



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled


THE DATING GAME: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY  
OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE DATING  
FORMAT TO SEXUAL AGGRESSION

presented by

Sharon A. Cisco

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

M.S. degree in Criminal Justice

  
Major professor

Date May, 20, 1987



RETURNING MATERIALS:

Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

JUL 23 2005

NOV 13 2005

JUL 24 2005

#37 K128

SEP 27 2005

OCT 18 1993

276

MAGIC

APR 24 1990

DEC 15 1998

MAR 27 1997

087





THE DATING GAME: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY  
OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE DATING  
FORMAT TO SEXUAL AGGRESSION

By

Sharon A. Cisco

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Criminal Justice

1987

Copyright by  
SHARON A. CISCO  
1987

## ABSTRACT

### THE DATING GAME: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE DATING FORMAT TO SEXUAL AGGRESSION

By

Sharon A. Cisco

According to several studies, sexual assault that occurs on dates is a common occurrence. This exploratory study attempted to understand sexual aggression on dates in terms of the dating format. Data were collected from a purposive sample of 241 undergraduate students attending a large midwestern university. Factor analysis was used to reduce the data set and to identify various dimensions of dating. Four belief and four dating style dimensions were identified and correlation analysis and stepwise regression were used to test the relationship between these dimensions and use of as well as experience with verbal and physical coercive attempts to obtain sexual compliance. Dating style dimensions correlated most significantly with the dependent measures with "pick-up" dates having the strongest association with verbal coercion. None of the belief or style factors were associated with the use of physical force. A symbolic interactionist perspective guided the research.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Merry Morash, the chairperson of my graduate committee, for her comments, criticisms, and scholarly suggestions in the preparation of this thesis. Also appreciated are the contributions of Dr. Robert Trojanowicz and Dr. Vince Hoffman who, as guidance committee members, played a part in the development and the revision of this work.

Gratitude is also extended to Dr. Albert Levak, Dr. Barrie Thorne, Dr. Joyce Ladenson, and Ms. Conna Wood for so graciously permitting me to survey their classes. Without their assistance, this thesis probably wouldn't have come to pass.

I owe a great personal debt and much gratitude to the late Dr. Philip Marcus and to Dr. Dora Marcus for their support, inspiration, patience and encouragement. They helped me through many a difficult moment.

Special thanks are also due Mr. Nicholas Hinkle whose computer technical assistance and friendship are much appreciated.

A special thanks goes to Ms. Shirley Anthes, whose work in typing difficult copy against pressing deadlines were extraordinary and indeed beyond the call of friendship. Her part in this thesis is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, and most importantly, I wish to thank my daughter and best friend, Casey, who has been so very supportive throughout the preparation of this thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
LIST OF APPENDICES . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background of the Research Problem . . . . .	1
The Research Problem . . . . .	5
The Need for Research . . . . .	6
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	12
II. LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .	14
Overview of the Literature on Rape . . . . .	14
Sexual Behavior in the Dating Relationship . . . . .	17
Theoretical Perspectives . . . . .	26
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	41
Hypotheses . . . . .	41
Definition of Terms . . . . .	43
Sample and Sampling Procedures . . . . .	45
Instrumentation . . . . .	46
Data Analysis . . . . .	48
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	49
Introduction . . . . .	49
Sample Characteristics . . . . .	50
Factor Analysis of Data Subsets . . . . .	54
Dating Belief Variables . . . . .	54
Dating Style Variables . . . . .	62
Offending and Game-Playing Variables . . . . .	70
Summary . . . . .	70
Simple Bivariate Correlation Analysis . . . . .	80
Step-Wise Multiple Regresstion . . . . .	86

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	90
Overview . . . . .	90
Limitations . . . . .	96
Discussion . . . . .	98
Implications for Theory . . . . .	101
Considerations for Future Research . . . . .	104
APPENDICES . . . . .	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	127

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Variables for the Sample . . . . .	51
2. Factor Loadings to Determine Dating Belief Orientations, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241) . . . . .	56
3. Description of the New Belief Variables (4-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations . . .	61
4. Factor Loadings to Determine Dating Style Orientations, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241) . . . . .	63
5. Description of the New Dating Style Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241)	65
6. Factor Loadings to Determine Alcohol and Drug Orientations, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241) . . . . .	65
7. Description of the New Alcohol and Drug Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241)	67
8. Description of Third and Fourth Subset Variables (n=241) .	68
9. Factor Loadings to Determine Gameplaying or Offending Orientations used by Respondents, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241)	71
10. Description of the New UMANIPUL and UFORCE Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241) . . . . .	74
11. Factor Loadings to Determine Gameplaying or Offending Orientations Experienced by Respondents, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241) . . . . .	75
12. Description of the New OFFENDNG and GAMEPLAY Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241) . . . . .	77
13. Summary of New Factor Variables . . . . .	79
14. Bivariate Correlations (Pearson's r) for Dating Belief and Style Variables with all Dependent Measures, Females (n=171) . . . . .	81

