduction . . . . .	1
Method . . . . .	25
Results . . . . .	39
Discussion . . . . .	57
Footnote . . . . .	72
References . . . . .	73
Appendices . . . . .	82

## The Relationships Among, and Predictors of, Men's Sexual, Physical, and Emotional Abusiveness Toward Romantic Partners and Others

Over the past 20 years there has been growing research interest and documentation of the scope and pervasiveness of male violence, and in particular male violence against women. Several theoretical models have been developed to explain the emerging statistics on the prevalence of female victimization in the forms of rape (sexual assault) and battering (physical and emotional). Although originally competing, there have been recent efforts to integrate the various theoretical models, with recognition of a need to consider multiple and often interacting risk factors (Dutton, 1988; Finkelhor, 1981; Koss & Dinero, 1988; Malamuth, 1986). There has also been recent recognition of a need to integrate research on the different forms of woman abuse. For example, similar patterns of results are found by research on the different forms of woman abuse (Gondolf, 1985a). The degree of similarity among the various forms of woman abuse, and violence in general, has implications for the different theoretical models being considered for integration. Given these implications, the nature of such similarities needs to be empirically investigated. The present study is, to our knowledge, the first attempt to empirically investigate the sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness of a non-prison and non-psychiatric male population toward romantic partners and others. It is also a first attempt to identify "anti-risk factors" that counteract the effects of risk factors. The theoretical perspective and intended contribution of this study will be described after a brief review of the prevalence statistics, the theoretical models, and the current state of knowledge in both the rape literature and the battering literature.

## Prevalence of Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women by Men

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), in 1989 approximately 94,500 women were forcibly raped in the United States (FBI, 1989). Because only a small fraction of rapes are reported and even fewer pass through the criminal justice system, the true prevalence of rape is much higher than FBI estimates (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). According to Russell (1984), only 9.5% of rape victims among a probability sample of 930 adult women in San Francisco reported their experience to the police. Using the highest of all estimated reporting rates (40%), Clark and Lewis (1977) calculated that approximately 7% of all rapes that occurred in Toronto resulted in incarceration of the rapist. Using the reporting rate found by Russell (1984), this estimate would be approximately 1.7%. Thus, assuming similar clearance and conviction rates in the United States and Canada, prison populations may represent as little as 1.7% of all rapists in these two countries.

Cumulative research findings estimate that approximately one in four women will be victims of rape and one in three women will be victims of attempted rape during their lifetimes (Koss et al., 1987; Russell, 1984). Of these rapes, approximately 85% to 89% are committed by men who are acquaintances of their victims (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988; Russell, 1984). Research with undetected offenders, including a national survey of 2,971 male college students, has obtained self-reports of acts that meet the legal definition of rape for 7.7%, and the legal definition of attempted rape for 25% of the men surveyed (Koss et al., 1977). The pervasiveness of male sexual violation of women is underscored by Malamuth's (1981) finding that approximately 35% of men nationwide report some likelihood of raping if they could be sure that no one would know and by Muehlenhard and Linton's (1987) finding that approximately 57% of college men have engaged in sexual behavior against a woman's will.

### Prevalence of Woman Battering

According to the FBI, in 1989 approximately 1.8 million women were physically assaulted by their husbands or boyfriends, and 28% of female murder victims were killed by husbands or boyfriends. Although family disturbance calls constitute the largest single category of calls received by police departments each year (Police Foundation, 1977), research finds that battered women are very unlikely to call the police for a variety of reasons (Walker, 1979). The actual scope of battering is thus likely to be much higher than the number that has come to the attention of the FBI. Several studies have estimated that 50% to 60% of all women will have been physically abused by a male partner in their lifetime (Gelles, 1974; Straus, 1978; Walker, 1979). The pervasiveness of male physical abuse of women in intimate relationships is underscored by Briere's (1987) finding that, in a normal population of male college students, 79% said they would use physical violence against their wives or partners in at least one of a number of circumstances, such as if she had sex with another man.

### Prevalence of Emotional Abuse

There is a paucity of research on emotional abuse in intimate relationships relative to the research on physical abuse or sexual abuse. One obstacle has been the difficulty of measuring emotional abuse, which has been defined as including subtle attempts to control partners socially and financially, belittling, scolding, ignoring, damaging property, threatening to harm or kill the victim or ones she loves, or killing or injuring pets to intimidate the victim (Gelles & Straus, 1988; Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, & Hause 1990; Stordeur & Still, 1989; Tolman, 1989; Walker, 1979). Walker's (1979) extensive interviews with 120 battered women found that virtually all women who were physically abused were also emotionally abused by their batterers. In addition, she found that many women described the emotional abuse as more

devastating than the physical injuries; they explained that the physical injuries heal with time but the emotional scars do not. Similar results were obtained by Follingstad's (1990) interviews with 234 physically battered women; 97.9% of the 234 women reported having experienced at least one episode of emotional abuse, and 69.4% of the 234 women reported that emotional abuse had a more severe impact than physical abuse. Because these studies also found that a history of emotional abuse frequently preceded the first instance of physical attack in battering relationships, it is likely that emotional abuse is even more prevalent than physical abuse. At the time that the present research was begun, however, to our knowledge no empirical research existed that attempted to study the prevalence or correlates of emotional abuse in populations who had not already been identified as physical batterers or rapists.

#### Prevalence of General Male Violence

According to the FBI, in 1989, 89% of persons arrested for violent crimes were male; 11% were female. Additionally, writers who view violence as a men's problem cite sociological evidence such as the fact that wars are declared and fought almost exclusively by men (Miedzian, 1991).

#### Attempts to Explain Male Violence or Abusiveness: Theoretical Models

Four theoretical models that attempt to explain male violence or abusiveness, particularly male abusiveness against women, have received the widest attention: the biological predisposition model, the individual pathology model, the social control/social conflict model, and the social learning/cognitive-behavioral model. The following section briefly reviews these models, their limitations, and their potential contributions to an integrative model.

The biological predisposition model. Early attempts to explain why violence is a men's problem, and why it is such a pervasive men's problem, concluded that men

must be inherently more violent than women. The resulting biological predisposition model posits that men have a genetic predisposition toward violence that exists because over the course of human evolution, violent men enjoyed a greater reproductive advantage and created more reproductively successful sons than did nonviolent men (Wilson, 1982). Although the evolutionary argument is elegant, it is not directly testable. Indirect attempts to validate this model by seeking evidence of greater male violence or aggression very early in life have found only that as a group, very young boys engage in more rough and tumble play and are somewhat more impulsive than very young girls (Maccoby, 1980); however, adults play more roughly with male babies than with female babies (Holt, cited in Miedzian, 1991, p. 46), possibly affecting the babies' appetites for physically stimulating play.

Not to be overlooked are recent behavior genetic studies with reared apart monozygotic twins. These studies rather consistently find genetic contributions to various personality characteristics, including aggression, approaching 50% (Bouchard, Lykken, McGue, Segal, & Tellegen, 1990; Plomin, 1990; Tellegen, Lykken, Segal, & Rich, 1988). The genetic contribution is inferred from the fact that monozygotic twins are identical genetically, and if reared apart, their similarities cannot be attributed to shared family environment (although they would have shared the same intrauterine environment, and in most cases, the same culture at large). Since monozygotic twins are necessarily of the same gender, these heritability estimates do not directly address the question of gender differences in aggression. Heritability estimates for aggression in dizygotic twins reared apart are approximately 6% (Tellegen, et al., 1988). Thus there is at present more evidence for a genetic contribution to individual differences in aggression within gender than there is for a genetic contribution to differences in aggression between genders. Since the present study focuses on one gender, it may be

assumed that the maximum variance in abusiveness that can be accounted for by environmental factors is under 100%.

From a prevention/intervention perspective, possible genetic and environmental contributions should also be evaluated with respect to their usefulness. On the simplest level, environmental interventions may be considered more useful by default, simply because there is no simple genetic transplant or drug therapy for reducing violence. Environmental interventions may also always be more useful on a more complex level. For example, a genetic contribution may be responsible for ordering individuals as 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60 on some dimension such as aggression. However, if a social/environmental intervention could change this to 5,6,7,8,9,10, then the environmental intervention would have been extraordinarily useful without having to negate any genetic contribution to the ordering of individual differences. That social/environmental influences can have enormous, overriding effects on violence, is amply illustrated by anthropological works. For example, Miedzian (1991) pointed out that there have been entire societies that, due to historical events, were turned within the lifetime of one generation from peaceful cultures without even a word for murder in their vocabulary into savage warriors (the Semai of Malaya), and vice versa (the Maori of New Zealand). Such behavioral flexibility and responsiveness to changes in environmental or political conditions render any genetic predisposition of little practical consequence.

The individual psychopathology model. The individual psychopathology model was developed within a research context that focused attention on the most extreme cases of rape and battering, using small research samples selected from psychiatric or prison populations (Dutton, 1983). According to the strong form of this model, men who rape or men who batter their partners do so because they have a

mental disorder. Rapists are thought to have an antisocial personality disorder (Armentrout, 1978; Groth & Birnbaum, 1979; Rader, 1977), and batterers are thought to have antisocial personality disorder, borderline personality disorder, narcissistic personality disorder, or dependent/compulsive personality disorder (Hamberger, Hastings, & James, 1988).

A careful review of research evidence finds that strong form of this model is not supported. In general, only identified treatment populations contain large proportions of men with identifiable psychological problems (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). However, identified treatment populations constitute a very small and biased subset of rapists and batterers. With few exceptions, only those who have antisocial characteristics, often including previous arrests for other crimes, are convicted or court-ordered to participate in treatment (Clark & Lewis, 1977; Dutton, 1983). The few rapists or batterers in treatment who have not entered treatment by this route are likely to have entered the mental health system due to a variety of other problems (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Given that men with antisocial characteristics and psychological problems are preferentially entered into treatment programs, finding such characteristics common in these populations is trivial.

Recent quantitative research has supported the criticisms of this model. Ceasar (1985) compared the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) profiles of batterers in treatment with an unmatched comparison group of nonviolent men also in treatment and found that batterers did not score significantly higher on any subscale, and no mean subscale was clinically elevated. Hamberger, Hastings, and Lohr (1988) compared alcoholic and relatively nonalcoholic batterers in treatment with nonidentified batterers recruited in a community sample and nonviolent controls. Alcoholic batterers in treatment showed the most pathology, relatively nonalcoholic batterers in treatment

showed relatively less, and batterers not receiving service were indistinguishable from nonviolent controls. This suggests that when pathology is found among batterers, it probably reflects other problems of the sample under consideration, rather than being directly linked to the proclivity to batter their partners.

Similar results have been obtained in the rape literature. In reviewing studies that have used the MMPI, Koss, Leonard, Beezley, and Oros (1985) concluded that there is no evidence for the presence of neurotic or psychotic psychopathology in rapists. Although convicted rapists do tend to manifest elevations on scale 4 (Psychopathic Deviate) relative to non-criminal controls, they do not typically differ from other criminal populations on this scale (Rader, 1977). A recent study by Koss et al., (1985) represents one of the first empirical investigations that used the Psychopathic Deviate scale with a non-prison, non-psychiatric population of college students in which self-reported rapists and sexually abusive men were undetected by law enforcement agencies. This study found no differences in psychopathic deviance among rapists, otherwise sexually abusive men, and sexually non-abusive men, although various attitudinal measures did differentiate these groups (Koss et al., 1985). In this study all three measures used to tap the construct of psychopathic deviance failed to distinguish among the groups: the MMPI, the Social Anxiety Scale of Lykken's Activity Preference Questionnaire (APQ), and the Buss and Durke (1957) Hostility Inventory.

In sum, there is no evidence that any particular psychopathology causes either rape or battering. Additionally, the evidence suggests that levels of psychopathic deviance among men convicted for rape and men convicted for other crimes may be similarly elevated not because the same men tend to be both woman abusers and

generally criminal, violent, or antisocial, but because such a relationship exists in the biased samples that have typically been used in research on this topic.

The weak form of this model purports only to describe the characteristics of men who abuse women. Nonpathological measures of antisocial tendencies (e.g., the California Psychological Inventory Responsibility and Socialization scales, and questions asking about involvement with delinquent peers) have been found to correlate with reports of perpetrating sexual assault or rape (Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984). However, tolerance of rape has been found to correlate more strongly with sexist attitudes than with an antisocial personality (Hall, Howard, & Boezio, 1986). Other characteristics and attitudes that have been found to describe woman abusers are more central to the next two theoretical models to be presented than they are to the weak form of this model and will be discussed in that context.

In addition to equivocal research support, this model has been criticized from a clinical perspective as impeding batterers from taking responsibility for their behavior by allowing them to hide behind the excuse of a disease (Ptacek, 1988). It has also been criticized for its inability to explain why such large proportions of the male population as the prevalence statistics suggest are proposed to be afflicted with mental disorders that lead to violence against women (Miedzian, 1991).

The social control/social conflict model. The social control/social conflict model was developed to address two major issues that were left unanswered by the other models: (a) to explain the pervasiveness of male abusiveness toward women in particular, and (b) to suggest feasible directions for the development of prevention and intervention strategies (Burt, 1980; Koss et al., 1985; Weis & Borges, 1973).

A central tenet of this model is that male violence, or the threat of male violence serves the function of controlling women. That is, it serves to keep women off the

streets (restricting their leisure and keeping them out of certain jobs), and it convinces women that they need to be in a relationship with a man for protection, making them vulnerable to accepting abuse from a husband or boyfriend whose abusive pattern is known to them and thus less frightening than the unknown abuse that awaits them "outside" (Radford, 1987; Green, Hebron, & Woodward, 1987). Radford (1987, p. 43) writes "Legitimate targets are those women an individual man has the right to control, that is, who belong to *him* and not another man's wife, girlfriend, lover or daughter except when they step out of line and 'ask for it' -- by being out late at night, for example." Shotland and Straw (1976) obtained empirical support for this contention. In their studies, college undergraduates witnessed a violent fight between a man and a woman (confederates). These students intervened more frequently in the fight when they believed the man and the woman were strangers than when they believed the man and woman were romantic partners, implying that a "lover's quarrel" is an acceptable forum for violence.

According to this model, this system is not necessarily driven by a conscious "conspiracy" on the part of men, because it is easily enough perpetuated by the system of attitudes, beliefs, and accepted habits that are pervasive in sexist societies. For example, boys are inculcated with a system of beliefs that values the domination of a submissive girlfriend or wife as "manly." The ideal sexual couple is portrayed as an aggressive, protective (possessive), accomplished, and honorably violent man who turns a demure, naively innocent, or coquettish younger female into a sweetly submissive, happily dependent charge who derives her life's pleasure from admiring her Romeo and learning what she needs to do in order to please him. According to this model, this leads to a male drive for control and dominance of women. Furthermore, this model posits that the society is structured to reinforce these beliefs (Straus, 1976).

According to this view, aggressive men are living up to cultural expectations (Brownmiller, 1975; Morgan, 1987; Taylor, 1972).

The major line of empirical research within this model in both the battering and rape literatures has focused on untangling the web of interrelated attitudes and beliefs that constitute a rape-supportive and battering-supportive system, and demonstrating a relationship between these attitudes and beliefs and the commission of sexual assault or battering.

Within the battering research, Briere (1987), sampling normal male college students, found that attitudes supporting wife abuse and attitudes supporting interpersonal violence were significantly positively related to these men's self-reported likelihood of physically battering their wives or future wives. With respect to clinical work, Bernard and Bernard (1984) and Gondolf (1985b) have described batterers as overidentifying with the stereotypic masculine role and the belief that men should be strong, dominant, superior, and successful. They describe batterers as locked in a cycle of striving to live this unattainable image, never feeling they have quite attained it, and consequently struggling ever more desperately to attain it. Walker's (1979) extensive interview studies add to this evidence of how the structure of the society that inculcates men with these beliefs also makes it difficult for battered women to leave abusive relationships because of economic dependence, lack of childcare, and other structural impediments.

Empirical research within the sexual assault literature has also found evidence that culturally transmitted assumptions such as sex role stereotyping, distrust of the opposite sex, and acceptance of interpersonal violence are highly correlated with acceptance of rape myths and constitute a rape-supportive belief system (Burt, 1980). (Examples of rape myths include the belief that "a woman who goes to the home or

apartment of a man on the first date implies she is willing to have sex" or that "in the majority of rapes, the victim was promiscuous or had a bad reputation" Burt, 1980, p. 223). Similar results were reported by Koss, et al. (1985), who found that men who reported having threatened or actually used force to gain nonconsensual sexual intercourse with female acquaintances differed from sexually nonaggressive men in the degree to which they believed myths about rape, attributed adversarial qualities to interpersonal relationships between men and women, viewed as normal an intermingling of aggression and sexuality, accepted sex role stereotypes, and felt that rape prevention is the woman's responsibility. Additionally, Groth and Birnbaum (1979) have noted a tendency of incarcerated rapists to deny wrongdoing, to interpret rape as an extension of the male role, and to deny that rape can occur among friends or acquaintances.

Another line of empirical research within this model has focussed on elucidating the structural components of American society that serve to perpetuate rape and other forms of woman abuse. For example, Muehlenhard (1988) and Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) obtained strong empirical evidence that implicates key elements of the traditional American dating system in legitimating the use of force by those in power (e.g., the man who drives and pays for the date) and weakening the resistance of the less powerful (e.g., the woman, who is easily persuaded that she "owes him something"). Koss and Dinero (1988) also found that certain habits that are common, and even encouraged of young men in our culture, are significantly related to self-reported sexual aggression and rape -- namely, degree of alcohol consumption, degree of reading pornographic magazines, how much a man talks with his peers about how particular women would be in bed, and how sexually active a man is. With respect to pornography, a recent review of the literature (Linz, Donnerstein, and Penrod 1987)

supported the social control model's view that pornography is a risk factor for rape not because it is sexually arousing, but because it degrades women. Specifically, these authors concluded that sexually explicit images per se do not increase aggressive behavior against women, change attitudes about rape, or influence other forms of antisocial behavior. Instead, they concluded, it is the violent images and images of female degradation in some forms of pornography, or even violent images alone (as in "slasher" films) that account for many of the antisocial effects observed in experimental studies (i.e., increased self-reported likelihood to rape or use force against a female, and increased laboratory aggression against female confederates).

This model appears to have practical value in suggesting a number of potential interventions, primarily directed at changing structural and attitudinal components at a societal level. Its major limitation is that it does not offer an explanation as to why some men ascribe to the view promulgated by the sexist society more than do other men. Related to this, it does not consider the complexity of society's double messages. For example, children are generally reprimanded for belligerent behavior, and the edict "don't hit girls" is common among prepubescent children. Something must mediate differential absorption of society's many messages and propensities for acting upon those messages.

Social learning and cognitive-behavioral perspectives. Bandura's (1965) social learning theory has been used to explain how attitudes and values are transmitted to children. This model regards aggression as learned behavior and postulates that informal observation of the behaviors of influential people and of their consequent rewards or punishments provides an observer with either the inhibition or disinhibition for repeating these acts. According to this view, violence may be learned by observing it and its rewards in the family of origin, in the culture, and in the media as well as

through trial-and-error learning (Bandura, 1973). In this model, violence is not caused by individual psychopathology or societal stress such as unemployment, but rather by the way in which certain men have learned to respond to these difficulties. Cognitive-behavioral perspectives are called into play to flesh out the mechanisms of this learning, positing both deficits in appropriate skills for expressing discontent and negotiating compromises, and the existence of irrational self-statements that lead to anger and hostility (Ellis, 1977; Meichenbaum, 1977; Novaco, 1975). A comparison of domestically violent men with two samples of more generally assaultive men and a nonviolent, demographically matched control group did, indeed, find levels of hostility that were similarly elevated in the domestically violent and generally assaultive men, but not in the control group (Maiuro, Cahn, Vitaliano, Wagner, & Zegree, 1988). In this study, hostility was measured with the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory and the Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire.

This model is also supported by research that estimates that high proportions of abusive men come from violent family backgrounds; estimates as high as 75-80% have been obtained (Fitch & Papatonio, 1983; Waldo, 1987). Stacy and Shupe (1983), however, pointed out that in most studies, the percentages obtained were not compared with a control group, and they noted that if one-half of all heterosexual relationships contain some violence, close to half of all children may have witnessed or experienced violence in their homes. With respect to corporal punishment of children, Graziano and Nomaste (1990) have found that of 679 first-year college students, 93.2% were spanked as children; 90.7% of the entire sample remember these events not as controlled discipline, but as somewhat uncontrolled actions arising at least in part from parental anger, and 27.8% reported that during the ages of 7 to 9 the corporal punishment they experienced was "severely painful" or "severe enough to cause welts

or bruises" (there were no significant gender differences with respect to these results). With respect to controlled research, Browning (1983) found no difference in the histories of child abuse or violence in family of origin between batterers and nonbatterers. Briere (1987) also found no correlation between self-reported likelihood of using violence against a spouse and a family history of violence. It may be that the disparate results of these studies might be reconciled by closer attention to not only the physical severity and frequency of abuse, but also to the emotional and cognitive impact of the abuse on the child.