Table	Page
15. Bivariate Correlations (Pearson's $r$ ) for Dating Belief and Style Variables with all Dependent Measures, Males (n=70)	84
16. Step-Wise Regression of all Independent Variables on UMANIPUL, Males (n=70) . . . . .	88
17. Step-Wise Regression of all Independent Variables on GAMEPLAY, Females (n=271) . . . . .	88
1B. Eigenvalues for 58 Dating Belief Variables . . . . .	123
2B. Eigenvalues for First Dating Style Subset, 10 Variables .	125
3B. Eigenvalues for Second Dating Style Subset, 6 Variables .	125
4B. Eigenvalues for First Subset of Dependent Measures, 8 Variables. . . . .	126
5B. Eigenvalues for Second Subset of Dependent Measures, 24 Variables . . . . .	126



## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. The Survey Instrument . . . . .	106
B. Eigenvalue Tables . . . . .	123

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background of the Research Problem

For most women, the word "rape" conjures an immediate terrifying image: a stranger with a gun breaking into the house at night, a knife-wielding stranger appearing suddenly out of a dark alley. Those images aren't incorrect, but they are a long way from complete. The word "forced," however, as defined by law--and most men and women--seldom encompasses more than the traditional picture of sudden attack by a total stranger.  
(Mithers, 1980:210)

Even though there has been considerable publicity given to the topic of rape over the past decade or so--much of which has attempted to eradicate the many myths surrounding this subject--the stereotype of the rapist as a stranger still prevails. Contrary to this myth, however, evidence shows that rapes are often committed by someone known to the victim, for example, a friend, neighbor, relative, or date. In fact Bowker (1981a), Dowd (1983), Mithers (1980), and Seligmann et al. (1984) estimate that at least 50 percent of all rapes are not stranger rapes at all, but acquaintance rapes. Research bears this out. Schneider (1981), in a study of 216 rapes in New Jersey, found that 59 percent of these reported rapes fell into the acquaintance category. Similarly, Amir (1971) found over

40 percent and in MacDonald's (1971) study of 200 rapes in Denver, 40 percent of the victims were raped by either a friend, relative, employer, or casual acquaintance. These figures, of course, do not reflect unreported rapes, which many suspect, if known, would boost the numbers of acquaintance rapes even higher. It is believed that a woman who finds herself assaulted by someone she knows is unlikely to interpret it as rape, and, therefore, is unlikely to report it.

Furthermore, Storaska's (1975) "educated guess" is that 35 percent of all acquaintance rapes are committed by the victim's date, boyfriend or fiancée and Theo (1983) contends that "date rape" is the most common sexual offense of all--"rape in which a man commits sexual aggression against a woman he is out with." That sexual aggression does occur on dates appears to be supported by research, research that has focused on college students who date.

In work done by Kanin and Parcell (1977), 83 percent of the 282 college women in their sample reported being sexually offended by men they dated. This included casual dates as well as long-term relationships. And in an earlier study, of which the above is a replication (Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957), 55.7 percent of the dating college females in the sample reported sexual aggression with 20.7 percent reporting forceful attempts at intercourse. Similarly, Wilson, Faison and Britton (1983), in a study of full-time undergraduate students from a university in the South, found that 31 percent of the males surveyed admitted to using "forceful and offensive attempts for sexual intercourse which did not involve menacing threats or painful physical persuasion and 2.3 percent reported that they had

made forceful and offensive attempts for sexual intercourse which involved menacing threats and/or painful physical persuasion" (p. 247). In a 1979 survey of the entire University of Rhode Island population regarding incidence of sexual assault (defined as sexual contact through the use of force, threatened force, or a weapon, without consent) and sexual harassment, Lott, Reilly and Howard (1983) found that "the vast majority of women reporting assaults (71 percent) were main campus undergraduates." Moreover, "half of all reported assaults were perpetrated by acquaintances with 18 percent by co-workers, friends or dates" (p. 304).