With respect to sexual abuse of male children, research is of such recent origin that little more has been established than the fact that it is much more common than was previously thought. Estimates of the percentage of child victims who are male range from 31% to 63% (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Groth, 1977, 1979; Van Ness, 1984). The first national survey of adults concerning a history of childhood sexual abuse found a victimization rate of 16% for men; 40% of the sexual abuse reported by men was perpetrated by a stranger, approximately 50% of the offenders were considered authority figures, and 83% of the offenders against males were males (Finkelhor, 1990).

The long-term effects of sexual abuse on male victims are not clear. There is some evidence that men are reluctant to view themselves as having been victimized or as suffering any long-term effects from the experience (Finkelhor, 1984). There is a belief among clinicians that the male role of mastery pushes many male victims to identify with the abuser and become abusers themselves. A wide range of problem populations have disclosed higher levels of child sexual abuse than has been found for the general population; such problem populations include drug abusers (Finkelhor, 1984), juvenile offenders (Jones, Gruber & Timbers, 1981), and rapists and child

molesters (Groth, 1979). In a national sample of male college students, Koss and Dinero (1988) found that having performed sexual acts at another's request before the age of 14 also differentiated men who were sexually abusive toward female partners from men who were not (Koss & Dinero, 1988). However, at least one study suggests that men who were sexually abused as children may be especially sensitive to the plight of victims; they judged abuse to be more harmful, believed it was the abusers' power that caused the victims to submit, and were more favorable to increasing the amount of public agency involvement as a solution (Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis, & Smith, 1989). The studies reviewed above have different inclusion criteria with respect to the age difference they require in order to count a sexual experience as abusive; they also differ with respect to the age at which they consider the male victim a child. It is possible that these factors account for the differences in results.

The research on violent pornography and violent media that was discussed in the previous section on the social conflict/social control model is also relevant to the social learning/cognitive-behavioral model. Whereas the former model focuses attention on the content of the media that increase violence against women, the social learning perspective explains the mechanism by which viewing such materials could increase the likelihood of actually engaging in such behaviors -- the process of vicarious learning by observing a model who is rewarded for his behavior.

Another line of research that was discussed in the previous section on the social conflict/social control model, but is also relevant to the social learning/cognitive-behavioral model is that represented by Shotland and Staw's (1976) studies. Society's tolerance of violence towards women when this occurs in the context of an intimate relationship allows such behaviors to be maintained by adults. That is, the adult consequences of punishment vs. tolerance vs. reward do not deter men's violence

toward their romantic partners the way they deter violence toward strangers. A striking illustration of this idea that men hit their wives (or people hit their family members) because such behavior is generally not punished, is offered by Gelles and Straus (1988, pp. 20-21). These authors describe a situation where "David" had "lost it" and slapped his 3-year old son so hard that he fell across the coffee table, striking his head. David's reason for this abuse was that the toddler had knocked over David's new television set and the picture tube had shattered. The authors ask the reader to suppose that David's television was in the lobby of an automobile agency he manages, and an unattended toddler knocks over this television set. They ask "Would David slap, spank, or even beat the wayward three-year old? Absurd." They conclude that although the identical act was hypothetically committed by the toddler in both situations, David would be able to control his anger in the situation where the toddler is not his because he would certainly be severely punished for abusing someone else's child (he would probably lose his job and serve a jail term). However, the abuse of his own child results only in X-rays and a report to the state department of social services. Interestingly, battered women consistently report that their batterers are able to control themselves in public, and often strike them without delay as soon as the last guest has left (Walker, 1979).

In sum, the social learning and cognitive-behavioral perspective has led not only to interesting research linking early childhood experiences of abuse with a broad range of problematic behaviors as an adult. It has also stimulated interesting research on continued learning of violence as it is modeled in the media, and continued maintenance of forms of violence that are tolerated by society. Focus on the cognitive aspect of the social learning/cognitive-behavioral model has resulted in useful clinical interventions,

including replacement of irrational beliefs that lead to anger-proneness with more adaptive beliefs as well as teaching of missing communication skills.

A limitation of this model by itself is that it has difficulty explaining why boys and girls who are equally abused as children do not have the same types of problems with anger control and proclivity to become abusers; it does not explain why abused girls are likely to become victims and why abused boys are likely to become abusive men (Finkelhor, 1984). The intervention programs that have been developed by workers who hold this perspective have also been criticized as taking too narrow a view of abusive behavior (Gondolf, 1986). The criticism is that even if these programs were 100% successful in teaching abusive men to control their anger and violent behavior, these men might intensify their control over their partners in other ways, such as withholding finances or limiting their role in decision-making, thus maintaining or escalating emotionally abusive behavior. These kinds of criticisms suggest that this model may be more useful when integrated with a complementary model than it is in isolation.

Integrative perspective of the present study. The present study views the social conflict/social control perspective and the social learning and cognitive-behavior perspective as having complementary strengths and limitations and thus as working well together. The cognitive-behavioral perspective is conceptualized as providing the mechanism by which the various abusive behaviors under consideration may be learned. The social control perspective is conceptualized as explaining why there could be systematic learning of certain abusive behaviors. In other words, the social control perspective accounts for what role models are "out there" to be emulated, and what forms of adult aggression will be punished, tolerated, and rewarded; the social learning perspective accounts for how these consequences affect behavior. The cognitive-

behavioral model is viewed as a more general model, into which the social control model can be incorporated.

The following analogy may help to clarify this integrative perspective. The law of gravity explains why a book slides down an incline. But even when two inclines are equally steep, the same book may swiftly slide down one incline that is covered with ice but become stuck on the other that is covered with cement. The concept of friction must be incorporated or integrated with the law of gravity to explain the phenomena just described. Incorporating the concept of friction does not negate the concept of gravity; but the concept of gravity alone cannot explain the difference in the behavior of the book on identically sloped inclines with different surfaces. In the same way, the concepts of the social control model may need to be integrated with the cognitive-behavioral model to explain certain aspects of the topic of the present study.

One concern of the present study was thus to explore aspects of abusiveness that relate to predictions that are specific to the social control model. One specific prediction is that abusiveness toward women is a widespread phenomenon, engaged in by a large percentage of men, which would indicate a problem at a societal level rather than a problem of a few "sick" or aberrant men. (Such a finding would not negate the cognitive-behavioral model, which does not make a prediction one way or the other.)

A second prediction follows from the social control model's view of rape and other sexually abusive behavior not as acts of sexual gratification but as "exercises in power and intimidation" (Edwards, 1987). In a heterosexual sample, sexual abusiveness (assumed to be directed toward women), physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner (a woman), and emotional abusiveness toward a romantic partner (a woman) should have the same underlying construct, but physical and emotional abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner should have a different

underlying construct. Furthermore, different levels of abusiveness should have the same underlying construct. For example, sexual contact with an unwilling partner should have the same underlying construct as sexual intercourse with an unwilling partner, and actual physical attacks should have the same underlying construct as the threat of physical attack.

A third prediction specific to the social control model follows from this model's assumption that societal values designate wives and girlfriends as "appropriate" targets of abuse. If this is true, then men who care about being considered socially desirable should be reluctant to abuse or admit to abusing inappropriate targets (i.e., persons other than romantic partners), but they should be just as likely to abuse or admit abusing appropriate targets (i.e., romantic partners) as men who care less about being considered socially desirable.

A fourth prediction specific to the social control model is that relative to childhood experiences, the attitudes that researchers working within this theoretical framework have identified as rape-supportive and abuse-supportive should explain all types of abusiveness toward women or romantic partners (assumed to be women) better than they explain abusiveness toward others.

#### Integration of Research on Sexual Abusiveness, Battering, and General Abusiveness in the Present Study

Integration of research on sexual abusiveness, battering, and general abusiveness is required in order to answer the questions discussed above. Integration of research on sexual abusiveness and battering is also required for another reason -- a methodological reason with very important practical implications. When a study compares sexually abusive men with sexually non-abusive men, but physical and emotional abusiveness are not even measured, the non-abusive group is not a clean

category; it may include men who are physically or emotionally abusive even though they are not sexually abusive. Clearly, it is impossible to be certain that differences that are found between these two groups distinguish sexually abusive men from non-abusive men; they might be distinguishing sexually abusive men from men who batter their wives and girlfriends physically or emotionally. It is thus impossible to know whether characteristics that distinguish the sexually non-abusive group should be promoted as desirable qualities of truly non-abusive men, for they might be qualities that are characteristic of men who are physically or emotionally abusive but not sexually abusive. Thus, unless the comparison is made with a clean group that is relatively nonviolent with respect to all forms of woman abuse, factors that differentiate the two groups have little clinical relevance. Furthermore, important differences between sexually abusive and truly non-abusive men might be obscured; that is, when no differences are found between the groups, this could mean that sexually abusive men are similar to physically/emotionally abusive men in the comparison group. For these reasons, the present investigation considers sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness in the same study.

#### Integration of Research on Risk-Factors and Anti-Risk Factors in the Present Study

In addition to exploring risk-factors of men's abusiveness, the present study also aimed to identify anti-risk factors. Anti-risk factors refer to attitudes, beliefs, or habits that are not simply the absence of a risk factor, but that are the presence of something that interferes with the development or expression of risk factors. The concept of anti-risk factors derives from an application of the cognitive-behavioral perspective that has not previously been examined in the abuse literatures. That is the concept of Differential Reinforcement of Incompatible Behavior (DRI) as described by Nemeroff and Karoly (1991). DRI is an alternative to punishment and extinction in

decreasing response likelihood (in this case abusive behavior). The key to its use is in identifying a behavior that is truly incompatible with the problem behavior. The basic principle is that one cannot do two incompatible things at once. Reinforcement has generally been found to be more effective in changing behavior than punishment or non-reinforcement, largely because it does not have the unintended side effects of increasing resentment and aggression (Axelrod & Apsche, 1983). Because DRI is based on reinforcement rather than punishment or non-reinforcement, it is likely to be powerful in and of itself; because it can be used in conjunction with techniques to punish or not reinforce the unwanted abusive behaviors, it may contribute to even more powerful interventions than could be developed using any one method by itself.

The exploration of the present study extends the principle of DRI to attitudes and beliefs. It is hypothesized that if certain attitudes and beliefs can be risk-factors that increase the likelihood of abusive behavior, there may be other, incompatible attitudes and beliefs that may be considered anti-risk factors that decrease the likelihood of abusive behavior. These anti-risk factors would be qualitatively more than just the inverse or absence of risk factors, but would be truly different and incompatible attitudes or beliefs or habits. For example, believing that one derives a great deal of satisfaction from earning another's trust might make earning another's trust a goal one strives to achieve. Callous and abusive behavior in any arena -- sexual, emotional, or physical -- would be an impediment to earning and keeping another person's trust. Therefore one who values earning another's trust would be intrinsically motivated to communicate and interact with others sensitively rather than abusively. This would be a more primary, and perhaps stronger, motivator than only external controls such as laws and would be considered an anti-risk factor. Of key importance, anti-risk factors offer a positive, intrinsically rewarding reason for replacing certain abusive behaviors

with certain non-abusive behaviors. This is in distinction to a strategy that relies only on punishment to deter abusive behaviors that may be intrinsically satisfying for the abuser. Anti-risk factors are themselves intrinsically satisfying.

### The Present Study

The present study was exploratory in nature and aimed to accomplish 3 major goals: (a) to explore the prevalence of, relationships among, and correlates of, men's sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners and others, (b) to compare sexually abusive men with completely non-abusive men on variables that previous research suggests should differentiate these two groups, and (c) to identify one or more anti-risk factors that could potentially be promoted in the socialization of future generations of men, and perhaps the re-socialization of the present generation.

This study was approached from a perspective that views all levels of abuse as part of a continuum rather than as qualitatively different. Thus, the term sexual abuse will refer to all "levels" of sexual violation ranging from unwanted touching obtained by continued arguments to unwanted intercourse obtained by physical force.

Likewise, physical abuse will refer to all levels of physical violation or threat of physical violation ranging from slamming a door to injuring a person with a weapon, and emotional abuse will refer to all levels of emotional violation ranging from devaluing another's thoughts or opinions to humiliating or frightening them.

Research questions. This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the prevalence and frequency of heterosexual men's sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness, toward romantic partners and others?
2. What are the relationships among the different types of abusiveness?

3. Are partners or others more often the recipients of each type of abuse?

When each type of abuse is further categorized into subtypes of abuse, are partners or others more often the recipients of each subtype of abuse?

4. How does a concern with social desirability relate to men's propensity to engage in or report each type of abuse?

5a. What is the explanatory contribution of childhood experiences? What is the incremental explanatory contribution of current habits beyond what is explained by childhood experiences? What is the incremental explanatory contribution of current attitudes beyond what is explained by the combination of childhood experiences and current habits? Does alcohol consumption interact with attitudes to explain even more variance in abusiveness than is explained by their simple additive effects?

5b. How much of each type of abusiveness can be explained by a man's childhood experiences beyond what is explained by his current habits and attitudes?

6. How do men who are highly sexually abusive differ from men who are sexually non-abusive and physically and emotionally low-abusive (a cleaner comparison group than has been used in previous research)? How do they differ from men who are sexually non-abusive but who may or may not be highly physically and emotionally abusive (the comparison group that is typically used in sexual aggression research)?

7. Can we identify an "anti-risk factor" that might make some of these men less likely to abuse than others even if they had childhood experiences that would typically lead to abusiveness as an adult?

## Method

### Subjects

Participants were 424 men enrolled in introductory psychology classes. They received course credit for participating. In order for their data to be used in the study, the following inclusion criteria had to be met: (a) They had to be between 18 and 21 years old, (b) the sexual preference they indicated had to be heterosexual, (c) they had to indicate that English is the language they now speak best, and (d) their questionnaires had to pass several validity checks designed to detect random responses, extreme response biases, and failure to read carefully and follow simple directions.

An age criterion of no more than a 4-year span was established because age was expected to affect both recall of childhood experiences and prevalence and recall of sexual aggression. Because 45% of all alleged rapists who are arrested are under age 25 (FBI, 1986), and because the majority of college students are between the ages of 18 and 21, the age criterion was set at 18 to 21. Data from 44 respondents (10.4%) were not used because these respondents were over 21 years old.

This study was restricted to heterosexual men because a man's sexual orientation could affect his attitudes and behaviors independent of his degree of abusiveness, and because it was not expected that large enough samples of homosexual and bisexual men would be obtained to include sexual orientation as a variable. Data from 15 respondents (3.5%) were not used because these respondents reported one of the following: homosexual preference ( $n = 6$ ), bisexual preference ( $n = 4$ ), or did not report their sexual preference ( $n = 5$ ).

Fluency in English was required not only for the obvious reason of insuring that respondents would be capable of reading and completing a moderately long questionnaire packet, but also to insure that differences in responding would not be due to misinterpretation of the questions or linguistic styles of respondents whose

familiarity with the English language and American culture is minimal. Data from 19 respondents (4.5%) were not used because these respondents were not fluent in English (14 respondents indicated this on the demographics form; an additional 5 respondents left this question blank and did not attempt to answer questions that required written responses). Thus, the number of respondents who met the demographic criteria for inclusion in this study was 356.

Three methods were employed to detect invalid responding: (a) 2-point scales, 3-point scales, and 4-point scales were intermingled with 5-point scales. Random responders could thus be detected at several points throughout the questionnaire; for example, choices C, D, or E were considered invalid on a 2-point question. Sixteen (4.5% of those who met the demographic criteria) random responders were detected and excluded from the sample. (b) Two similar scales, which were scored in opposite directions, were used to detect responders who answered 100% of the items in one direction (e.g., sexually abusive) on one questionnaire and 100% of the items in the opposite direction (e.g., not sexually abusive) on the other questionnaire. Three respondents (0.8%) were thus detected and excluded, leaving 338 questionnaires for the third validity check. (c) The question, "Have you read this? If so, mark choice E," was embedded near the end of the questionnaire in a scale measuring physical abusiveness for which response patterns were expected to favor choice A (never). Fifty-five of the 338 respondents failed to choose E as directed and were thus excluded from the study. Because of a concern that failure to respond as directed could reflect a systematic difference in variables of interest and thus potentially restrict the range of scores on those variables, means on all variables were compared for the two groups -- those who chose E as directed and those who did not. T tests indicated that there were no significant differences in the means between the two groups on any scales except the

one in which the question was embedded. The question appeared to be detecting a response pattern (choice A) in the direction opposite to the one which the question directs the respondent to choose (choice E) in addition to detecting individuals who stopped reading individual questions on this scale. Another difference between the two groups was that the group that failed to answer E had three times the percentage of random responders on other scales than did the group that answered E as directed. This suggests that this question detected respondents who were careless on other scales besides the one in which the question is embedded.

The final sample that was used in this study consisted of 283 unmarried heterosexual men between the ages of 18 and 21 years, who indicated that English was the language they spoke best, and whose questionnaires passed all three validity checks. Their age composition was as follows: 18 ( $n = 101$ ; 35.7%), 19 ( $n = 111$ ; 39.2%), 20 ( $n = 55$ ; 19.4%), and 21 ( $n = 16$ ; 5.6%). The majority of this sample was European American ( $n = 255$ ; 90.1%), followed by Asian or Pacific Islander ( $n = 12$ ; 4.2%), Hispanic ( $n = 6$ ; 2.1%), African American ( $n = 4$ ; 1.4%), Native American ( $n = 3$ ; 1.1%), Middle Eastern ( $n = 1$ ; <1%), and other ( $n = 2$ ; <1%) ethnic origins. The majority of these respondents were raised in Christian religions other than Catholic ( $n = 129$ ; 45.6%), followed by Catholic ( $n = 110$ ; 38.9%), Jewish ( $n = 16$ ; 5.6%), and other religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam;  $n = 5$ ; 1.8%). No formal religion was practiced in the homes of ( $n = 19$ ; 6.1%) respondents, and four respondents did not answer this question.

### Measures

The Tri-Abuse Scale (TAS; see Appendix B, questions 215 - 250 on first scantron and 1 - 78 on second scantron), developed for this study, was designed to measure sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness directed at a "romantic partner" or

"anyone else," as well as types and frequency of acts within each of these categories. A scale was constructed for each type of abusiveness, using the same response categories for each scale. The item domain for the Sexual Abusiveness Scale (SAS) was based on a review of the sexual assault literature, and loosely based on the widely used Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss, et al, 1987). The item domain for the Physical Abusiveness Scale (PAS) was created from a review of the battering literature. It encompasses all forms of physical violence on the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). The item domain for the Emotional Abusiveness Scale (EAS) was based on a review of the battering literature relevant to emotional abuse, with particular attention to Walker's (1979) description of emotionally abusive behavior in the cycle of violence within battering relationships. The TAS is thus composed of three subscales, one measuring sexual abusiveness (SAS), one measuring physical abusiveness (PAS), and one measuring emotional abusiveness (EAS). Each of these subscales is further divided into subscales reflecting abusive behavior directed at a romantic partner (SASP, PASP, EASP) and abusive behavior directed at anyone other than a romantic partner (SASO, PASO, EASO). All questions on the TAS are behavioral, describing activities that the respondent may have engaged in since the age of 14. Example questions include "Have you succeeded in having sexual intercourse (oral, anal, or vaginal) with someone when they didn't want to by overwhelming them with continual arguments?" (SAS); "Have you pushed, grabbed, shoved, shaken, or slapped someone; pinned someone down or prevented someone from leaving?"(PAS); and "Have you intentionally tried to make someone feel inferior by calling them degrading names such as 'slut,' 'fag,' etc.?" (EAS).

The SAS crossed 2 types of sexual activity (sexual contact, including fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse, and sexual intercourse, including oral, anal, or

vaginal) with 4 methods of obtaining the activity (overwhelming with arguments, using position of authority, threatening or using physical force, and giving the person alcohol or drugs) with 2 possible outcomes (unsuccessfully attempted the activity or succeeded in doing the activity) with 2 targets (romantic partner or anyone else). The PAS crossed level of force (see below) with 7 types of physical acts of abusiveness (ranging from slamming a door or smashing an inanimate object to physically attacking another's body using objects or weapons), with 2 targets (romantic partner or anyone else). In all but the first two questions, three levels of force were specified ("did this with a great deal of force," " did this without a great deal of force," and "threatened to do this"). The EAS crossed 21 individual acts of emotional abusiveness (ranging from completely disregarding another's feelings or opinions, to humiliating, harassing, and frightening another) with 2 targets (romantic partner or anyone else). For all items on the Tri-Abuse Scale, five response categories were provided, ranging from Never (1) to More than 20 times (5).

In this study the internal consistency of each of the three subscales was above .90, as measured by Cronbach's alpha (SAS: 32 items, alpha = .906; PAS: 38 items, alpha = .921; EAS: 42 items, alpha = .928). One month test-retest reliabilities were also obtained for 117 of the 128 fall semester respondents who returned for retesting one month after the original testing session (8.6% failed to return for the retest session). Test-retest reliabilities were as follows: SAS,  $r = .753$ , PAS,  $r = .630$ , EAS,  $r = .999$ .

The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss, et al., 1987) is a 10-item survey that assesses sexual experiences similar to those assessed by the SAS. Unlike the SAS, developed for the present study, the SES does not cross all four methods of obtaining a nonconsensual sexual act with both types of acts and both types of

outcomes, and its answer choices are dichotomized into a Yes/No format. This measure was administered to detect respondents who endorsed 100% of the items in one direction on the SAS and 100% in the opposite direction on the SES. Cronbach's alpha for an earlier version of the SES has been reported as .89 (Koss & Gidycz, 1985); Cronbach's alpha was .83 in our sample.

The Parent Behavior Form (PBF; Kelly & Worell, 1976) is a questionnaire that measures adult respondents' recollection of their relationships with each of their parents during their childhood years. In the present study six 9-item subscales of this questionnaire were used. The Mother Rejection (MR) and Father Rejection (FR) subscales measure the degree to which the respondents remember each parent as making them feel rejected as children. The Mother Hostile Control (MHC) and Father Hostile Control (FHC) subscales measure the degree to which the respondents remember each parent as exerting hostile control over them during their childhood years. The Mother Acceptance (MAC) and Father Acceptance (FAC) subscales measure the degree to which the respondents remember each parent making them feel accepted as children. Example questions include, "Thought I was just someone to 'put up with'" (MR, FR); "When I didn't do as she/he wanted, said I wasn't grateful for all she/he had done for me" (MHC, FHC); and "Was able to make me feel better when I was upset" (MAC, FAC). Acceptance items were interspersed among the rejection and hostile control items so that not all questions would be negative. Acceptance items were not scored for this study. The median internal reliability estimates derived from college students for the PBF scales have been reported to range from .79 to .82 (McCranie & Simpson, 1986). In this sample, Cronbach's alpha was .650 for FR, .794 for FHC, and .827 for FR and FHC combined; .485 for MR, .813 for MHC, and .801 for MR and MHC combined; .848 for MAC, and .872 for FAC. The present

study will use the composite MRHC and FRHC because these composites are more reliable than the subscales they are composed of. The average test-retest reliability of the entire Parent Behavior Form (including scales not used in this study) for a sample of college students is approximately .79 (Houston & Vavak, 1991). In this sample test-retest reliabilities were .75 for mother rejection and hostile control, and .71 for father rejection and hostile control.

Violence in family of origin items (Koss & Dinero, 1988) are used to assess parent-to-child physical abuse (PCA) and parent-to-parent physical abuse (PPA). A sample question is, "Physical blows (like hitting, kicking, throwing someone down) sometimes occur between family members. For an average month, check how often these occurred in your family when you were growing up. One of your parents did this to you (a) never (b) once or twice (c) 3-5 times, (d) 6-10 times or (e) over 10 times." Respondents indicate level of violence experienced on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 4. Endorsements are summed to yield a total score.

The Early Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Dinero, 1988) is an 8-item scale that measures sexual acts that another person did to the respondent before the respondent reached the age of 14. This is followed by 10 questions that ask the respondent to describe the highest numbered experience endorsed in the 8-item scale. A sample question from the 8-item scale is, "Another person showed his/her sex organs to you?" Respondents indicate the approximate number of times they have had each experience before the age of 14 on a 5-point scale anchored by never (0) and more than 5 times (4). Response categories are summed to yield a total score. A sample question from the descriptive items is, "What is the main reason you participated?" The alternatives are (a) felt good, (b) curiosity, (c) other person bribed me with money or candy, (d) other person used authority or threatened me, and (e) other person used

physical force. In the present study, experiences reported in the first 8 items were labeled Type 1 child sexual abuse (ABUS1) if either of the following were endorsed in the next 11 items: (a) the reason the respondent participated was because the other person bribed him or used authority, threats, or physical force; or (b) as a result of this experience the respondent felt victimized or taken advantage of anywhere from "a little" to "very much." The construct measured by the first 8 items alone was labeled Type 2 child sexual abuse (ABUS2). In this sample, Cronbach's alpha for the 8-item scale was .913, and test-retest reliability was .84.

The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (first subscale; RMA; Burt, 1980) 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 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (0) to strongly agree (4).<sup>1</sup> Responses to items keyed negatively are reversed, and responses are summed to yield total scores ranging from 0 (least accepting of rape myths) to 44 (most accepting of rape myths). Cronbach's alpha is reported to be .875 (Burt, 1980). In this study's sample, Cronbach's alpha was .762.

The Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (AIV; Burt, 1980) is a 6-item scale that measures the degree to which respondents accept the notion that force and coercion are legitimate ways to gain compliance, especially in intimate and sexual relationships (e.g., "Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women," keyed positively; "A man is never justified in hitting his wife," keyed negatively). Respondents indicate their support for each statement on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (0) to strongly agree (4).<sup>1</sup> Responses to items keyed negatively are reversed, and responses are summed to yield total scores ranging from 0 (least

accepting of this belief) to 24 (most accepting). Cronbach's alpha is reported as being .586 (Burt, 1980). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .528. Because this internal consistency is low, the items were split into three subscales: Acceptance of Violence Toward Women in Sexual Situations (AVS; 3 items); Acceptance of a Husband's Violence Toward His Wife (AVM; 2 items); and Acceptance of General Violence (AVG; 1 item). These categories were rationally derived by reading the content of the items on the AIV; examination of an intercorrelation matrix supported this subdivision. Cronbach's alpha for AVS was .592, an improvement over .528.

The Hostility Toward Women Scale (HOW; Check & Malamuth, 1983) is a 30-item scale that assesses hostile and cynical attitudes toward women (e.g., "I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them" (keyed true); "When I look back at what's happened to me I don't feel at all resentful toward the women in my life" (keyed false). The number of items that are endorsed in the direction indicative of hostility toward women are summed to yield total scores ranging from 0 (no responses hostile toward women) to 30 (all responses hostile toward women). Check and Malamuth (1983) reported a Kuder-Richardson formula 20 (KR 20) reliability of .89 for this scale. In this study Cronbach's alpha was .804.

The Negative Masculinity Scale (NM; Spence, Helmeich, & Holahan, 1979) is a 15-item subscale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. It measures characteristics that men are believed to possess in greater abundance than women, but that in excess would be socially undesirable (e.g., "I am a bossy person," keyed positively; "I give in to other people easily and let them tell me what to do," keyed negatively). Respondents indicate their agreement with these 15 statements on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from not at all like me (0) to very much like me (4).<sup>1</sup> Cronbach's alpha for negative and positive masculinity combined has been reported to

be .76 for college males (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981; Spence et al., 1979). Test-retest reliability has been reported as .76 for college males (Helmreich et al., 1981). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for negative masculinity only was .642.

The Sexual Conservatism Scale (SC; Burt, 1980) is a 10-item scale that assesses the belief that only traditional sexual behaviors are legitimate (e.g., "A woman shouldn't give in sexually to a man too easily or he'll think she's loose," keyed positively; "Masturbation is a normal sexual activity," keyed negatively). Respondents indicate their support for each statement on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (0) to strongly agree (4).<sup>1</sup> Responses to items keyed negatively are reversed, and responses are summed to yield total scores ranging from 0 (least sexually conservative) to 40 (most sexually conservative). Cronbach's alpha is reported as .811 (Burt, 1980). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .545.

Age of first sexual intercourse (FIRSTINT; Koss & Dinero, 1988) was measured by the following item: "How old were you when you first had sexual intercourse (either forced or voluntary)?" Response categories were (a) 13 or younger (scored 4), (b) 14 or 15, (c) 16 or 17, (e) 18 or 19, and (e) Over 20, or haven't yet (scored 0). The test-retest reliability for this item was .796.

Alcohol consumption (ALC; Koss & Dinero, 1988) was measured by a set of three items that measured the frequency of alcohol consumption, the quantity consumed on a typical drinking occasion, and the frequency of drinking to the point of intoxication or drunkenness (ie. feeling dizzy, feeling ill, passing out, or feeling out of control). The test-retest reliability for this set of items was .870.

How sexually active a man is (SACT) was measured by two items that asked about frequency of "sexual intercourse (oral, anal, or vaginal) with someone when they let you know they wanted to have intercourse with you, and you also really wanted

this" The same response format was used as has been described for the SAS. In this sample, the test-retest reliability for this set of items was .74.

How frequently a man reads pornographic magazines (PRN; Koss & Dinero, 1988) was measured by an item that asked: "How often do you read any of the following magazines: Playboy, Penthouse, Chic, Forum, Gallery, Genesis, Oui, or Hustler? (Check one)." Response categories were (a) Never, (b) Seldom, (c) Somewhat frequently, and (e) Very frequently. In this sample, the test-retest reliability for this item was .63.

Sex talk with peers (STK; Koss & Dinero, 1988) was measured by an item that asked: "Currently, when you are with your friends, how often do you hear talk that speculates about 'How a particular woman would be in bed?' (Check one)." Response categories were (a) Never, (b) A few times a year, (c) Monthly, (d) Weekly, and (e) Daily. In this sample, the test-retest reliability for this item was .58.

The Social Desirability Scale (SOC; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) is a 32-item scale that assesses the degree to which a person reports statistically infrequent, but socially desirable behaviors as true of herself or himself, and statistically frequent, but socially undesirable behaviors as false for herself or himself. This scale is thus an indicator of the degree to which a person wants to appear socially desirable (e.g., "Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates," keyed true; "If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do so," keyed false). The number of items that are endorsed in the direction marked as indicative of socially desirable responding are summed to yield total scores ranging from 0 (no socially desirable responses) to 32 (all socially desirable responses). The internal consistency coefficient using KR 20, is reported to be .88

(Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .726. One month test-retest reliability is reported to be .89 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

Anti-risk items. The first potential anti-risk item, geared toward prevention of sexual abusiveness, was rationally developed by asking: The pursuit of what pleasure might interfere with tendencies to trick, use, or disregard another person's feelings? A reasonable answer appeared to be the pursuit of the satisfaction that comes from earning another person's trust. An item that read, "Earning someone's trust is a very satisfying experience for me," was thus the first potential anti-risk item.

The second anti-risk candidate, geared toward the prevention of abusive behavior that is largely motivated by low frustration tolerance, or anger, was developed by asking the following question: What response might a person have when things do not go as planned or expected that is more than merely the absence of anger? A reasonable response appeared to be curiosity. An item that read, "When things don't go as I had planned or expected, I become curious rather than upset or angry," was thus the second potential anti-risk item.

These items were embedded in the first subtest of the questionnaire packet. This section included the negative masculinity scale and "filler items" from other subscales of the PAQ, included to obscure the sharp contrast between these items and the negative masculinity items.

The third anti-risk candidate was developed by asking: What experience could even an abused child have, which could be encouraged by schools and other public service agencies, and which might foster development of a reflective nature that might resist oversubscribing to the macho image? A reasonable response appeared to be reading, assuming that at least some of the material read portrayed perspectives other

than that which dominates the mass media. An item that read, "Did you read a lot when you were growing up?" was thus the third exploratory item.

### Procedure

Participants were tested in groups of 8 to 35 during the 1990 fall semester and the 1991 spring semester. Six male upperclass undergraduate research assistants administered the questionnaire packet after memorizing and role-playing a standard set of instructions. The procedures followed during the spring semester were identical to those followed during the fall semester, with the exception that fall semester participants returned for a second testing session one month after the first session for the purpose of obtaining test-retest reliabilities for the Tri-Abuse Scale and several other measures; spring semester participants were not re-tested. Fall test-retest reliabilities were obtained for the following measures: the Tri-Abuse Scale, Parent Behavior Form (rejection and hostile control subscales for both parents), Early Sexual Experiences Survey, age of first sexual intercourse, alcohol consumption, the respondent's report of how sexually active he is, the respondent's report of how frequently he uses pornographic magazines, and the respondent's report of how frequently he engages in sex talk with peers.

Care was taken to insure anonymity and encourage honest responding. Participants were informed orally that their questionnaires would be identified only by ID numbers created for this study (not their student ID numbers), and that their names could in no way be associated with the questionnaires to which they responded. To maximize privacy during the questionnaire administration, participants were seated in alternate seats. They were required to read and sign a written consent statement before participating in the study, which re-iterated these instructions and informed them that if they became uncomfortable they could discontinue their participation at any time (see

Appendix A). The consent form also provided the names and phone numbers of community resources available to anyone who felt as if he might benefit from talking to someone after participation in this study. Participants then completed a demographics sheet (see Appendix B) and the questionnaire packet. The questionnaire packet contained the following scales in the order presented: the Negative Masculinity Scale, the Social Desirability Scale and Hostility Toward Women Scale (which were intermingled), six Parent Behavior Form subscales (Rejection, Hostile Control, and Acceptance), items assessing level of violence in the family of origin, the Early Sexual Experiences Survey, the Alcohol Use Scale, several questions assessing current habits and degree of mutually consensual sexual activity, the Tri-Abuse Scale, the Sexual Experiences Survey, and the Sexual Conservatism, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence, and Rape Myth Acceptance scales (see Appendix C). The Rape Myth Acceptance scale was administered last to avoid sensitizing participants to the focus of this study of assessing rape and related behaviors (the word rape was not used in the Tri-Abuse scale; only the behavior was described). At the end of the questionnaire packet was a page with 5 questions to which the respondent was allowed to write an open response in the 4 lines provided for each question. These open responses were used to verify the response on the demographic sheet regarding fluency in English and to generate hypotheses for future research.

Upon completion of participation in this study, respondents were given a handout that, in addition to explaining the nature of the study and the value of their participation, also explained the nature of acquaintance rape and what they could do on a personal level and on a broader social level to help prevent its occurrence (see Appendix D).

## Results

### Descriptive Data

#### Incidence and Frequency of Each Type of Abusiveness

The prevalence and frequency of subtypes of sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners and others are summarized in Table 1. The frequencies reported are conservative estimates that were calculated by adding the lowest number from each frequency category. For example, for D = 6 to 20 times, 6 was added to the total only for those items that clearly referred to different acts (e.g., if a man endorsed categories other than "never" on several items that referred to different methods of obtaining sexual intercourse against someone's will, only the one method that he used most frequently was counted, because more than one method could have been used to obtain one act of intercourse).

The percentage of men who reported having engaged in abusive behavior ranged from 19.1% for sexual intercourse with an unwilling person who is not a romantic partner, to 98.9% for humiliating anyone other than a romantic partner. The minimum mean number of abusive incidents reported per abusive person ranged from 6.44 (sexual abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner) to 48.84 (emotional abusiveness towards anyone other than a romantic partner).

#### Relationships Among Different Types of Abusiveness

A principal components factor analysis was attempted on the individual items of the Tri-Abuse Scale. High correlations among variables within that scale resulted in an ill-conditioned correlation matrix; therefore, similar items were summed to form 14 composite variables (see Table 2 and Appendix C-1). A principal components factor analysis with both orthogonal (varimax) and oblique (oblimin) rotations was then performed on these 14 variables. Table 2 shows the two factors that emerged -- a

Table 1

Prevalence and Frequency of Each Type and Subtype of Abuse

Type of Abuse	Target of Abuse	Percentage Reporting any occurrence of beh. specified	Mean Minimum # of Incidents since age 14 per individ. in column on left
Unwanted Sexual Intercourse	Partner	21.2%	5.0
	Other	19.1%	3.9
Unwanted Sexual Contact	Partner	39.9%	5.0
	Other	34.3%	4.8
(SAS)	Combined	48.8%	11.2
Actual Physical Attack	Partner	41.3%	7.4
	Other	67.5%	14.3
Threaten Physical Attack	Partner	36.0%	3.2
	Other	57.6%	5.5
Physical Acting Out	In Partner's Presence	84.8%	12.1
	In Other's Presence	93.6%	18.6
(PAS)	Combined	98.9%	49.6
Frighten or tyrannize	Partner	51.6%	4.5
	Other	70.3%	6.5
Humiliate or Belittle	Partner	98.6%	26
	Other	98.9%	45.1
(EAS)	Combined	100.0%	64.9

Note. SAS = Sexual Abusiveness Scale. EAS = Emotional Abusiveness Scale. PAS = Physical Abusiveness Scale.

Table 2

Factor Analysis of 14 Subtypes and Targets of Abuse

Subtypes and Targets of Abuse	% of variance accounted for	Factor Loadings
Factor 1: Emotional and Physical Abusiveness	45.0%	
Emotional		
Humiliating Partner (HUM-P)		.72
Humiliating Others (HUM-O)		.78
Frightening Partner (FRT-P)		.59
Frightening Others (FRT-O)		.69
Physical		
Physical acting out in partner's presence (ACT-P)		.69
Physical acting out in others' presence (ACT-O)		.66
Explicitly threatening to physically attack partner (THRT-P)		.70
Explicitly threatening to physically attack other (THRT-O)		.71
Actual physical attack of partner (ATTK-P)		.66
Actual physical attack of others (ATTK-O)		.66
Factor 2: Sexual Abusiveness	18.1%	
Unwanted Sexual Contact -- Partner (CONT-P)		.78
Unwanted Sexual Contact -- Others (CONT-O)		.79
Unwanted Sexual Intercourse -- Partner (INT-P)		.90
Unwanted Sexual Intercourse -- Others (INT-O)		.90

Note. Only variables loading .3 or greater are shown.

sexual abusiveness factor and a physical and emotional abusiveness factor. Variables that loaded at least .3 on either of these factors are presented. The factors were correlated .34. To increase confidence in the stability of these findings, the sample was split by semester (Fall and Spring), and then a random split was used for each semester to generate four data sets that were each factor analyzed in the way described for the full sample. All four samples and both rotational procedures yielded the same two factors, with the same 10 variables loading on the first factor and the same 4 variables loading on the second factor.

A correlation matrix presenting the relations among sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners and others is presented in Table 3. Because SASP and SASO are extremely highly correlated ( $r = .86$ ), these two variables were combined into their composite, SAS, for further analyses.

Table 3

Correlations Among Sexual, Physical, and Emotional Abusiveness Toward Romantic Partners and Others, and The Relationship of These Variables to Social Desirability

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. SASP	1.0	.86**	.53**	.37**	.40**	.20*
2. SASO		1.0	.48**	.34**	.36**	.23**
3. EASP			1.0	.66**	.75**	.40**
4. EASO				1.0	.57**	.66**
5. PASP					1.0	.59**
6. PASO						1.0
7. SAS	.96**	.95**	.47**	.30**	.41**	.17**
8. SOC	-.25**	-.20*	-.26**	-.36*	-.13	-.20*

Note. SASP = Sexual Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. SASO = Sexual Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner. EASP = Emotional Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. EASO = Emotional Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner. PASP = Physical Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. PASO = Physical Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner. SAS = Total Sexual Abusiveness Score. SOC = Social Desirability.

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

Who Are The Targets of What Types and Subtypes of Abuse?

For each type and subtype of abuse, Table 4 shows how many men reported abusing only romantic partners, how many reported abusing only persons other than romantic partners, how many reported abusing both romantic partners and others, and Table 4

Number of Men Who Report Having Engaged in Particular Abusive Behaviors Toward

Particular Targets

	No One	Partner Only	Other Only	Partner and Other
Any Sexual Abusiveness	144	37a	24b	77
Intercourse	207	21	15	39
Contact	147	39a	23b	74
By Force	270	6	2	4
By Alcohol	201	12a	27b	42
By Authority	271	6a	0b	5
By Verbal Persuasion	179	34a	10b	59
Any Physical Abusiveness	3	12a	33b	235
Actual physical attack	75	17a	91b	100
Threat of Physical attack	122	11a	71b	79
Physical Acting Out	4	14a	39b	226
Any Emotional Abusiveness	0	2a	21b	259
Humiliate	0	2	2	278
Frighten	115	14a	65b	88

Note. Table entries with different subscripts differ at the .05 level of significance as per McNemar's Test of Dichotomous Variables.

how many reported abusing no one. McNemar's Test of Dichotomous variables (Fleiss, 1981) was used to test the significance of differences in the number of men who reported abusing partners and the number of men who reported abusing others. Romantic partners were significantly more often the targets of unwanted sexual activity obtained by a man's use of authority or verbal persuasion, but others were significantly more often the targets of unwanted sexual activity when alcohol was involved. Persons other than romantic partners were significantly more often the targets of all types and subtypes of physical and emotional abusiveness except humiliation; however, approximately half of the abusive men (in most subcategories of physical and emotional abusiveness) had both romantic partners and others as targets.