More recently, Koss (cited in Sherman, 1985) completed a three-year survey of college women from 35 universities nationwide. Of the first 1,000 respondents (a total of 6,500 women were surveyed by project's end), one out of eight women reported being raped and 47 percent of that group "said the rapists were either first dates, casual dates, or romantic acquaintances."

Weis and Borges (1973:73) link the incidence of sexual assault on campus to the way dating is organized: "It might be suggested that the American dating system is a major factor contributing to the 'rape scene' in this country." And according to Thio (1983:145):

Male role expectations often require that the male take an active part in achieving the social and the sexual relation with a female. He should be aggressive and use whatever force necessary to carry out his sexual conquest. He need not concern himself with how much force he is allowed to use. Our culture puts that burden on the female; it is she who has to determine the limit of the force he is allowed. But even when the female bluntly tells him to stop or puts up a fight to ward off his sexual advances, he may still ignore her resistance.

Unfortunately, this is often accepted as "normal" dating behavior.

An article in a large midwestern university paper (Christopherson, 1983: 12), referring to a talk by a male member of a sexual assault and safety education program, well illustrates this point:

He talks to many college men who say they aren't rapists. After all, they don't maliciously jump out of bushes in the night, abuse 90-year-old women or pursue little girls on their way home from school. But they may believe that, when the women they date say "stop," they are only being coy, and so these men don't stop. Technically, that makes them rapists.

There have been years of conditioning that women mean yes when they say no.

Heterosexual dating has been traditionally characterized by role playing with males assuming the dominant role and females the passive in accordance with sex role socialization. And it has been characterized by stereotypical beliefs about male and female sexual behavior--beliefs which often lead to conflicts concerning sexual activity. Males have been taught to expect sexual rewards when dating and to try for them despite female protestations. Females, on the other hand, have been taught they are responsible for setting sexual limits, so tend to fault themselves when aggression does occur. Because both parties enter the dating event with conflicting expectations, they have difficulty interpreting the sexual or non-sexual goals of the other. Consequently, the dating event becomes an arena where the participants, unsure of the expectations of their dating partners, play games of manipulation and coercion. This game playing appears to be related to the incidence of sexual aggression reported by the studies mentioned earlier.

### The Research Problem

In American society the traditional dating format appears to be conducive to incidents of sexual aggression:

- (1) dating participants carry into the dating relationship stereotypical ideas of male and female sexual behavior--ideas which may lead to conflicts concerning sexual activity (e.g., the belief that females expect or want to be forced to engage in sexual activity);
- (2) males have traditionally assumed the dominant role in all facets of the dating relationship, including that of sexual initiator, and females have assumed the dependent role;
- (3) males are encouraged to expect sexual activity as a payoff for their social and financial investment in the date;
- (4) females are expected to set sexual limits while, at the same time, males are encouraged to extend those limits; and
- (5) sexual activity is considered by many to be an integral part of the dating scene, therefore, participants may feel obligated to initiate or participate in such activity when they may, in fact, not want to.

These and other characteristics of the dating event seem to contribute to misunderstandings, conflicting expectations and gameplaying to achieve goals, especially sexual ones. And the result may be sexual offending ranging from verbal manipulation (i.e., the use of "lines" or threats to end a relationship) to physical sexual assault.

### The Need for Research

There are two major justifications for conducting research dealing with sexual offending that occurs on dates. First of all, even though the topic has received considerable media attention, little research has been done in this area. In general, date assault as well as other forms of acquaintance rape have been neglected by the academic community. Only recently, within the last five years or so, have researchers begun to treat the topic seriously. Consequently, most of the information we do have on rape concerns stranger rape. This is not to say knowledge about stranger rape is unimportant, but it is only a part of the larger picture of rape; and information on date assault will help complete that picture. Secondly, a better understanding of the relationship of sexual offending to the dating format, may provide answers for preventing future victimizations.

Furthermore, though research in this area--sexual offending on dates--suggests that the traditional structure of dating contributes in some way to sexual offending and in some instances rape, few have pursued this line of thought. Most of the work, thus far, primarily has attempted to show that college women are being victimized by dates and rather frequently. But it has not attempted to determine how or to what extent the traditional dating configuration or dating game contributes to sexual offending and more importantly, whether or not individuals who date in a non-traditional way are being victimized at the same rate as those who date traditionally.