#### Social Desirability and the Propensity to Engage in or Report Different Types of Abuse Toward Different Targets

The relationship between the degree to which men reported socially desirable behavior and the kind of abuse they reported are presented at the bottom of Table 3. The more more that men endorsed a variety of socially desirable behaviors as characteristic of themselves, the less likely they were to report all combinations of types and targets of abusiveness except one -- physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner.

#### What is the Incremental Explanatory Contribution of Childhood Experiences, Current Habits, Current Attitudes, and Interactions of Alcohol and Attitudes, in the Prediction of Each Type of Abusiveness?

A set of hierarchical multiple regression analyses was conducted to assess the incremental explanatory contribution of childhood experiences, current habits, current attitudes, and interactions of alcohol and attitudes in the prediction of each type of abusiveness. Each type of abusiveness served as the dependent variable in a separate

regression analysis. Because SASP and SASO were correlated .86 (see Table 3; also, see Nunally, 1988, for a discussion of combining highly correlated variables), their composite, SAS, was used in these hierarchical analyses. Correlations among predictor variables were also examined for items with correlations above .60 (see Table 5). Mother rejection and hostile control and father rejection and hostile control were thus combined to form a new variable, parent rejection and hostile control (PRHC).

Five variables were considered exploratory and entered in a last step rather than in the main body of the hierarchical analyses. Variables were considered exploratory if they met any of the following criteria that render their reliability or validity questionable: (a) a one or two item variable requires the respondent to report something other than his own behavior or direct experiences of another's behavior, (b) a scale is comprised almost exclusively of items that previous research indicates are very difficult for respondents to answer validly, or (c) a scale has a Cronbach's alpha well below .6 in the present study, and is not well-supported in previous research. Three variables were considered exploratory on the basis of the first criterion: general interpersonal violence (AVG), acceptance of a man's violence toward his wife (AVM), and parent to parent physical abuse (PPA). The first two are attitudes, not behaviors, and the third is a second-hand report, not a direct experience. Type 1 Child Sexual Abuse (ABUS1) requires the respondent to label his early sexual experiences as abusive or coerced. Because there is some evidence that men are particularly reluctant to view themselves as having been victimized (Finkelhor, 1984), ABUS1 was deemed to meet the second criterion, and was also treated as exploratory. One multi-item scale with a Cronbach alpha well below .6 was also considered exploratory: Sexual Conservatism (Cronbach's alpha = .545). Table 6 reports the Pearson correlations and semi-partial correlations between each predictor variable and each abusiveness variable.

Table 5

Intercorrelation among Predictor Variables; Means and Standard Deviations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. PCA	1.0																
2. PPA	.34**	1.0															
3. MRHC	.35**	.12*	1.0														
4. FRHC	.38**	.20**	.64**	1.0													
5. ABUS2	.13*	.14*	.06	.11	1.0												
6. ABUS1	.02	.01	.03	.00	-.15	1.0											
7. AGEF	-.01	-.03	-.04	-.01	-.13	-.12	1.0										
8. RMA	.02	.04	.26**	.16**	.07	-.06	.14	1.0									
9. HOW	.10	.12*	.33**	.34**	.12*	.05	.07	.43**	1.0								
10. AVS	.05	.07	.20**	.11	.03	-.05	-.16*	.52**	.29**	1.0							
11. AVM	-.00	.05	.09	.05	.01	.01	-.12	.11	.03	.17**	1.0						
12. NM	-.00	-.03	.24**	.17**	.16**	-.08	-.07	.28**	.31**	.17**	.03	1.0					
13. CON	.01	.03	-.00	-.02	-.03	.11	-.03	.20**	-.02	.09	-.05	-.00	1.0				
14. ALC	.04	.07	.14*	.14*	.18**	-.06	-.08	.15*	.23**	.17**	.01	.14*	-.13*	1.0			
15. STK	-.06	.03	.06	.06	.12	.06	-.01	.10	.20**	.15*	.02	.09	.00	.33**	1.0		
16. PRN	-.00	.17**	.10	.09	.14*	-.13	.06	.17**	.21**	.15*	.06	.19**	-.17**	.13*	.07	1.0	
17. SACT	-.00	-.00	.14*	.17**	.36**	.00	-.15	.15*	.13*	.11	.01	.17**	-.15*	.39**	.14*	.18**	1.0
MEAN	.41	.13	7.5	7.9	6.0	.96	.85	10.1	9.5	2.8	1.7	23.4	17.0	6.4	2.9	.99	3.3
SD	.73	.44	5.5	6.1	7.9	1.8	.81	6.3	5	2.2	1.9	6.8	5.1	2.8	.99	.67	2.4

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

**Note.** PCA = Parent to child physical abuse. PPA = parent to parent physical abuse. MRHC = mother rejection and hostile control. FRHC = father rejection and hostile control. ABUS2 = Frequency of early sexual experiences at another's request. ABUS1 = Early sexual experiences that were self-identified as abusive, or coerced, or requested by someone older. AGEF = Age at first sexual intercourse. RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance. HOW = Hostility Toward Women. AVS = Acceptance of a man's violence toward women in sexual situations. AVM = Acceptance of a man's violence toward his wife. NM = Negative Masculinity. CONS = Sexual Conservatism. ALC = Alcohol consumption. STK = Sex talk. PRN = Use of pornographic magazines. SACT = How sexually active a person is.

Table 6

Zero Order Correlations and Semi-partial Correlations Between Risk-Factors and Abusiveness

Predictor (Independent Variables)	Resultant Dependent Variables				
	SAS r	PASP r	EASP r	PASO r	EASO r
<u>Childhood</u>					
PCA	.11 (-.01)	.14 (-.00)	.16** (.00)	.16** (.06)	.13* (-.01)
PPA	.08 (-.01)	.11 (.04)	-.07 (-.00)	-.07 (-.00)	.06 (-.02)
FRHC	.19** (.06)	.29** (.16*)	.32** (.11*)	.18** (.06)	.27** (.09)
MRHC	.19** (.10)	.20** (.01)	.33** (.15)	.17** (.04)	.29** (.15**)
ABUS1	-.05 (-.07)	-.09 (-.02)	-.03 (-.02)	-.09 (-.01)	-.01 (-.03)
ABUS2	.21** (.13*)	.28** (.30****)	.29** (.27****)	.23** (.23****)	.29** (.25****)
% var (Adj Rsq)	6%, p=.0008	13%, p=.0000	18%, p=.0000	8%, p=.0001	14.2%, p=.0000
AGEF	-.11	-.16*	-.17*	-.21**	-.20*
<u>Attitudes</u>					
RMA	.26** (.04)	.26** (.05)	.26** (.03)	.17** (.02)	.21* (-.02)
HOW	.26** (.13*)	.27** (.15)	.32** (.19*)	.23** (.16)	.33* (.22****)
NM	.19** (.08)	.19** (.09)	.24** (.12*)	.16** (.08)	.27** (.17**)
CONS	.06 (.04)	.08 (.06)	.04 (.02)	.08 (.07)	.06 (.06)
AVG	.13 (.04)	.08 (-.02)	.11 (.00)	.07 (.007)	.08 (-.02)
AVS	.28** (.14*)	.26** (.12*)	.28** (.13*)	.12 (.02)	.21** (.09)
AVM	.15* (.10)	.13 (.09)	.11 (.07)	.05 (.04)	.05 (.02)
% var (Adj Rsq)	12%, p=.0000	11%, p=.0000	11%, p=.0000	5%, p=.005	13.6%, p=.0000
<u>Habits</u>					
ALC	.36** (.21****)	.27** (.11****)	.35** (.17****)	.08 (-.03)	.21** (.08)
STK	.13* (.01)	.20** (.11*)	.21** (.10)	.24** (.22)	.19** (.22****)
PRN	.16** (.07*)	.06 (-.01)	.05 (-.04)	.06 (-.03)	.11 (.03)
SACT	.35** (.22****)	.34** (.26****)	.41** (.30****)	.12* (.08)	.23** (-.04)
% var (Adj Rsq)	17.5%, p=.0000	14.2%, p=.0000	21%, p=.0000	5.4%, p=.0007	7.6%, p=.0000

\* p &lt; .05 \*\* p &lt; .01.

\*\*\* p &lt; .005.

\*\*\*\* p &lt; .0005.

Note. SAS=Sexual Abuse. PASP=Physical Abuse to Partner. EASP=Emotional Abuse to Partner. PASO=Physical Abusiveness to Others. PCA=Parent to child physical abuse. PPA=Parent to parent physical abuse. MRHC=Mother rejection and hostile control. FRHC=Father rejection and hostile control. ABUS1=Early sexual experiences that were self-identified as abusive, or coerced, or requested by someone older. ABUS2=frequency of early sexual experiences at another's request. RMA=Rape Myth Acceptance. HOW=Hostility Toward Women. NM = Negative Masculinity. CONS = Sexual Conservatism. AVG = Acceptance of general interpersonal violence. AVS=Acceptance of violence toward a female sexual partner. AVM=Acceptance of a husband's violence toward his wife. ALC = Alcohol consumption. STK = Sex talk. PRN = Use of pornographic magazines. SACT = How sexually active a person is.

Before the hierarchical regression multiple analyses were performed, regressions and correlations were run to examine the effects of demographic variables on SAS, EASP, EASO, PASP, and PASO in order to determine whether any demographic variables would have to be statistically controlled. Four orthogonal contrast coded vectors were formed to represent the 5 categories of religious background. Because 90.1% of this sample was European American, respondents of all other ethnic origins were combined and a Pearson correlation was calculated between the composite variable and the European American variable. No demographic variable was significantly related to any abuse variable (see Table 7).

Because childhood experiences would have preceded the other risk factors in time, they were entered as a set in the first step of each analysis. Age of first sexual intercourse was entered in a second step, followed by current habits, which were entered in a third step. Current attitudes were entered in a fourth step to see how important attitudinal risk factors are, after childhood experiences and current risky habits were taken into account. Because alcohol may be used as an excuse to act on attitudes and thus augment the effects of attitudinal risk factors, alcohol by attitude interactions were examined (Table 8) and entered in a fifth step. The five exploratory variables were entered in the last step of these hierarchical analyses.

The current attitudes measured in this study contributed significantly to sexual abusiveness (see Table 9) and to physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner, after childhood experiences, age of first intercourse, and current habits were accounted for. Current attitudes did not similarly contribute to emotional abusiveness toward others or physical abusiveness toward others. Alcohol further augmented the effects of the set of attitudinal risk factors for sexual abusiveness but not for physical and emotional abusiveness.

Table 7

Relationships Between Demographics and Abusiveness

Predictor (Independent Variables)	Resultant Dependent Variables				
	SAS r	EASP r	EASO r	PASP r	PASO r
<u>Demographics</u>					
Ethnicity	.00	-.03	-.01	-.01	.01
Age	.10	-.03	-.04	.01	-.02
Parent Educ	-.11	-.07	-.06	-.08	-.08
Relig as ch	R=.13	R=.11	R=.16	R=.13	R=.15

Note. SAS = Sexual Abusiveness. EASP = Emotional Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. EASO = Emotional Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than A Romantic Partner. PASP = Physical Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. PASO = Physical Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner.

Table 8

Alcohol by Attitude Interactions in the Prediction of Adult Abusive Behavior

Predictor Variables	Resultant Dependent Variables									
	SAS		PASP		EASP		PASO		EASO	
	Rsq ch	Tot R sq	Rsq ch	Tot R sq	Tsq ch	Tot R sq	Rsq ch	Tot R sq	Rsq ch	Tot R sq
Step Var										
1. HOW		6.2%***		6.7%***		10.0%***		5.0%***		10.6%***
2. ALC	9.2%	15.4%***	4.7%	11.4%***	8.0%	18.0%***	ns		1.5%	12.1%*
3. interaction	1.5%	17.0%*		ns		ns	ns			ns
1. RM		6.3%***		6.3%***		6.4%***		2.4%**		3.9%***
2. ALC	10.3%	16.7%****	5.6%	11.9%***	10.0%	14.5%***	ns		2.9%	6.8%**
3. interaction		ns	1.6%	13.5%*		ns	ns			ns
1. NM		3.3%**		3.3%**		5.5%***		2.1%**		7.1%***
2. ALC	11.0%	14.3%****	6.2%	9.5%***	10.3%	16.0%***	ns		2.7%	9.8%**
3. interaction		ns		ns		ns	ns			ns
1. AVS		7.5%***		6.4%***		7.3%***		1.0%		4.1%***
2. ALC	9.8%	17.3%***	5.4%	11.8%***	9.5%	17.0%***	ns		2.8%	6.9%**
3. interaction	2.0%	17.5%*	1.4%	13.2%*		ns	ns			ns
1. SACT		12.2%****		11.6%****		16.2%****		1.0%		4.8%***
2. ALC	5.3%	17.5%****	1.9%	13.5%***	4.1%	20.3%****	ns		2.0%	6.8%*
3. interaction	3.5%	21%****	3.3%	16.8%***	1.7%	22.0%**	ns			ns
1. AVM		1.7%*		1.4%*		1.0%*		ns		ns
2. ALC	12.2%	13.9%****	7.0%	8.4%****	12.5%	13.5%****	ns			4.6%***
3. interaction		ns	1.4%	9.8%*	1.5%	15%*	ns			ns

Note. SAS = Sexual Abusiveness. PASP = Physical Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. EASP = Emotional Abusiveness Toward a Romantic Partner. PASO = Physical Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner. EASO = Emotional Abusiveness Toward Anyone Other Than a Romantic Partner. HOW = Hostility Toward Women. RM = Rape Myth Acceptance. NM = Negative Masculinity. AVS = Acceptance of Violence Toward Women in Sexual Situations. SACT = How sexually active a person is. AVM = Acceptance of a Husband's violence toward his wife. ALC = Alcohol Consumption.

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$ .\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .\*\*\*\*  $p < .0001$ .

Table 9

Incremental Explanatory Contributions of Childhood Experiences, Current Habits, Current Attitudes, and Interactions Between Attitudes and Habits, to Each Type of Abusiveness

Summary of Adjusted R Square Change				
DEP	PREDICTOR SETS	R sq ch	Rsq tot	p
SAS	1. Childhood Risk Factors	6.9	6.9	.0001
	2. Age of first Sexual Intercourse	3.2	10.1	.0013
	3. Current Habits	8.4	18.5	.0000
	4. Current Attitudes	3.8	22.3	.0023
	5. Alcohol by Attitude Interactions	3.0	25.3	.0060
	6. Exploratory Variables	0.6	25.9	.2100
EMO- PHYS-P	1. Childhood Risk Factors	18.5	18.5	.0000
	2. Age of first sexual Intercourse	0.8	19.3	.0097
	3. Current Habits	9.1	28.4	.0000
	4. Current Attitudes	4.4	32.8	.0003
	5. Alcohol by Attitude Interactions	0.5	33.3	.2012
	6. Exploratory Variables	0.6	33.9	.2005
EMO- PHYS-O	1. Childhood Risk Factors	13.6	13.6	.0000
	2. Age of first sexual Intercourse	-0.2*	13.4	.7812
	3. Current Habits	4.1	17.5	.0018
	4. Current Attitudes	3.0	20.5	.0087
	5. Alcohol by Attitude Interactions	-0.7*	19.8	.7793
	6. Exploratory Variables	-0.2*	19.6	.4728

Note. Adjusted R Square values were used to reduce bias due to the large number of variables tested. Adjusted R Square values do not necessarily increase with the addition of more predictors, and may actually decrease. SAS = Total Sexual Abusiveness. EMO-PHYS-P = Emotional and physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner. EMO-PHYS-O = Emotional and physical abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner. Childhood Risk Factors = rejection and hostile control from both parents, parent to child physical abuse, and frequency of early sexual experiences performed at another's request. Current Habits = alcohol use, use of pornographic magazines, sex talk, and how sexually active a person is. Current Attitudes = Acceptance of rape myths, hostility toward women, acceptance of a man's violence toward women in sexual situations, and negative masculinity. Alcohol by Attitude interactions = four interaction variables. Exploratory variables = early sexual experiences that were self-identified as abusive, or coerced, or requested by someone older, general acceptance of violence, acceptance of a husband's physical violence toward his wife, parent to parent physical abusiveness, and sexual conservatism.

Unique Explanatory Contribution of the Childhood Risk Factor Set

To assess how much of each type of abusiveness can be explained by a man's childhood experiences beyond what is explained by his habits and attitudes, the childhood experiences set was entered in the last step of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis (see Table 10). Early childhood experiences explained significant additional variance for all types of abusiveness except sexual abusiveness.

Table 10

Unique Explanatory Contribution of Childhood Experiences

Summary of Adjusted R square change				
DEP	PREDICTOR SETS	R sq ch	Rsq tot	p
SAS	1. Attitudes and Habits plus interaction	25.3	25.3	.0000
	2. Childhood Risk Factors	0.0	25.3	.3782
EMO-PHYS-P	1. Attitudes and Habits plus interaction	29.0	29.0	.0000
	2. Childhood Risk Factors	4.3	33.3	.0002
EMO-PHYS-O	1. Attitudes and Habits plus interaction	13.8	13.8	.0000
	2. Childhood Risk Factors	6.0	19.8	.0001

Note. Adjusted R Square values were used to reduce bias due to the large number of variables tested. Adjusted R Square values do not necessarily increase with the addition of more predictors, and may actually decrease. SAS = Total Sexual Abusiveness. EMO-PHYS-P = Emotional and physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner. EMO-PHYS-O = Emotional and physical abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner. Current Habits = alcohol use, use of pornographic magazines, sex talk, and how sexually active a person is. Current Attitudes plus interaction = Acceptance of rape myths, hostility toward women, acceptance of a man's violence toward women in sexual situations, negative masculinity, and four alcohol by attitude interaction variables. Childhood Risk Factors = rejection and hostile control from both parents, parent to child physical abuse, and frequency of early sexual experiences performed at another's request.

Comparison of Highly Sexually Abusive Men With a Maximally Clean Comparison Group and With the Typically Used Comparison Group.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the childhood experiences, current habits, and current attitudes of (a) men who were a half standard deviation above the mean on sexual abusiveness, and (b) men who were sexually non-abusive and also a half standard deviation below the mean on both physical, and emotional abusiveness (the maximally clean comparison group). These two groups differed significantly,  $F(1, 91) = 10.43, p = .000$ . The MANOVA was followed up with subsequent analyses of variance (ANOVAS; see Table 11).

Another MANOVA, followed by ANOVAS as described above, was then conducted, this time comparing the sexually abusive men with (c) men who were sexually non-abusive, but who could have been highly abusive physically or emotionally (the typically used comparison group). These two groups also differed significantly,  $F(1, 183) = 5.47, p < .000$ . For all risk-factors except one, subsequent ANOVAS yielded the same conclusions when this less clean comparison group was used as when the cleaner comparison group was used. The exception was an item that assessed how frequently a man witnessed physical violence between his parents when he was a child. This item significantly differentiated the two groups only when the sexually abusive group was compared with the cleaner comparison group (see Table 11).

Table 11

Childhood Experiences, Current Habits, and Current Attitudes of Highly Sexually Abusive Men and Two Comparison Groups

Risk Factor	Highly Sexually Abusive	Cleaner Comparison Group (SAS=0 and low EAS and PAS)	Less Clean Comparison Group (SAS=0; EAS and PAS Not Considered)	F (p)	F (p)
	Mean (SD) (N)	Mean (SD) (N)	Mean (SD) (N)		
MRHC	10.17 (6.05) (47)	4.84 (3.6) (49)	6.78 (5.26) (144)	27.8 (.0000)	13.6 (.0008)
FRHC	10.57 (6.28) (47)	5.04 (4.9) (49)	6.94 (5.83) (143)	23.3 (.0000)	13.2 (.0004)
PCA	0.64 (0.92) (47)	0.33 (0.7) (49)	0.41 (0.76) (144)	3.44 (.067)	02.9 (.09)
PPA	0.26 (0.61) (47)	0.04 (0.2) (49)	0.11 (0.44) (144)	5.5 (.02)	03.1 (.08)
ABU1S	0.98 (1.93) (47)	1.29 (2.2) (49)	1.15 (2.09) (144)	0.53 (.47)	0.23 (.63)
ABU2S	8.21 (8.86) (47)	3.02 (4.6) (49)	4.9 (7.6) (144)	13.1 (.0005)	06.0 (.02)
FRST	2.30 (1.0) (47)	0.92 (1.0) (49)	1.41 (1.18) (141)	46.1 (.0000)	21.5 (.0000)
SEXACT	5.04 (2.15) (47)	1.71 (1.8) (49)	2.60 (2.29) (144)	69.0 (.0000)	42.0 (.0000)
TKP	3.21 (0.75) (47)	2.16 (1.2) (49)	2.76 (1.10) (144)	27.4 (.0000)	08.8 (.0023)
RDP	1.26 (0.64) (47)	0.80 (0.6) (49)	0.85 (0.63) (144)	13.6 (.0004)	14.8 (.0002)
ALC	8.45 (1.84) (47)	4.65 (2.8) (49)	5.37 (3.06) (144)	61.2 (.0000)	42.6 (.0000)
RMA	13.21 (5.70) (46)	7.24 (5.5) (49)	8.33 (6.04) (142)	26.8 (.0000)	23.3 (.0000)
AVS	3.85 (2.07) (46)	1.51 (1.8) (49)	2.27 (2.09) (142)	35.2 (.0000)	20.0 (.0000)
AVM	2.37 (1.90) (46)	1.22 (1.6) (49)	1.56 (1.82) (142)	10.9 (.0000)	06.7 (.01)
HOW					
NM	25.77 (7.18) (47)	20.47 (5.8) (49)	21.94 (6.55) (144)	16.0 (.0001)	11.6 (.0008)
CONS	17.30 (4.18) (46)	17.04 (4.6) (49)	17.21 (5.12) (143)	.09 (.77)	00.0 (.91)

Composition of the Groups

Total Sexual Abusiveness	20.54 (9.65) (47)	0.0 (0) (49)	0.0 (0) (144)
Total Physical Abusiveness	33.62 (23.3) (47)	5.74 (3.6) (49)	20.03 (17.24) (144)
Total Emotional Abusiveness	46.57 (22.7) (47)	11.43 (5.0) (49)	26.15 (19.05) (144)

Note. MRHC = Mother Rejection and Hostile Control. FRHC = Father Rejection and Hostile Control. PCA = Parent to Child Physical Abuse. PPA = Parent to Parent Physical Abuse. ABU1S = Type 1 Child Sexual Abuse. ABU2S = Type 2 Child Sexual Abuse. FIRSTINT = age at first sexual intercourse. SEXACT = frequency of mutually consensual sexual intercourse. TKP = Frequency of talking with peers about how a particular woman would be in bed. RDP = frequency of reading pornographic magazines. ALC = frequency and quantity of alcohol consumption. RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance. AVS = Acceptance of Violence Toward Women in Sexual Situations. AVM = Acceptance of a Husbands' Violence Toward their Wives. NM = Negative Masculinity. CONS = Sexual Conservatism.

## Anti-Risk Factors

The three prospective anti-risk items were assessed in two ways. The first way involved examining the simple Pearson correlation between each potential anti-risk item and a composite abusiveness score formed by adding the Z-scores of sexual abusiveness, physical abusiveness and emotional abusiveness. Only one item "Earning someone's trust is a very satisfying experience for me" achieved significance. This variable was thus entered into four hierarchical multiple regression analyses to assess whether it would still exhibit a significant negative correlation with abusiveness when childhood experiences of abuse were held statistically constant. Two of these four analyses used the total abusiveness score as the dependent variable, and two used sexual abusiveness as the dependent variable. For each dependent variable, the anti-risk variable was entered after the childhood set in one analysis, and after the childhood set, alcohol consumption, and sexual activity in the other analysis (see Table 12). In all four analyses significant R square change values indicated that the anti-risk variable explained significant additional variance in total abusiveness and sexual abusiveness beyond what was explained by all variables entered in earlier steps. As expected, the beta weights associated with this variable were all negative.

To determine the degree to which ANTI-R1 is empirically more than the inverse of risk-factor attitudes, another set of hierarchical multiple regression analyses was conducted. This time the attitude set (Rape Myth Acceptance, Hostility Toward Women, Acceptance of a Husband's Physical Violence Toward his Wife, and Negative Masculinity) was entered first, and ANTI-R1 was entered in a second step. With SAS as the dependent variable the single item ANTI-R1 variable explained 2.4% ( $p < .006$ ) additional variance (with a negative beta weight) above and beyond what was explained by the set of risk-factor attitudes. ANTI-R1 did not, however, explain additional

variance in the full TRI-ABUS scale when this was the dependent variable. The set of risk-factor attitudes explain 6.2% of the variance in ANTI-R (R square = .062;  $F < .002$ ).

Table 12

Effects of the Trust Anti-Risk Factor Beyond the Effects of Childhood Experiences, Alcohol Consumption and Sexual Activity

Summary of R square change			
	R sq ch	Adj R sq tot	p
DEP=TRI-ABUSE			
1. PRHC, PCA, ABUS2		20.2%	.0000
2. Anti-R1	2.3%	22.5%	.0025
DEP=TRI-ABUSE			
1. PRHC, PCA, ABUS2		20.2%	.0000
3. ALC, SACT	8.6%	28.8%	.0000
2. Anti-R1	1.7%	30.5%	.0071
DEP=SAS			
1. PRHC, PCA, ABUS2		6.9%	.0000
2. Anti-R1	3.9%	10.8%	.0043
DEP=SAS			
1. PRHC, PCA, ABUS2		6.9%	.0000
3. ALC, SACT	1.2%	18.9%	.0000
2. Anti-R1	2.8%	21.7%	.0012

Note. TRI-ABUSE = Total sexual, physical, and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners and others. SAS = Sexual Experience Survey. PRHC = Parent Rejection and Hostile Control. PCA = Parent to Child Physical Abuse. ABUS2 = Type 2 Child Sexual Abuse. ALC = Alcohol Consumption. SACT = how sexually active a person is. Anti-R1 = the first Anti-Risk variable.

## Discussion

### Prevalence and Frequency

All forms of abusive behavior -- sexual, physical, and emotional -- appear to be extremely common among normal college men. The percentages of men who reported engaging in the various types of abusive behavior ranged from 19.1% to 98.9%. The type of abuse that has generally been counted as actual physical abuse of wives or girlfriends -- that is, actually hitting, punching, kicking, etc. -- was reported by 41.3% of the men in this study. These prevalence rates are much too high to be considered instances of individual psychopathology, and support to the view that broader social forces must be involved.

Information on frequencies suggested that most men who reported any abusive behavior were not men who "flew off the handle" in one unusually trying situation. The estimates of the minimum number of times since the age of 14 that a man engaged in such a behavior ranged from 3.2 times to 63.22 times for the various types of abusive behavior/target combinations. This suggests that the social forces involved may not be simply situational life-circumstance stressors such as unemployment that would create such a high level of stress that a basically non-abusive man might engage in an uncharacteristic abusive behavior. Such life stressors can be ruled out as the main cause of abusive behavior with even greater confidence in this study because this sample was selected to represent men in similar life circumstances -- all are unmarried college students between the ages of 18 and 21. The broad social forces implicated in the high rates of abusiveness are more likely to be ones that are linked to relatively stable characteristics of these men. The attitudes and habits measured by this study might be considered such relatively stable characteristics.

### Who Are The Targets of What Type of Abuse?

An interesting finding that was not anticipated by previous research that measured only men's abusiveness toward wives and girlfriends is that greater percentages of men reported emotional and physical abusiveness toward all others than toward their romantic partner(s), and that the mean number of abusive behaviors directed at others by abusive men was higher than the mean number of abusive behaviors directed at romantic partners. This finding, taken together with the high correlations between each type of abusiveness toward romantic partners and each type of abusiveness toward others suggests that the majority of men who are abusive toward women are generally abusive. This implies that it may be important for intervention programs to include training that is designed to reduce these men's general readiness to respond in an angry, hostile manner. However, the findings being discussed here should be interpreted while keeping two points in mind: (a) The number of romantic relationships a person has is generally much smaller than the total of all other persons with whom that person is acquainted, and (b) although in a heterosexual sample, romantic partners may be assumed to be females, the "others" category may include both males and females. Thus, although a larger number of abusive behaviors may be directed at persons other than a romantic partner, any one romantic partner may be the target of abusive behavior much more often than any one other individual, and therefore feel more controlled and terrorized than any other individual. However, the man who is reporting these behaviors may egocentrically see only that he engages in abusive behaviors more often with others than with his romantic partner. If this is true then it may be important for intervention programs working with men who batter their wives or girlfriends to guide them through the thought process by which they can come to see how the effects of their behavior are likely to be disproportionately felt by their romantic partners.

For sexual abusiveness, who the target was is to be interpreted somewhat differently. Because men who reported either a homosexual or a bisexual preference were not included in this study, the "other" category on the sexual abusiveness items presumably referred to females other than females who had been the man's romantic partner. Those respondents who commented on an open-ended written comment sheet about their interpretation of the "romantic partner" and the "other" categories indicated that for "romantic partner" they included only women with whom they had had some kind of ongoing romantic relationship, such as a girlfriend; for "other" (on the sexual abusiveness questions) they included only women with whom they had no ongoing relationship (for example, a woman they just met at a party, or a first date). For physical and emotional abusiveness, they included everyone other than a romantic partner -- men and women. Keeping this in mind, it is not surprising that these men reported more total sexual abusiveness toward romantic partners than toward others -- assuming that they spent more time, were more often in private situations, and thus had more opportunities to be sexually abusive toward romantic partners in an ongoing relationship than toward other women.

Looking at the methods by which sexual activity may be obtained against a person's will, only one method did not follow the trend just described. A significantly larger number of men used alcohol as the method of obtaining sexual activity with unwilling others than with romantic partners. This underscores the social acceptability of using alcohol to obtain sex in first encounters in party situations on college campuses. By contrast verbal persuasion is more effective within the context of an ongoing relationship. Another interesting finding is that all 11 men who reported having used a position of authority (such as boss, teacher, camp counselor, or supervisor) to coerce sexual activity reported using this method with a romantic partner.

Thus, men who used this method formed ongoing, unequal relationships with the women over whom they had power by their official position. This is perhaps in part due to their continuing access to these women, who either worked with them or were in some other way in frequent contact with them.

### Relations Among Different Types of Abusiveness

The results of the factor analysis (that all subtypes of physical and emotional abusiveness load on one factor regardless of target, and that both subtypes of sexual abusiveness load on a second factor, regardless of target) agree with the high internal consistency Cronbach's alphas that were obtained for the SAS, PAS and EAS. This supports a view of the various subtypes of physical and emotional abusiveness as part of a continuum. The same is true for the various subtypes of sexual abusiveness. That is, these results support a view of these subtypes of abusiveness as a continuous series of elements or events that pass into one another and cannot readily be distinguished and that share a common underlying character. This is a very interesting finding in that it agrees with results that have been obtained from interviews with battered women (Follingstad, 1990; Walker, 1979), from clinical work with women who have been sexually violated in various ways (Koss et al., 1988), and from interviews with women from the general population, who were asked to describe any sexual violation they had experienced, ranging from verbal coercion to rape (Kelly, 1987). Women experience these forms of abuse as parts of a continuum of violence in the sense described above; likewise, the impact the abusive behaviors have on them emotionally is more similar than different across subtypes of abusive behavior (Follingstad, 1990; Kelly, 1987; Koss et al., 1988; Walker, 1979). The present results suggest that this concept of a continuum does not exist only in women's perceptions but also in abusive men's actual behavior, as they report it themselves.

The close link between emotional and physical abusiveness also has another interesting implication for research on abuse. Because abused individuals often repress the memories of, or are reluctant to disclose experiences of physical or sexual abuse, measures of emotional abuse might be more sensitive detectors of a history of abuse than measures of physical abuse only. Since emotional and physical abuse are very closely linked, it could prove extremely useful to include measures of emotional abuse in studies that are concerned with physical abuse.

That no separate factor emerged for partner and others indicates that even though for the overall sample there was more abusiveness toward others than toward partners, the relative ranking of men on abusiveness toward partners and toward others is very similar. In other words, men who are more abusive toward others are also more abusive towards partners. Although finding that all subtypes of physical and emotional abusiveness toward romantic partners are more similar than different would support the feminist analysis of all types of woman abuse as having a common underlying dynamic, the findings of this study are more complicated. Finding that this concept of abusiveness as a continuum crosses relationship boundaries (in terms of who is the victim) suggests that a more general dynamic underlies the abusive behavior of these abusive men. Future studies should examine the role of general hostility and general anger-prone thoughts both in terms of their relation to hostility and attitudes specifically hostile toward women and in terms of their relation to the different types of abusiveness. Social theories such as Mosher and Tomkins' (1988) 'machismo' theory may prove useful in unifying the aspects of the social control model that are useful in explaining abusive behavior with the mechanisms of the cognitive-behavioral models. The advantage of a theory such as Mosher's is that it accounts for both general male

abusive and belligerent behavior, and specific abusiveness toward women, particularly women who are "family."

Only one clear distinction was found by this factor analysis: All forms of sexual abusiveness are distinct from all forms of emotional and physical abusiveness (even though emotional and physical means of obtaining unwanted sexual activity were measured by the sexual abusiveness items). This finding tends to support the view that sexual abusiveness is motivated by something different than are physical and emotional abusiveness. Thus, in normal college men, sexual abuse may be predominantly sex-motivated and substantially less power or anger-motivated than the other two forms of abuse (see Groth, 1979 for a discussion of sex, anger, and power motivated rapes).

#### Relations Between Social Desirability and Each Type/Target Combination of Abusiveness

The more a man endorses socially desirable behaviors as characteristic of himself and socially undesirable behaviors as uncharacteristic of himself, the less likely he is to report all combinations of types and targets of abusiveness except one -- physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner. The negative relationship of social desirability with SASP, SASO, EASP, EASO, and PASO may reflect both actual increased inhibition to engage in the behaviors measured by these scales and increased defensiveness in reporting these behaviors at higher levels of social desirability. In either case, the nonsignificant relationship of social desirability with physical abusiveness toward a romantic partner indicates that men who apparently care to be considered socially desirable are no less likely to report being physically abusive toward their romantic partners than are men who apparently care less about being considered socially desirable. This one nonsignificant correlation stands out in contrast

to the high negative correlations that are consistently found when social desirability as measured by the Marlowe Crowne Scale is correlated with various measures of aggression and violence (Selby, 1984). From a social control perspective it may be interpreted as supporting the contention that women in the private sphere (ie. romantic partners of heterosexual men) are considered "appropriate" targets of the types and levels of physical abuse that were commonly reported by men in this study. That sexual abusiveness was negatively correlated to social desirability may reflect recent efforts on this college campus, as well as recent media attention to the problems of date rape. For example, many instructors of Introductory Psychology classes have had guest lecturers educate their students about the problem of date rape, several dormitories have invited speakers from the psychology department to speak to their residents about this problem, and several fraternities have been approached by women and men affiliated with a new rape crisis center, and have hosted speakers whose goal was to educate fraternity members about the problem of date rape. All of these speakers shared a goal of preventing rape by increasing men's responsibility and awareness of date rape as a serious problem that they can prevent. It is possible that similar work in the area of non sexually motivated courtship violence and domestic violence may bring about similar changes in the perception of the acceptability of physically abusing romantic partners. It remains for future research, however, to attempt to determine to what degree such awareness changes the behaviors and to what degree it only changes the reporting.

#### Incremental Explanatory Contributions of Sets of Risk Factors to Each Type/Target Combination of Abusiveness

The hierarchical multiple regression analyses shed light on the differences in the dynamics underlying sexual abusiveness on one hand and physical and emotional

abusiveness on the other hand. Sexual abusiveness is the only type of abusiveness that is not explained by the set of childhood experiences variables once all current attitudes, habits, and their interactions have been accounted for. That is, the current attitudes and habits account for all the explained variance in sexual abusiveness. This does not mean that childhood experiences of abuse are not important risk-factors for abusiveness as an adult; indeed, when the childhood experiences set is entered by itself, it explains a significant percentage of the variance in sexual abusiveness. Furthermore, almost every one of the current habits and attitudes that explains variance in sexual abusiveness is itself related to experiences of childhood abuse. What it does suggest, however, is that the paths by which childhood experiences of abuse are translated into sexual abusiveness as an adult are accounted for quite well by the attitudes and habits measured in this study. An implication for intervention efforts is that by interfering with or reversing the development and expression of these habits and attitudes, it may be possible to minimize the damage of childhood experiences of abuse.

When the sets were entered in reverse order, current habits, current attitudes, and the interactions between alcohol and current attitudes all contributed significantly to the explanation of additional variance in abusiveness after childhood experiences of abuse had been accounted for. This suggests that these habits, attitudes, and interactions may take on a "life of their own" and increase the risk of adult abusiveness beyond what it would be based on the childhood experiences alone. An implication of this finding is that only eliminating childhood experiences of abuse might not be effective if these risk-factor habits and attitudes develop anyway, by some other mechanism, such as social norms of one's peer group that are supportive of such habits and attitudes.

The picture for physical and emotional abusiveness is somewhat different. For these types of abusiveness, regardless of who the target is, childhood experiences of abuse contributed significantly to the explanation of additional variance in abusiveness, beyond what was explained by all current habits and attitudes had been considered. Furthermore, when childhood experiences were entered into the equation first, they explained more than twice as much variance in physical and emotional abusiveness than in sexual abusiveness. This implies that childhood experiences of abuse play a greater role in physical and emotional abusiveness than they play in sexual abusiveness. There may also be other current habits and attitudes that were not measured, which would explain relatively more of the variance in these types of abusiveness, compared with what is explained only by childhood experiences.

An interesting finding that emerges from an examination of the pattern of significant alcohol by attitude interactions in explaining abusiveness is that such interactions increase the effects of the attitudes for sexual abusiveness and for the other types of abusiveness when a romantic partner is the target, but not when persons other than romantic partners are the targets. Furthermore, alcohol consumption is not by itself related to physical or emotional abusiveness of others. This is an unexpected finding that supports Lang and Sibrel's (1989) conclusion that alcohol intoxication does not produce aggressive behavior, or loss of inhibition, but that thinking one is intoxicated, and thinking that intoxication can be used as an excuse does. The present finding suggests that there is considerable cognitive control directing the consequences of alcohol intoxication, perhaps using intoxication to be abusive in situations where being abusive would not place one in danger, and not being abusive in situations where it might place one in danger. For example, when a man is intoxicated, his reflexes are impaired, and he would be at a disadvantage in a physical fight with an equally strong

peer; however, because of women's smaller size and because women are not socialized to fight, a man probably would not have to worry about such a disadvantage in a romantic situation with a woman or with a female romantic partner.

### Comparison of Highly Sexually Abusive Men With The Typically Used Comparison Group and With a Cleaner Comparison Group

A major goal of the present study had been to compare highly sexually abusive men with men who are sexually non-abusive and also virtually non-abusive physically and emotionally toward everyone -- romantic partners and others. When the clean comparison group was used, greater mean differences were found between the groups on all risk-factors than when the traditional comparison group (only sexually non-abusive) was used. However, thirteen risk-factors significantly differentiated the highly sexually abusive group from the comparison group regardless of which comparison group was used. One risk-factor differentiated the highly sexually abusive group from the comparison group only when the clean comparison group was used. This risk-factor was having (as a child) witnessed violence between one's parents. The mean score on this variable was only slightly over two times higher in the highly sexually abusive group than in the traditional comparison group; it was more than 6 times higher in the highly sexually abusive group than in the cleaner comparison group.

In general the ability of the risk factors to differentiate the highly sexually abusive group even from a less clean comparison group is probably due to the importance of these risk factors. This is especially true for the current attitudes and habits that were measured; as was shown by the hierarchical multiple regressions, these were the strongest predictors of sexual abusiveness. The similarity of results using the two comparison groups is not due to excess similarity of the two groups; the less clean group contained almost 3 times as many individuals as the cleaner group, the mean

physical abusiveness score of the less clean group was almost 4 times that of the cleaner group, and the mean emotional abusiveness score was more than twice that of the cleaner group. A fruitful goal for future large scale studies might be to further clean the highly sexually abusive group and look separately at men who sexually abuse women, men, and children.

### Anti-Risk Factors

The unique goal of this study was to identify an "anti-risk factor" that might make some men less likely to abuse than others even if they had childhood experiences that would typically lead to abusiveness as an adult. The anti-abuse factor that was identified in this study was an item that read "Earning someone's trust is a very satisfying experience for me." This item explained significant variance in total abusiveness (sexual, physical, and emotional toward both romantic partners and others) above and beyond what was already accounted for by the following variables: the childhood experiences of abuse set, degree of sexual activity (frequency of mutually consensual sexual intercourse), and degree of alcohol consumption. As expected, the trust anti-risk variable was associated with a negative beta weight. This variable also explained significant variance with a negative beta weight for sexual abusiveness after the same variables were all accounted for. This means that we have identified something that is not the mere inverse of these risk factors. It means that if we have two men who were equally abused as children, who are equally sexually active, and who consume equal amounts of alcohol, but one man considers earning someone's trust a very satisfying experience and the other does not, the first man will be non-abusive relative to the second.

The implications of this finding for prevention and intervention efforts are exciting. It offers the possibility for an active "yes" component to accompany the "no"

components of intervention. Rather than relying solely on preaching "don't do this or that because it is wrong and you will be punished" (which may require expensive resources for constant surveillance and enforcement of punishment), programs can teach young men positive means of earning others' trust and acceptance -- which are perhaps more basic needs than the sex and power needs that abusive men strive to fulfill. Furthermore, because there is a small, but significant negative relationship between ANTI-R1 and the set of attitude risk factors considered in this study, there is a possibility that fostering the development of ANTI-R1, could have the desirable side effect of diminishing risk-factor attitudes such as hostility toward women, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and so on. Yet, because ANTI-R1 explained significant variance in sexual abusiveness beyond that explained by the set of attitude variables, it functions as more than the inverse of attitudinal variables in explaining that type of abusiveness.

In addition to further survey research, research of certain subcultures that differ only on the trust anti-risk variable and degree of abusiveness, but have similar histories of child sexual, physical, and emotional abuse experiences, are similarly sexually active, and are equally often intoxicated would provide important information for prevention and intervention efforts. Research that attempts to unearth how the trust ethic develops in the midst of other risk factors would be invaluable. Two subcultures that might be thus compared are the "Greeks" (fraternity members) and the "Deadheads" (followers of the Grateful Dead). The former have already been investigated to some degree and are known in the sexual aggression literature as rape-supportive (Martin, 1989; Sanday, 1990). The latter have not been investigated in the research literature, but casual observation of a camp of a dozen to several hundred of these people during the weekend of a Grateful Dead concert reveals that although

intoxication and drug use are rampant, there is an ethic of trust, peace, and love rather than one of exploitation and violence. In this atmosphere even women who are not known to the group may walk alone through the camps without fear of harassment. This ethic also extends to personal property, which may be left in a corner at the beginning of a concert and will still be there untouched at the end of the concert. The process by which such an ethic of trust develops and is maintained in what would seem to be a risky environment is a question that if answered, could provide provide us with powerful strategies for prevention and intervention efforts.

### Limitations

Because this study was exploratory in nature and was designed to answer a broad range of related questions, its findings should be taken as tentative and in need of further research. Because of the large number of analyses performed, results that were significant only at the .05 or even .01 level could be due to chance significance (Type 1 Error) and should be replicated before they are given much weight.

Our requirement that we identify all types of abusiveness toward all targets in order to identify a comparison group that is low on physical and emotional abusiveness in addition to being sexually non-abusive, combined with space limitations and the large number of questions already in the questionnaire packet, did not allow for certain distinctions that would be desirable. For example, physical and emotional abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner could have included men, women, and children, strangers and family members. We assume that sexual abusiveness toward anyone other than a romantic partner consisted predominantly of casual dates who were women (in this heterosexual sample), but we cannot be certain that no girl children, boy children, or men were included. Furthermore, because this is self-report data, we must expect that there may be a certain degree of underreporting. The highly significant

results that were obtained in most of the analyses suggest that the risk factors and anti-risk factors in this study are either strong enough in the predominant group studied or general enough not to be masked by some heterogeneity in the targets of abuse. With respect to sexual abusiveness, a review of MMPI studies (Nagayama-Hall, 1990) concluded that there are no differences in MMPI profile types within or between sexual offender subgroups (eg., offenders with adult victims vs. child victims, etc.). Nevertheless, the composition of the target groups should be kept in mind when the results of this study are considered. Certainly further research is needed.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, the findings of previous research on risk factors for sexual abusiveness are supported and strengthened when a cleaner non-abusive comparison group is used. The reason for this is not merely that sexually non-abusive men are also non-abusive physically and emotionally, but rather that most of the risk factors are risk factors for physical abusiveness and emotional abusiveness as well as being risk factors for sexual abusiveness. Likewise, the anti-risk factor identified in this study is negatively correlated to not only sexual abusiveness, but also to total abusiveness. An implication for prevention programs is that they may benefit from pooling resources to combat risk factors that all forms of abusiveness share in common. An implication for theoretical models is that they do need to be integrated to explain the commonalities of various types and targets of abusive behavior as well as explaining specific types of abusiveness directed at particular targets. There is evidence from the hierarchical regression analyses that even while most of the strongest risk factors for one type of abusiveness explain a significant proportion of another type of abusiveness, some sets of risk factors are much more related to one type of abusiveness than to another. In particular, the potency of alcohol consumption as a risk factor for abusiveness toward a

romantic partner but not toward all others should be further investigated. It is possible that a great deal of cognitive control in choice of target is exercised even when intoxicated.

The most interesting finding of this study is that men who consider earning someone's trust as a very satisfying experience are less abusive in all ways, regardless of their experiences of child sexual, physical, and emotional abuse, regardless of how sexually active they are, and regardless of how much alcohol they drink. That is a powerful antidote to violence and should be further investigated.

#### Footnote

<sup>1</sup>The original Rape Myth Acceptance, Sexual Conservatism, and Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scales (Burt, 1980) all used a 7-point scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (7). In the present study we converted this to a 5-point scale due to methodological constraints (only scantrons with 5 response options were available).

## References

- Armentrout, J. A., & Haver, A. L. (1978). MMPIs of rapists of adults, rapists of children, and nonrapist sex offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 34, 330-332.
- Axelrod, S., & Apscho, J. (1983). The effects of punishment on human behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 589-595.
- Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bernard, J. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1984). The abusive male seeking treatment: Jekyll and Hyde. Family Relations, 33, 543-547.
- Bouchard, T.J., Jr., Lukken, D.T., McGue, M., Segal, N.L., and Tellegen, A. (1990). Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota study of twins reared apart. Science, 250: 223-228.
- Briere, J. (1987). Predicting self-reported likelihood of battering: Attitudes and childhood experiences. Journal of Research in Personality, 21, 61-69.
- Browning, J. J. (1983). Violence against intimates: Toward a profile of the wife assaulter. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men, women and rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.

- Caesar, P. L. (1985, August). The wife-beater: Personality and psycho-social characteristics. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Check, J. V. P., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). The hostility toward women scale. Paper presented at the North American Meeting of the International Society for Research on Aggression, Victoria, British Columbia.
- Clark, L., & Lewis, D. (1977). Rape: The price of coercive sexuality. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, *24*, 349-354.
- Davis, G. E., & Leitenberg, H. (1987). Adolescent sex offenders. Psychological Bulletin, *101*, 417-427.
- Dutton, D. G. (1988). The domestic assault of women. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dutton, D. G. (1983). A nested ecological theory of male violence towards intimates. In P. Caplan (Ed.), Feminist psychology in transition (pp. 12 - 36). Montreal: Eden.
- Edwards, A. E. (1987). Male violence in feminist theory: An analysis of the changing conceptions of sex/gender violence and male dominance. In J. H. Hanmer, & M. Maynard (Eds.), Women, violence and social control (pp. 13-30). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Ellis, A. (1977). The basic clinical theory of rational emotive therapy (pp. 3 - 46). In A. Ellis & R. Grieger (Eds.), Handbook of rational-emotive therapy. New York: Springer.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1989). Crime in the United States: Uniform crime reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Finkelhor, D. (1981, June). Four preconditions of sexual abuse: A model. Paper presented at the National Conference of Family Violence Research, Durham, NH.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse: New theory and research. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1990). Sexual abuse in a national survey of adult men and women: prevalence, characteristics, and risk factors. Child Abuse and Neglect, *14*, 19-28.
- Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G. T., Lewis, I. A., & Smith, C. (1989). Sexual abuse and its relationship to later sexual satisfaction, marital status, religion, and attitudes. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *4*, 379-399.
- Fitch, F. J., & Papatonio, A. (1983). Men who batter: Some pertinent characteristics. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, *17*, 190-192.
- Fleiss, J. L. (1981). Statistical methods for rates and proportions (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Folingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. Journal of Family Violence, *5*, 107-120.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). The violent home. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). Intimate violence. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1985a). Anger and oppression in men who batter: Empiricist and feminist perspectives and their implications for research. Victimology: An International Journal, 311-324.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1985b). Fighting for control: A clinical assessment of men who batter. Social Casework, *66*, 48-54.

- Gondolf, E. W. (1986). The case against anger control treatment programs for batterers. Response to the Victimization of Women and Children, 2, 2-5.
- Graziano, A. M., & Namaste, K. A. (1990). Parental use of physical force in child discipline. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 449-463.
- Green, E., Hebron, S., & Woodward, D. (1987). Women, leisure and social control. In J. H. Hanmer, & M. Maynard (Eds.), Women, violence and social control (pp. 13-30). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Groth, A. N. (1979). Sexual trauma in the life histories of rapists and child molesters. Victimology: An International Journal, 4, 10-16.
- Groth, A. N., & Birnbaum, H. J. (1979). Men who rape: The psychology of the offender. New York: Plenum.
- Groth, A. N., Burgess, A. W., & Holstrom, L. L. (1977). Rape: Power, anger, and sexuality. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 1239-1243.
- Hall, E. R., Howard, J. A., Boezio, S. L. (1986). Tolerance of rape: A sexist or antisocial attitude? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 101-118.
- Hamberger, L., Hastings, K., & James, E. (1988). Characteristics of male abusers consistent with personality disorders. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 39, 763-770.
- Hamberger, L. K., Hastings, J. E., & Lohr, J. M. (1988, November). Cognitive and personality correlates of men who batter: Some continuities and discontinuities. Presented in A. Holtzworth-Monroe (Chair), Research on marital violence: What we know, how we can apply it. Symposium presented at the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New York.
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Wilhelm, J. A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Sex Roles, 7, 1097-1107.

- Houston, B. K. & Vavak, C. R. (1991). Cynical hostility: developmental factors, psychosocial correlates, and health behaviors. Health Psychology, 10, 9-17.
- Jones, R., Gruber, K, & Timbers, G. (1981). Incidence and situational factors surrounding sexual assault against delinquent youths. Child Abuse and Neglect, 5, 431-440.
- Kelly, L. The continuum of sexual violence. In J. H. Hanmer, & M. Maynard (Eds.), Women, violence and social control (pp. 46-61). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Kelly, J. A., & Worell, L. (1976). Parent behaviors related to masculine, feminine, and androgynous sex role orientations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 843-851.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1988). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. In R. A. Prently & V. L. Quensey (Eds.), Human Sexual Aggression: Current Perspectives (pp. 133 - 147). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 12, 1-23.
- Koss, M. P. & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 422-423.
- Koss, M. P. & Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C.J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. Sex Roles, 12, 981-992.
- Lang, A. R., & Sibrel, P. A. (1989). Psychological perspectives on alcohol consumption and interpersonal aggression: The potential role of individual differences in alcohol-related criminal violence. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 16, 299-324.
- Linz, D., Donnerstein, E., & Penrod, S. (1987). Sexual violence in the mass media: Social psychological implications. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), Sex and gender (pp. 95-123). Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Maccoby, E. (1980). Sex differences in aggression: A rejoinder and reprise. Child Development, 51, 964-980.
- Maiuro, R. D., Cahn, T. S., Vitaliano, P. P., Wagner, B. C. & Zegree, J. B. (1988). Anger, hostility, and depression in domestically violent versus generally assaultive men and nonviolent control subjects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 17-23.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 953-962.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. Journal of Social Issues, 37, 138-153.
- Martin, P. Y. (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. Special Issue: Violence against women. Gender and Society, 3, 257-473.
- Miechenbaum, D. H. (1977). Cognitive-behavior modification. New York: Plenum.
- Miedzian, M. (1991). Boys will be boys. New York: Doubleday.

- Money, J. & Ehrhardt, A. (1972). Man and woman, boy and girl. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Morgan, D. H. (1987). Masculinity and violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), Women, violence and social control (pp. 180-192). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities International.
- Mosher, D. L., & Tomkins, S. S. (1988). Scripting the Macho Man: Hypermasculine Socialization and Enculturation. The Journal of Sex Research, 25, 60-84.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6, 20-37.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 186-196.
- Nagayama H., Gordon, C. (1990). Prediction of sexual aggression. Clinical Psychology Review, 10, 229-245.
- Nemeroff, J. & Karoly, P. (1991). Operant methods. In F. Kanfer & A. Goldstein (Eds.), Helping people change (pp. 139-140). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Novaco, R. W. (1975). Anger and coping with stress: Cognitive behavioral interventions. In J. P. Foreyt & D. P. Rathjen (Eds.), Cognitive behavior therapy: Research and application (pp. 135-173) New York: Plenum.
- Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric Theory. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Plomin, R. (1990). The role of inheritance in behavior. Science, 248, 183-188.
- Police Foundation. (1977). Domestic violence and the police: Studies in Detroit and Kansas City. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Justice.

- Predue, W. C., & Lester, D. (1972). Personality characteristics of rapists. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1972, 35, 514.
- Ptacek, J. (1988). Why do men batter their wives? In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rader, C. M. (1977). MMPI profile types of expositors, rapists, and assaulters in a court services population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 61-69.
- Radford, J. (1987). Policing male violence -- Policing women. In J. H. Hanmer, & M. Maynard (Eds.), Women, violence and social control (pp. 13-30). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Rappaport, K. & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 216-221.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1984). Sexual exploitation. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Sanday, P. R. (1990). Fraternity gang rape: Sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus. New York: New York University Press.
- Selby, M. J. (1984). Assessment of violence potential using measures of anger, hostility, and social desirability. Journal of Personality Assessment, 48, 531-544.
- Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 990-999.
- Spence, J. T., Helmeich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1673-1682.
- Stacey, W. A., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon.

- Stordeur, R. A., & Stille, R. A. (1989). Ending men's violence against their partners. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Straus, M. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife beating. Victimology: An International Journal, 1, 54-76.
- Straus, M. (1978). Wife beating: How common and why. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 443-458.
- Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Taylor, L. (1972). The significance and interpretation of replies to motivational questions: The case of sex offenders. Sociology, 6 (1).
- Tellegen, A., Lykken, D.T., Bouchard, T.J., Wilcox, K.J., Segal, N.L., and Rich, S. (1988). Personality similarity in twins reared apart and together. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 1031-1039.
- Tolman, R. M., & Bennett, L. W. (1990). A review of quantitative research on men who batter. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 87-118.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. Violence and Victims, 4, 159-177.
- Van Ness, S. R. (1984). Rape as instrumental violence: A study of youth offenders. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 9, 161-170.
- Waldo, M. (1987). Also victims: Understanding and treating men arrested for spouse abuse. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65, 385-388.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.
- Weis, K. & Borges, S. S. (1973). Victimology and rape: The case of the legitimate victim. Issues in Criminology, 8, 71-115.
- Wilson, E. O. (1982). On human nature. New York: Bantam Books.

## Appendix A

### Informed Consent (C1)

The Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. We 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 various aspects of a man's childhood experiences, attitudes, and current habits, are related to how he interacts with people, both in sexual and nonsexual situations. You will be participating in two sessions that will involve filling out some questionnaires. Some of the questions from the questionnaires ask you about your habits, such as how often you read a newspaper, or how much alcohol you drink, and others ask more personal questions about the nature of your relationships with your family and with women. It is estimated that this will take no more than two hours of your time. It is important for the validity of this study that if you participate, you answer all questions honestly.

Although there is always a possibility that discussing issues of a personal nature could cause discomfort, this is not expected to be a problem for most people. If, however you do 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 at 841-2345). Please also feel free to call the Principal Investigator, who may also be contacted through the clinic.

You are assured that your participation will be kept confidential; you will be given a code number and your name will in no way be associated with any data that are collected. At the end of your participation in the second session you will receive two credits for participation in two hours of research.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is complete, please feel free to ask now or to contact the Principal Investigator by phone or mail. You will be given a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

I. Powch, Graduate Student  
435 Fraser, The University of Kansas  
913-864-4121

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of subject agreeing to participate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Month/Day/Year

By signing the subject certifies that he is at least 18 years old.

### Informed Consent (C3)

The Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. We 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.

Several weeks ago, you answered a set of questionnaires for a study of mens' childhood experiences, and current attitudes, and habits, and how these are related to the way he interacts with people, both in sexual and nonsexual situations. We need more information about several of the questionnaires you answered during that session. Today you will be answering a subset of the questionnaires you answered in the first session. We need you to take as much time and effort to answer them honestly and accurately as you did the first time.

As was stated in the consent form for the first session, although there is always a possibility that discussing issues of a personal nature could cause discomfort, this is not expected to be a problem for most subjects. If, however you do 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, who may also be contacted through the clinic.

You are assured that your participation will be kept confidential; you will be given a code number and your name will in no way be associated with any data that are collected.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is complete, please feel free to ask now or to contact the Principal Investigator by phone or mail. You will be given a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

I. Powch, Graduate Student  
435 Fraser, The University of Kansas  
913-864-4121

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of subject agreeing to participate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Month/Day/Year

By signing the subject certifies that he is at least 18 years old.



Appendix C-1

Key to Questionnaire Packet in Appendix C-2

\*Note: Filler items and scales not scored for this study are denoted as "."

Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)	Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)
1	1	NM	1	47	SOC
	2	.		48	HOW
	3	.		49	HOW
	4	NM		50	HOW
	5	.		51	SOC
	6	NM		52	SOC
	7	NM		53	HOW
	8	NM		54	SOC
	9	ANTI-R2		55	HOW
	10	NM		56	HOW
	11	.		57	SOC
	12	.		58	SOC
	13	NM		59	HOW
	14	NM		60	HOW
	15	NM		61	SOC
	16	NM		62	SOC
	17	ANTI-R1		63	SOC
	18	NM		64	HOW
	19	NM		65	HOW
	20	.		66	HOW
	21	NM		67	SOC
	22	NM		68	HOW
	23	NM		69	HOW
	24	.		70	HOW
	25	.		71	HOW
	26	.		72	SOC
	27	.		73	SOC
	28	SOC		74	HOW
	29	SOC		75	SOC
	30	SOC		76	SOC
	31	HOW		77	HOW
	32	SOC		78	HOW
	33	SOC		79	SOC
	34	HOW		80	HOW
	35	SOC		81	SOC
	36	HOW		82	HOW
	37	SOC		83	HOW
	38	SOC		84	HOW
	39	HOW		85	.
	40	SOC		86	SOC
	41	SOC		87	SOC
	42	HOW		88	SOC
	43	HOW		89	.
	44	HOW		90	HOW
	45	SOC		91	SOC
	46	SOC		92	.

Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)	Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)
1	93	SOC	1	138	PBF (FAC)
	94	.		139	PBF (MR)
	95	PBF (MAC)		140	PBF (FR)
	96	PBF (FAC)		141	PBF (MHC)
	97	PBF (MR)		142	PBF (FHC)
	98	PBF (FR)		143	PBF (MR)
	99	PBF (MHC)		144	PBF (FR)
	100	PBF (FHC)		145	PBF (MHC)
	101	PBF (MAC)		146	PBF (FHC)
	102	PBF (FAC)		147	PBF (MAC)
	103	PBF (MR)		148	PBF (FAC)
	104	PBF (FR)		149	.
	105	PBF (MHC)		150	.
	106	PBF (FHC)		151	PCV
	107	PBF (MAC)		152	PPV
	108	PBF (FAC)		153	.
	109	PBF (MR)		154	.
	110	PBF (FR)		155	.
	111	PBF (MHC)		156	.
	112	PBF (FHC)		157	.
	113	PBF (MAC)		158	.
	114	PBF (FAC)		159	ABUS2
	115	PBF (MR)		160	ABUS2
	116	PBF (FR)		161	ABUS2
	117	PBF (MHC)		162	ABUS2
	118	PBF (FHC)		163	ABUS2
	119	PBF (MAC)		164	ABUS2
	120	PBF (FAC)		165	ABUS2
	121	PBF (MR)		166	ABUS2
	122	PBF (FR)		167	.
	123	PBF (MHC)		168	.
	124	PBF (FHC)		169	.
	125	PBF (MAC)		170	.
	126	PBF (FAC)		171	ABUS1
	127	PBF (MR)		172	.
	128	PBF (FR)		173	ABUS1
	129	PBF (MHC)		174	.
	130	PBF (FHC)		175	.
	131	PBF (MAC)		176	ABUS1
	132	PBF (FAC)		177	.
	133	PBF (MR)		178	.
	134	PBF (FR)		179	ANTI-R3
	135	PBF (MHC)		180	.
	136	PBF (FHC)		181	.
	137	PBF (MAC)		182	.
				183	ALC

Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)	Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)
1	184	ALC	1	236	SAS (INT-O)
	185	ALC		237	SAS (INT-P)
	186	SEXTALK		238	SAS (INT-O)
	187	PORN		239	SAS (INT-P)
	188	FIRSTSEX		240	SAS (INT-O)
	189	.		241	SAS (INT-P)
	190	.		242	SAS (INT-O)
	191	.		243	SAS (INT-P)
	192	.		244	SAS (INT-O)
	193	.		245	SAS (INT-P)
	194	.		246	SAS (INT-O)
	195	.		247	PAS (ACT-P)
	196	.		248	PAS (ACT-O)
	197	.		249	PAS (ACT-P)
	198	.		250	PAS (ACT-O)
	199	.			
	200	.			
	201	.	2	1	PAS (ACT-P)
	202	.		2	PAS (ACT-O)
	203	.		3	PAS (ACT-P)
	204	.		4	PAS (ACT-O)
	205	.		5	PAS (ACT-P)
	206	.		6	PAS (ACT-O)
	207	.		7	PAS (ACT-P)
	208	.		8	PAS (ACT-O)
	209	.		9	PAS (ACT-P)
	210	.		10	PAS (ACT-O)
	211	.		11	PAS (ATTK-P)
	212	.		12	PAS (ATTK-O)
	213	SEXACT		13	CHECK
	214	SEXACT		14	CHECK
	215	SAS (CONT-P)		15	PAS (ATTK-P)
	216	SAS (CONT-O)		16	PAS (ATTK-O)
	217	SAS (CONT-P)		17	PAS (THRT-P)
	218	SAS (CONT-O)		18	PAS (THRT-O)
	219	SAS (CONT-P)		19	PAS (ATTK-P)
	220	SAS (CONT-O)		20	PAS (ATTK-O)
	221	SAS (CONT-P)		21	PAS (ATTK-P)
	222	SAS (CONT-O)		22	PAS (ATTK-O)
	223	SAS (CONT-P)		23	PAS (THRT-P)
	224	SAS (CONT-O)		24	PAS (THRT-O)
	225	SAS (CONT-P)		25	PAS (ATTK-P)
	226	SAS (CONT-O)		26	PAS (ATTK-O)
	227	SAS (CONT-P)		27	PAS (ATTK-P)
	228	SAS (CONT-O)		28	PAS (ATTK-O)
	229	SAS (CONT-P)		29	PAS (THRT-P)
	230	SAS (CONT-O)		30	PAS (THRT-O)
	231	SAS (INT-P)		31	PAS (ATTK-P)
	232	SAS (INT-O)		32	PAS (ATTK-O)
	233	SAS (INT-P)		33	PAS (ATTK-P)
	234	SAS (INT-O)		34	PAS (ATTK-O)
	235	SAS (INT-P)		35	PAS (THRT-P)

Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)	Scantron	Item	Scale (Subscale)
2	36	PAS (THRT-O)	2	82	SES
	37	EAS (HUM-P)		83	SES
	38	EAS (HUM-O)		84	SES
	39	EAS (HUM-P)		85	SES
	40	EAS (HUM-O)		86	SES
	41	EAS (HUM-P)		87	SES
	42	EAS (HUM-O)		88	SES
	43	EAS (HUM-P)		89	CONSERV
	44	EAS (HUM-O)		90	CONSERV
	45	EAS (HUM-P)		91	CONSERV
	46	EAS (HUM-O)		92	CONSERV
	47	EAS (HUM-P)		93	CONSERV
	48	EAS (HUM-O)		94	CONSERV
	49	EAS (HUM-P)		95	CONSERV
	50	EAS (HUM-O)		96	CONSERV
	51	EAS (HUM-P)		97	CONSERV
	52	EAS (HUM-O)		98	CONSERV
	53	EAS (HUM-P)		99	AVG
	54	EAS (HUM-O)		100	AVS
	55	EAS (HUM-P)		101	AVS
	56	EAS (HUM-O)		102	AVM
	57	EAS (FRT-P)		103	AVS
	58	EAS (FRT-O)		104	AVM
	59	EAS (FRT-P)		105	RMA
	60	EAS (FRT-O)		106	RMA
	61	EAS (HUM-P)		107	RMA
	62	EAS (HUM-O)		109	RMA
	63	EAS (HUM-P)		110	RMA
	64	EAS (HUM-O)		111	RMA
	65	EAS (FRT-P)		112	RMA
	66	EAS (FRT-O)		113	RMA
	67	EAS (FRT-P)		114	RMA
	68	EAS (FRT-O)		115	RMA
	69	EAS (FRT-P)			
	70	EAS (FRT-O)			
	71	EAS (FRT-P)			
	72	EAS (FRT-O)			
	73	EAS (FRT-P)			
	74	EAS (FRT-O)			
	75	EAS (FRT-P)			
	76	EAS (FRT-O)			
	77	EAS (FRT-P)			
	78	EAS (FRT-O)			
	79	SES			
	80	SES			
	81	SES			

Appendix C-2

THESE QUESTIONS ASK YOU TO SAY WHAT KIND OF A PERSON YOU THINK YOU ARE. FOR EXAMPLE, HERE IS A SENTENCE: "I WATCH TV ALL THE TIME." IF YOU WATCH TV ALL THE TIME, THAT SENTENCE IS VERY MUCH LIKE YOU. IF YOU WATCH TV A LOT, THEN THE SENTENCE IS MOSTLY LIKE YOU. OR YOU MAY WATCH TV ONLY A LITTLE BIT - THEN THE SENTENCE IS A LITTLE LIKE YOU. BLACKEN IN THE APPROPRIATE CIRCLE ON ANSWER SHEET #1. PLEASE DO NOT MARK THIS TEST FORM SO THAT WE CAN USE IT AGAIN.

- |  | Not at all<br>like me | A little<br>like me | Somewhat<br>like me | Mostly<br>like me | Very much<br>like me |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
|  | A                     | B                   | C                   | D                 | E                    |
| 1. I am a very forceful, "take charge" kind of person.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 2. When things go wrong, I get upset and whiny.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 3. I am able to do tough things by myself if I have to and I don't need<br>other people to help me or tell me what to do.....                |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 4. I feel that "I'm the greatest", and better than other people.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 5. I am very emotional. (That means my feelings get stirred up easily).....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 6. I give in to other people easily and let them tell me what to do.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 7. I brag a lot about myself and what I do.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 8. I get very upset and excited when big things go wrong.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 9. When things don't go as I had planned or expected I become curious rather than<br>upset or angry.....                                     |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 10. I am a self-centered person. I want things to go my way.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 11. I haven't got a lot of nerve and have trouble standing up for myself.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 12. I am very helpful to other people.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 13. I am a greedy person.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 14. It is very important to me that people like me and approve of the things I do.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 15. I am a bossy person.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 16. My feelings are NOT hurt easily.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 17. Earning someone's trust is a very satisfying experience for me.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 18. Most people are out for themselves. I don't trust them very much.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 19. I hardly ever cry.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 20. I feel sure I can do most of the things I try.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 21. I remind myself that I'm "number one" and have to look out for myself first.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 22. Lots of times people are out to do me wrong and I try to pay them back.....  |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 23. I like to play things safe and not take chances.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 24. When I encounter people very different from myself I sometimes wish I could step<br>inside them and experience the world as they do..... |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 25. I am very trustful of people so it's easy for them to fool me.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 26. I derive great satisfaction from really communicating with someone even if I end up<br>not getting what I had originally wanted.....     |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |
| 27. When I'm in a tough spot, I get very bothered and don't know what to do.....   |                       |                     |                     |                   | A B C D E            |

FOR THESE QUESTIONS, PLEASE MARK (a) FOR TRUE AND (b) FOR FALSE

28. T F Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
29. T F I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
30. T F It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. **A = TRUE**
31. T F I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them. **B = FALSE**
32. T F I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings.
33. T F I never resent being asked to return a favor.
34. T F I feel upset even by slight criticism by a woman.
35. T F I have never intensely disliked anyone.
36. T F It doesn't really bother me when women tease me about my faults.
37. T F On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
38. T F I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
39. T F I used to think that most women told the truth but now I know otherwise.
40. T F I am always careful about my manner of dress.
41. T F My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
42. T F I do not believe that women will walk all over you if you aren't willing to fight.
43. T F I do not often find myself disagreeing with women.
44. T F I do very few things to women that make me feel remorseful afterward.
45. T F I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
46. T F If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do so.
47. T F On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
48. T F I rarely become suspicious with women who are more friendly than I expected.
49. T F There are a number of females who seem to dislike me very much.
50. T F I don't agree that women always seem to get the breaks.
51. T F I like to gossip at times.
52. T F There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
53. T F I don't seem to get what's coming to me in my relationships with women.
54. T F No matter who I'm talking to I'm always a good listener.
55. T F I generally don't get really angry when a woman makes fun of me.
56. T F Women irritate me a great deal more than they are aware of.
57. T F I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
58. T F There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
59. T F If I let women see the way I feel, they would consider me a hard person to get along with.
60. T F Lately, I've been kind of grouchy with women.
61. T F I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
62. T F There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

63. T F I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
64. T F I think most women would not lie to get ahead.
65. T F It is safer not to trust women.
66. T F When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.
67. T F I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake.
68. T F I am not easily angered by a woman.
69. T F I often feel that women probably think I have not lived the right kind of life.
70. T F I never have hostile feelings toward women that make me feel ashamed of myself later.
71. T F Many times a woman appears to care, but really just wants to use you.
72. T F I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
73. T F I always try to practice what I preach.
74. T F I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life.
75. T F I have never felt I was punished without cause.
76. T F I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
77. T F I don't usually wonder what hidden reason a woman may have for doing something nice for me.
78. T F If women had not had it in for me, I would have been more successful in my personal relationships with them.
79. T F I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
80. T F I never have the feeling that women laugh about me.
81. T F I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
82. T F Very few women tend to talk about me behind my back.
83. T F When I look back at what's happened to me I don't feel at all resentful toward the women in my life.
84. T F I have been rejected by too many women in my life.
85. T F I have learned a lot from the women in my life.
86. T F I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
87. T F When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
88. T F I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
89. T F It gives me great pleasure to help someone express what they are truly feeling.
90. T F I never sulk when a woman makes me angry.
91. T F At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
92. T F If someone gives me something reluctantly I can't enjoy it no matter how much I wanted it.
93. T F There have been occasions when I have felt like smashing things.
94. T F Some of my most meaningful conversations have been with my female friends.

**A = TRUE**  
**B = FALSE**

**THIS SECTION ASKS ABOUT YOUR FAMILY AND FRIENDS WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP**

For this first set of questions, answer each statement by filling in circle A if the statement is like your mother and/or father. Blacken in circle B if the statement is somewhat like your mother and/or father. Blacken in circle C if the statement is not like your mother and/or father. Please note that you are to answer each statement separately for each parent.

Made me feel better after talking over my worries with her/him.	95.	Mother A B C	96.	Father A B C
Thought I was just someone to "put up with."	97.	Mother A B C	98.	Father A B C
If I took someone else's side in an argument, she/he was cold and distant to me	99.	Mother A B C	100.	Father A B C
Was able to make me feel better when I was upset	101.	Mother A B C	102.	Father A B C
Made me feel I was not loved	103.	Mother A B C	104.	Father A B C
Said I was a big problem	105.	Mother A B C	106.	Father A B C
Made me feel free when I was with her/him	107.	Mother A B C	108.	Father A B C
Was never interested in meeting with or talking to my friends	109.	Mother A B C	110.	Father A B C
Almost always complained about what I did.	111.	Mother A B C	112.	Father A B C
Comforted me when I was afraid	113.	Mother A B C	114.	Father A B C
Didn't show that she/he loved me	115.	Mother A B C	116.	Father A B C
Told me I was immature	117.	Mother A B C	118.	Father A B C
Had a good time at home with me	119.	Mother A B C	120.	Father A B C
Didn't seem to think of me very often	121.	Mother A B C	122.	Father A B C
Often blew her/his top when I bothered her/him	123.	Mother A B C	124.	Father A B C
Was easy to talk to	125.	Mother A B C	126.	Father A B C
Changed her/his mind to make things easier for herself/himself	127.	Mother A B C	128.	Father A B C
Whenever we got into a discussion, she/he treated me more like a child than an adult	129.	Mother A B C	130.	Father A B C
Seemed to see my good points more than my faults	131.	Mother A B C	132.	Father A B C
Didn't get me things unless I asked over and over again	133.	Mother	134.	Father

Like  
Somewhat  
Not at all

When I didn't do as she/he wanted, said I wasn't grateful for all she/he had done for me	135.	<i>Like</i> Mother <i>Somewhat Like</i> <i>Not at all like</i> A B C	138.	Father A B C
Smiled at me very often	137.	Mother A B C	138.	Father A B C
Asked other people what I did away from home	139.	Mother A B C	140.	Father A B C
Told me of all the things he/she had done for me	141.	Mother A B C	142.	Father A B C
Almost always wanted to know who phoned me and who wrote to me and what they said	143.	Mother A B C	144.	Father A B C
Was less friendly with me if I didn't see things her/his way.	145.	Mother A B C	148.	Father A B C
Cheered me up when I was sad	147.	Mother A B C	148.	Father A B C

149. How strict were your parents in making you obey their rules?
- (a) Not at all strict  
(b) A little strict  
(c) Somewhat strict  
(d) Very strict  
(e) Extremely strict
150. In an average month when you were growing up, how often were you punished or spanked for physical play, wrestling, or roughhousing with your sisters, brothers or friends?
- (a) Never  
(b) Once or twice  
(c) 3-5 times  
(d) 6-10 times  
(e) Over 10 times
- Physical blows (like hitting, kicking, throwing someone down) sometimes occur between family members. For an average month, check how often these occurred in your family when you were growing up.
151. One of your parents did this to you (Check one)
- (a) Never  
(b) Once or twice  
(c) 3-5 times  
(d) 6-10 times  
(e) Over 10 times
152. One of your parents or step-parents did this to the other
- (a) Never  
(b) Once or twice  
(c) 3-5 times  
(d) 6-10 times  
(e) Over 10 times
153. While you were growing up, did you ever run away from home for more than 24 hours?
- (a) Yes  
(b) No
154. While you were growing up, did any of your friends ever regularly get in trouble with the law for minor offenses (like truancy, fighting, or running away)?
- (a) Yes  
(b) No

155. Did you ever feel uncomfortable hanging around with any of your friends for fear that you might get in trouble with the law when you were with them?
- (a) Not at all uncomfortable
  - (b) A little uncomfortable
  - (c) Somewhat uncomfortable
  - (d) Very much uncomfortable
  - (e) Extremely uncomfortable

As a child, how often did you feel:

156. Awkward and shy or uncomfortable around other children
- (a) Hardly ever
  - (b) Fairly often
  - (c) Almost always
157. Angry around other children
- (a) Hardly ever
  - (b) Fairly often
  - (c) Almost always
158. Nervous, anxious, and afraid around other children
- (a) Hardly ever
  - (b) Fairly often
  - (c) Almost always

**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.**

- (a) = Never
- (b) = Once
- (c) = Twice
- (d) = 3-5 times
- (e) = More than 5 times

159. Another person showed his/her sex organs to you? a b c d e
160. A request by someone older than you to do something sexual? a b c d e
161. You showed your sex organs to another person at his/her request a b c d e
162. Another person fondled you in a sexual way a b c d e
163. Another person touched or stroked your sex organs a b c d e
164. You touched or stroked another person's sex organs at his/her request a b c d e
165. Attempted intercourse (got on top of you, attempted to insert penis, but penetration did not occur) a b c d e
166. Intercourse (oral, anal or vaginal) with any amount of penetration (ejaculation not necessary) a b c d e

***If you answered never to any item from 159 through 166 then skip to # 177; otherwise continue without skipping any questions.***

**If you answered something other than "never" to more than one of the items from # 159 through 168, answer the following questions for the highest numbered item to which you answered something other than "never." For example, if you answered something other than "never" to #159 and #163 then you would answer the following questions for the event described in #163 because 163 is higher than 159.**

167. How often did this event happen with the same person? (a) Once  
(b) Twice  
(c) 3-5 times  
(d) More than 5 times
168. How old were you the first time any of the above happened? (a) Under 5  
(b) 5-7  
(c) 8-11  
(d) 12-14
169. Who did any of the above to you (blacken all choices that apply)  
(a) Stranger  
(b) Friend or acquaintance  
(c) baby-sitter or other authority figure who is not a relative  
(d) A relative other than your parents  
(e) One of your parents (or step-parents)
170. Who did any of the above to you (blacken all choices that apply)  
(a) Male(s) only  
(b) Female(s) only  
(c) Both male(s) and Female(s)
171. How much older than you were any of these people (check all that apply)  
(a) Your age or younger  
(b) 1 to 4 years older  
(c) 5 to 10 years older  
(d) 11 to 15 years older  
(e) More than 15 years older
172. Over how long a period did this go on? (Check one) (a) 1 day or less  
(b) 2-14 days  
(c) 2-4 weeks  
(d) 1-6 months  
(e) More than 6 months
173. What is the main reason you participated? (Check one)  
(a) Felt good  
(b) Curiosity  
(c) Other person bribed me with money or candy  
(d) Other person used authority or threatened me  
(e) Other person used physical force
174. Who, if anyone, is the most important person you discussed this with at the time?  
(a) Parent(s)  
(b) Teacher or other adult  
(c) Sibling (brother/sister)  
(d) Friend  
(e) Didn't tell anyone
175. How did this person react?  
(a) Not at all supportive  
(b) A little supportive  
(c) Somewhat supportive  
(d) Quite a bit supportive  
(e) Very much supportive
176. As a result of this experience, to what extent do you feel that you were victimized or taken advantage of? (Check one)  
(a) Not at all  
(b) A little  
(c) Somewhat  
(d) Quite a bit  
(e) Very much
-

177. Did you have a close female friend some time before the age of 14 (someone you talked to about personal things and spent a lot of time with, but were not sexual with)? (a) Yes (b) No
178. Where you grew up, did boys and girls play together, playing the same games together in the same roles (for example, playing "house" does not count if the girls play "mommies" and the boys play "daddies", but riding bikes, building a campfire, training a pet or collecting things counts). How often did you share activities like these with girls when you were growing up?  
 (a) Never  
 (b) Very rarely  
 (c) Once in a while  
 (d) Pretty often  
 (e) Very often; girls were almost always included in my playtime
179. Did you read a lot when you were growing up? (a) Yes (b) Somewhat (c) No
180. Do you get into, or do you think you might like to get into philosophy? (a) Yes (b) Maybe (c) No
181. Would you consider yourself a "seeker of truth"? (a) Yes (b) Maybe (c) No
182. Are you someone who can appreciate the beauty and serenity of a sunset in almost a spiritual way?  
 (a) Yes (b) Maybe (c) No
183. How often do you drink alcohol? (a) Not at all in the past year  
 (Check one) (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
184. 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 distilled spirits)  
 (c) Usually no more than 5 or 6 cans of beer (or 4 glasses of wine or 4 drinks of distilled spirits)  
 (d) Usually more than 6 cans of beer (or 5 or more glasses of wine or distilled spirits)
185. 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
186. Currently, when you are with your friends, how often do you hear talk that speculates about "How a particular woman would be in bed"? (Check one)  
 (a) Never  
 (b) A few times a year  
 (c) Monthly  
 (d) Weekly  
 (e) Daily
187. How often do you read any of the following magazines: Playboy, Penthouse, Chic, Club, Forum, Gallery, Genesis, Out, or Hustler? (Check one)  
 (a) Never  
 (b) Seldom  
 (c) Somewhat frequently  
 (d) Very frequently
188. How old were you when you first had sexual intercourse (either forced or voluntary)?  
 (a) 13 or younger  
 (b) 14 or 15  
 (c) 16 or 17  
 (d) 18 or 19  
 (e) Over 20, or haven't yet

Consider your sexual experience with the opposite sex. With approximately how many different people have you had sexual intercourse? (Check one)

189. (a) None  
 (b) 1 person  
 (c) 2-5 people  
 (d) 6-10 people  
 (e) 11-15 people
190. (a) 16-20 people  
 (b) 21-30 people  
 (c) 31-50 people  
 (d) Over 50 people

For the next 10 questions, please indicate how often you have watched/read the kind of movies/literature described. Give a separate answer for materials that were sexually explicit and materials that were not sexually explicit.

- A = once a year or less
- B = 2 to 5 times a year
- C = 5 to 12 times a year
- D = several times a month
- E = several times a week

	Explicit sex depicted	No explicit sex depicted
How often do you watch movies or read magazines or books that portray women as enjoying domination by a man (for example, being grabbed or dragged and held down, raped or forced to dance seductively, and apparently enjoying this)?	191. a b c d e	192. a b c d e
How often do you watch movies or read magazines or books that portray women as experiencing pain or humiliation and being very distressed by this, but unable to make the man stop?	193. a b c d e	194. a b c d e
How often do you watch movies or read magazines or books that portray women as experiencing pain or humiliation and being very distressed by this, and finally getting revenge on the man, or where the man gets punished?	195. a b c d e	196. a b c d e
How often do you watch movies or read magazines or books that portray women as enjoying equal power in sexual relationships with men?	197. a b c d e	198. a b c d e
How often do you watch movies or read magazines or books that portray two partners deeply in love in a relationship characterized by mutual respect and sensitivity?	199. a b c d e	200. a b c d e

For the next 10 questions, please indicate how turned on you usually become by the kinds of materials described in the previous 10 questions.

- A = extremely turned on
- B = moderately turned on
- C = slightly turned on
- D = not turned on, but not disgusted either
- E = not turned on, and definitely disgusted

201. (corresponds to #191) a b c d e	202. (corresponds to #192) a b c d e
203. (corresponds to #193) a b c d e	204. (corresponds to #194) a b c d e
205. (corresponds to #195) a b c d e	206. (corresponds to #196) a b c d e
207. (corresponds to #197) a b c d e	208. (corresponds to #198) a b c d e
209. (corresponds to #199) a b c d e	210. (corresponds to #200) a b c d e

FOR THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS, PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE ENGAGED IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED WITH A ROMANTIC PARTNER AND WITH ANYONE OTHER THAN A ROMANTIC PARTNER (FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON)

- A = never
- B = once
- C = 2 to 5 times
- D = 6 to 20 times
- E = more than 20 times

This group of questions deals with sexual experience FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON

HAVE YOU HAD SEXUAL CONTACT (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with someone when they let you know they wanted to have sexual contact with you, and you also really wanted this?

With a Romantic Partner  
PARTNER  
21. A B C D E

With Anyone Else  
OTHER  
212. A B C D E

HAVE YOU HAD SEXUAL INTERCOURSE (oral, anal, or vaginal) with someone when they let you know they wanted to have intercourse with you, and you also really wanted this?  
(note: consider intercourse to have occurred even if penetration was very brief and even if you did not ejaculate).

PARTNER  
213. A B C D E

OTHER  
214. A B C D E

HAVE YOU UNSUCCESSFULLY ATTEMPTED SEXUAL CONTACT (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with someone when they didn't want to by:

• overwhelming them with continual arguments?

PARTNER  
215. A B C D E

OTHER  
216. A B C D E

• using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)?

PARTNER  
217. A B C D E

OTHER  
218. A B C D E

• threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting the person's arm, holding the person down, etc.)?

PARTNER  
219. A B C D E

OTHER  
220. A B C D E

• giving this person alcohol or drugs?

PARTNER  
221. A B C D E

OTHER  
222. A B C D E

HAVE YOU SUCCEEDED IN HAVING SEXUAL CONTACT (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with someone when they didn't want to by:

• overwhelming them with continual arguments?

PARTNER  
223. A B C D E

OTHER  
224. A B C D E

• using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)?

PARTNER  
225. A B C D E

OTHER  
226. A B C D E

• threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting their arm, holding them down, etc.)?

PARTNER  
227. A B C D E

OTHER  
228. A B C D E

• giving this person alcohol or drugs?

PARNTER  
229. A B C D E

OTHER  
230. A B C D E

HAVE YOU UNSUCCESSFULLY ATTEMPTED SEXUAL INTERCOURSE (oral, anal, or vaginal) with someone when they didn't want to by:

• overwhelming them with continual arguments?

PARTNER  
231. A B C D E

OTHER  
232. A B C D E

• using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)?

PARTNER  
233. A B C D E

OTHER  
234. A B C D E

• threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting the person's arm, holding the person down, etc.)?

PARTNER  
235. A B C D E

OTHER  
236. A B C D E

• giving this person alcohol or drugs?

PARTNER  
237. A B C D E

OTHER  
238. A B C D E

HAVE YOU SUCCEEDED IN HAVING SEXUAL INTERCOURSE (oral, anal, or vaginal) with someone when they didn't want to by: (note: consider intercourse to have occurred even if penetration was very brief and even if you did not ejaculate).

A = Never  
 B = once  
 C = 2 to 5 times  
 D = 6 to 20 times  
 E = more than 20 times

- overwhelming them with continual arguments? 239. PARTNER ABCDE 240. OTHER ABCDE
- using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)? 241. PARTNER ABCDE 242. OTHER ABCDE
- threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting the person's arm, holding the person down, etc.?) 243. PARTNER ABCDE 244. OTHER ABCDE
- giving this person alcohol or drugs? 245. PARTNER ABCDE 246. OTHER ABCDE

The next group of questions deals with non-sexual physical acts (from age 14 on):  
 Have you:

Slammed a door behind you when someone really infuriated you:

- Have you done this with a great deal of force? 247. PARTNER ABCDE- 248. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you done this without a great deal of force? 249. PARTNER ABCDE 250. OTHER ABCDE

Have you smacked someone while pretending to just be playing around? Scantron # 2

- Have you done this with a great deal of force? 1. PARTNER ABCDE 2. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you done this without a great deal of force? 3. PARTNER ABCDE 4. OTHER ABCDE

Smashed or thrown a heavy or sharp object (in someone's presence, but not aimed at them) when someone infuriated you:

- Have you done this with a great deal of force? 5. PARTNER ABCDE 6. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you done this without a great deal of force? 7. PARTNER ABCDE 8. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you threatened to do this? 9. PARTNER ABCDE 10. OTHER ABCDE

Pushed, grabbed, shoved, shaken, or slapped someone; pinned someone down or prevented someone from leaving when they made you angry enough to do this:

- Have you done this with a great deal of force? 11. PARTNER ABCDE 12. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you read this? If so, mark choice E on 13 and 14. 13. PARTNER ABCDE 14. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you done this without a great deal of force? 15. PARTNER ABCDE 16. OTHER ABCDE
- Have you threatened to do this? 17. PARTNER ABCDE 18. OTHER ABCDE

Punched, or burned someone, yanked them by the hair, thrown a heavy or sharp object directly at someone, or otherwise inflicted injury on someone when they made you angry enough to do this:

A = never  
 B = once  
 C = 2 to 5 times  
 D = 6 to 20 times  
 E = more than 20 times

Have you done this with a great deal of force? 21. PARTNER ABCDE 20. OTHER ABCDE

(Now go to Answer Sheet #2; and continue blackening in the appropriate circles, starting with item #1 again.)

Have you done this without a great deal of force? 21. PARTNER ABCDE 22. OTHER ABCDE

Have you threatened to do this? 23. PARTNER ABCDE 24. OTHER ABCDE

Choked, or hit someone with a hard object when they made you angry enough to do this:

Have you done this with a great deal of force? 25. PARTNER ABCDE 26. OTHER ABCDE

Have you done this without a great deal of force? 27. PARTNER ABCDE 28. OTHER ABCDE

Have you threatened to do this? 29. PARTNER ABCDE 30. OTHER ABCDE

Used a weapon such as a knife or gun on someone when they made you angry enough to do this:

Have you done this with a great deal of force? 31. PARTNER ABCDE 32. OTHER ABCDE

Have you done this without a great deal of force? 33. PARTNER ABCDE 34. OTHER ABCDE

Have you threatened to do this? 35. PARTNER ABCDE 36. OTHER ABCDE

This group of questions deals with emotional actions (from age 14 on):

Have you tried to make someone insecure by criticizing and belittling their physical appearance, intelligence, opinions, values, etc.? 37. PARTNER ABCDE 38. OTHER ABCDE

Have you given someone the "silent treatment" (for example, sulked and/or refused to talk about it)? 39. PARTNER ABCDE 40. OTHER ABCDE

Have you made someone feel that their feelings, opinions, or wishes are of no importance by completely disregarding their feelings, opinions, or wishes? 41. PARTNER ABCDE 42. OTHER ABCDE

Have you intentionally tried to make someone feel inferior by calling them degrading and demeaning names such as "slut," "tag," etc.? 43. PARTNER ABCDE 44. OTHER ABCDE

Have you done or said something to hurt someone's feelings? 45. PARTNER ABCDE 46. OTHER ABCDE

Have you stomped out of the room? 47. PARTNER ABCDE 48. OTHER ABCDE

Have you been unreliable in terms of commitments? (For example, promise to meet the person and not show up) 49. PARTNER ABCDE 50. OTHER ABCDE

A = never  
 B = once  
 C = 2 to 5 times  
 D = 6 to 20 times  
 E = more than 20 times

- |  |     |                      |     |                    |
|--|-----|----------------------|-----|--------------------|
| Have you tried to make someone feel inferior by ridiculing or insulting their family, friends, religion, gender, race, or sexual orientation?                                      | 51. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 52. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| 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.)?    | 53. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 54. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| 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)? | 55. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 56. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you used reckless driving to frighten someone in the car into agreeing to something you want, or to get back at them?   | 57. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 58. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you made harassing phone calls?   | 59. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 60. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you coerced someone into doing something that would make them feel humiliated? (For example, coercing them to strip in front of your friends)                                 | 61. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 62. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you humiliated someone in public?   | 63. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 64. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you tried to get someone to do what you wanted by graphically describing how you have been violent in the past?   | 65. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 66. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you tried to control someone or get back at someone by hurting an animal (for example, a pet)?  | 67. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 68. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you broken into someone's house?  | 69. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 70. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you threatened to harm yourself in order to get someone to do something or prevent them from doing something?   | 71. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 72. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you threatened to harm someone else in order to get someone to do something or prevent them from doing something?   | 73. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 74. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you intentionally destroyed or defaced someone's personal belongings (for example, cut up their clothes, burned their notes before an exam, etc.)?                            | 75. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 76. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |
| Have you done or said anything to make someone afraid of you (except someone who is about to attack you, such as a mugger or bully)?   | 77. | PARTNER<br>A B C D E | 78. | OTHER<br>A B C D E |

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR SEXUAL EXPERIENCES FROM AGE 14 ON.  
ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET, MARK (a) FOR YES AND (b) FOR NO.**

79. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes, (b) No
80. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes (b) No
81. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes, (b) No
82. Have you attempted sexual intercourse (got on top of her, attempted to insert penis) with a woman when she didn't want it by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes (b) No
83. Have you attempted sexual intercourse (got on top of her, attempted to insert penis) with a woman when she didn't want it by giving her alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes (b) No
84. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes (b) No
85. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes (b) No
86. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by giving her alcohol or drugs? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes, (b) No
87. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of force (Twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes, (b) No
88. Have you engaged in sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? (From age 14 on)
- (a) Yes, (b) No

**THIS SECTION ASKS ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN AND WOMEN. ON THE ANSWER SHEET, BLACKEN IN THE BOX THAT INDICATES YOUR OPINION ON THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:**

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
	1	2	3	4	5
99. A woman who initiates a sexual encounter will probably have sex with anybody.....	1	2	3	4	5
90. A woman shouldn't give in sexually to a man too easily or he'll think she's loose.....	1	2	3	4	5
91. Men have biologically stronger sex drive than women.....	1	2	3	4	5
92. A nice woman will be offended or embarrassed by dirty jokes.....	1	2	3	4	5
93. Masturbation is a normal sexual activity.....	1	2	3	4	5
94. People should not have oral sex.....	1	2	3	4	5
95. I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement.....	1	2	3	4	5
96. Having sex during the menstrual period is unpleasant.....	1	2	3	4	5
97. The primary goal of sexual intercourse should be to have children.....	1	2	3	4	5
98. Women have the same needs for a sexual outlet as men.....	1	2	3	4	5
99. People today should not use "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a rule of living	1	2	3	4	5
100. Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women.....	1	2	3	4	5
101. Many times a woman will pretend she doesn't want to have intercourse because she doesn't want to seem loose, but she's really hoping the man will force her.....	1	2	3	4	5
102. A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her.....	1	2	3	4	5
103. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force.....	1	2	3	4	5
104. A man is never justified in hitting his wife.....	1	2	3	4	5
105. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she's willing to have sex.....	1	2	3	4	5
106. Any female can get raped.....	1	2	3	4	5
107. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.....	1	2	3	4	5
108. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wanted to.....	1	2	3	4	5
109. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops they are just asking for trouble.....	1	2	3	4	5
110. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.....	1	2	3	4	5
111. 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.....	1	2	3	4	5
112. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.....	1	2	3	4	5
113. 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.....	1	2	3	4	5
114. 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.....	1	2	3	4	5
115. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.....	1	2	3	4	5

**THIS SECTION ASKS ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN AND WOMEN. ON THE ANSWER SHEET, BLACKEN IN THE BOX THAT INDICATES YOUR OPINION ON THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:**

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
	1	2	3	4	5
99. A woman who initiates a sexual encounter will probably have sex with anybody.....					
100. A woman shouldn't give in sexually to a man too easily or he'll think she's loose.....					
101. Men have biologically stronger sex drive than women.....					
102. A nice woman will be offended or embarrassed by dirty jokes.....					
103. Masturbation is a normal sexual activity.....					
104. People should not have oral sex.....					
105. I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement.....					
106. Having sex during the menstrual period is unpleasant.....					
107. The primary goal of sexual intercourse should be to have children.....					
108. Women have the same needs for a sexual outlet as men.....					
109. People today should not use "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a rule of living					
110. Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women.....					
111. Many times a woman will pretend she doesn't want to have intercourse because she doesn't want to seem loose, but she's really hoping the man will force her.....					
112. A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her.....					
113. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force.....					
114. A man is never justified in hitting his wife.....					
115. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she's willing to have sex.....					
116. Any female can get raped.....					
117. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.....					
118. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wanted to.....					
119. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops they are just asking for trouble.....					
120. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.....					
121. 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.....					
122. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.....					
123. 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.....					
124. 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.....					
125. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.....					

51. Think of the adult person who was most influential in your life when you were between the ages of 10 and 16. In the space provided, briefly describe this person and your relationship with him or her.

---

---

---

---

52. Think of another adult person who was very influential in your life (other than a parent) when you were between the ages of 10 and 16. In the space provided, briefly describe this person and your relationship with him or her.

---

---

---

---

53. Think of someone close to your age who was very important in your life when you were between the ages of 10 and 16. In the space provided, briefly describe that person and your relationship with that person.

---

---

---

---

54. Think of the person who has been most important in your life in the past year or two. In the space provided, briefly describe that person and your relationship with that person.

---

---

---

---

55. In the space provided, briefly describe the ways in which you are most different from your father (or stepfather/male father figure), and tell why you think you are different in those respects?

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix D

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for taking the time to answer several hundred questions honestly and accurately.

We feel it's only fair for us to take a moment to explain to you more fully what we are trying to learn with this study, why it's important . . . and to respond to some of your questions and comments.

This is the first part of a study that will ultimately seek to identify the "Positive Resistance Factors" that help some men turn out to be egalitarian and nonviolent toward women, despite having grown up with risk factors such as a violent family of origin. (Previous research has identified a number of "risk factors" that tend to socialize men to be violent towards women to varying degrees.)

Before we can study nonviolent men who have overcome certain risk factors, we need questionnaires that identify these men. Previous studies have focussed on identifying men who are sexually violent or men who are batterers, but not men who are non-violent. This first study, therefore, included a questionnaire that asked about all kinds of violence, as well as the risk factors identified by previous research. At this point we want to know to what extent completely nonviolent men lack any or all of these risk factors.

Some of you were offended by some of the questions detailing violence and grossly sexist attitudes, and you certainly have a right to be offended. We know that most women and men see people of both genders as equally deserving of respect.

Many men are sickened by violence and would never perpetuate it. What we hope, however, is that those of you who fit in this category will not only acknowledge that there are men who have the attitudes and have committed the acts of violence referred to in the questionnaire you answered, but that you will take it upon yourselves to change the way we socialize the boys who will become the next generation's men.

Violence against women is much more common in our society than most people know. At the bottom of this page are some facts, and on the next page is an essay about one of the most common forms of violence against women -- date rape. ***Please read these, and don't stop with yourself. The sad statistics won't change unless men educate and change other men. You can start with the people you know and meet, where you live, where you play, and where you work. It takes a lot of guts to stand up for what you believe!***

Feel free to pass the essay on to friends or tack it on a bulletin board.

### Facts from a National Survey of college students:

- One in 4 college women were victims of rape or attempted rape.
- 84% of those raped knew their attacker (57% of the rapes happened on dates)
- 1 in 12 male students admitted having committed acts that meet the legal definition of rape or attempted rape.

# Acquaintance Rape at KU

*Rape is unwanted sexual touching*  
*Rape is an act of violence and control.*  
*Rape is the most underreported and least prosecuted violent crime.*  
*Rape is the ultimate expression of hatred and dominance.*  
*Rape is perpetuated by ignorance and complacency.*  
*Rape is everyone's problem.*

According to a recent national study of college campuses by Dr. Mary Koss, one in four women are raped by the age of 25. The FBI reports that one in three women are raped in their lifetime. In over two-thirds of these rapes, the woman knows her assailant. Over half of these rapes occur on dates. These figures make acquaintance and date rape more common than left-handedness, alcoholism, and heart attacks.

Our traditional beliefs and stereotypes concerning rape are based upon myths that actually help to guarantee the continued occurrence of sexual assault. For example, women are taught to depend on male acquaintances (lovers, fathers, brothers, uncles, and friends) to keep them safe from strangers in dark bushes, when in truth she is five times more likely to be raped by a man she knows. Chivalry—the idea of men protecting women from other men—leaves women with a false sense of security, rendering them more susceptible to attacks by an acquaintance. One of the most traumatic aspects of acquaintance rape is that the assailant is someone the woman trusts and often loves.

Frequently when women are raped, they are asked the following types of questions:

What were you wearing? Why were you with him?  
Did you fight back? Did he hit you?  
Did you yell? How loud did you yell?  
Did you say no? How many times did you say it?  
Did you lead him on? Were you a tease?  
Were you drunk? Had you slept with him before?  
Are you just regretting that you had sex with him?

By focusing on the behavior of the woman, these questions ignore the responsibility of the assailant. This kind of thinking holds the woman accountable for the actions of the man. Only the rapist can be held accountable. No one asks or deserves to be raped. There is no excuse for rape.

We teach men to victimize as we teach women to be victims. Boys and men are taught to be aggressive and concerned with their own needs. An aggressive mind-set entails disregard of the thoughts and feelings of others. Girls and women gain approval in our society by being "feminine." Being feminine means putting the needs of others in front of one's own. It is unfortunate that the ways in which we socialize men to be sexually selfless and women to be sexually selfless lead to inadequate communication. Men do not realize the importance of what the woman is saying (verbally and nonverbally) and women do not express their needs. Clearly, what might be considered merely a problem of communication between a man and a woman can result in rape. It is much easier to hold a woman responsible than to recognize that acquaintance rape is a logical outgrowth of gender socialization.

There are many myths which excuse the man's responsibility in acquaintance rape situations. Popular sayings such as "boys will be boys" are used to explain away male sexual aggression. The uncontrollability of male sexuality is a widely held belief. For example, men may say that they will get "blue balls" if their arousal does not quickly end in ejaculation. There is no corresponding term that applies to women. Another myth that enables men to act inappropriately is that, in certain situations, women "are asking for it" (rape). No behavior or dress justifies sexual assault; the rapist must always be held accountable for his actions. Part of the reason that men are perceived as being so powerful sexually is that our society does not see women as having sexual needs or desires. As individuals within the larger society, we need to redefine our own views of sexuality, since society's definition does not necessarily involve two mutually consenting adults.

If we are to truly understand that one in three women are raped in their lifetime, it follows that we must know some of the men who have raped these women. Rapists are people we know. In the study by Dr. Koss, one in twelve men admitted to having forced a woman to have sexual intercourse against her will. Of the men that said yes to this question, 84% did not identify their behavior as rape. In short, men fail to name what they did as rape.

It is time that we start focusing prevention activities upon men. When a sexual assault occurs, our questions ideally will not focus on the erroneous question of what the woman did to "provoke" the attack; rather, the questions will concentrate on why the man felt entitled to rape.

—Kirsten Lauring and Jim Danoff Burg