Within the context of conventional dating, men have traditionally assumed the responsibility for making decisions regarding whom to

date, where to go, what to do, how to get there, and additionally, have absorbed the financial cost of the date. Under these circumstances, females primarily have had only one decision to make: whether or not to accept the invitation. And once having accepted, for example, an offer to go out to eat or to a movie, convention has also implied that the female is accepting whatever else her date has in mind--she is accepting a packaged deal. Because attitudes and roles have been changing over the last few decades, albeit slowly, a number of college students may be engaging in a more egalitarian dating style and can serve as a comparison group to those who follow the traditional dating format. For example, some males may no longer view themselves as the sole economic provider for the date or feel they must fulfill the role of sexual initiator. And there may be females who no longer are passive participants, and who no longer see sex as an obligation on their part. Furthermore, some women may be initiating interaction (e.g., asking men out) and paying for the date. Ullman (1984), a senior at the University of California, Berkeley, claims that "dating is less stereotypical and more casual today." Yet she claims that "men and women alike are confused about who should ask whom out and who should pay." As she sees it, contemporary dating is divided into "formal" and "casual" dating with the former referring to the traditional format where males assume responsibility for the date and the latter referring to occasions where females are "active participants in the process." Applebome (1986) agrees with Ullman concerning the confusion over who pays for the date. Based on interviews with single people in their 20s and 30s, he claims that "paying for a date is one of those hazy areas that's



determined according to who did the asking, the degrees to which people accept traditional sexual roles and who has the most money." He goes on to say that "despite changing sexual mores, it's clear that many men and women still expect the man to pay, particularly on a first and second date."

We need to know what proportion of dating, college students are still participating in a traditional dating style and how many are not, and of those who are not, whether they are experiencing the same level of sexual aggression as their traditional counterparts. Common sense would seem to suggest that if females shared in the decision-making process and in the financial costs of the date, men would no longer be able to "anticipate a sexual return on their financial or social investment" (Weis and Borges, 1973), thus feeling justified in applying sexual pressure, nor would women feel they must comply with that pressure. Logic also suggests that women who are more assertive in their relationships with men, might experience less sexual offending. However, these suppositions need to be tested.

To understand why date assault occurs, we must look at the interactional setting in which it takes place. As Shepherd (1982:235) claims "frequently binding social arrangements, which we are so prone to take for granted, are themselves contributors to much victimization that occurs among human beings." And these "social arrangements" are often based on collective stereotypes. The traditional dating event is permeated with stereotypes--stereotypes of the event itself as well as sex role and sexual behavior stereotypes.

Traditionally, the dating configuration has reflected the way in which males and females have been socialized in our society.

In general women have been taught to be passive and dependent and males have been taught to be aggressive and dominant. Because women grow up with traits of passivity and learned helplessness, they tend to carry these traits into the dating relationship. And "when a woman is behaving in the way she is socialized, she is most vulnerable to sexual assault, having a trained incapacity to deal with such an attack should it occur" (Bart, 1981:125). This is true whether the attack is by a stranger, acquaintance, or a date. On the other hand, males have been taught to be dominant and in control of all situations including dating. Koss (1982) found that the sexually aggressive males in her work tended to "oversubscribe" to traditional males roles; men have learned to base their worth, in part, on their sexual performance.

Exacerbating the problem is the stereotype of rape as a stranger event. Barrett (1982:48) claims that "it's hard to make women understand that if they do get raped while they're in college, it's more likely to be on a date than in a dark alley." But if a woman is sexually assaulted by someone she knows, especially a date, she is likely to have difficulty defining it as sexual assault. As Medea and Thompson (1974:12) contend, "there are artificial lines of actual behavior: if it happens in an alley, it's rape, if it happens in bed, it's love. If the man is a stranger, it's rape; if he's your date, it's love."

Finally, analyses of the dating interaction may provide us information for preventing future victimizations. The solution to sexual offending that occurs on dates involves a multifaceted approach. While many authors propose long-range macro level changes,

such as institutional level changes regarding the socialization of children, we must, in the meantime, offer women some short-range strategies they can now use. The literature suggests that we change the dating equation from

male social + financial control = female sexual payoff

to

shared social & financial input = sex by consent & negotiation

If the rules of dating are changed so that the social and financial investment is shared, decisions should reflect consensus not coercion. Shared decision-making should lead to more congruent expectations or goals for the dating relationship, thereby, eliminating the game-playing nature of the interaction. When the female in a dating relationship can stop thinking of herself as the non-aggressive, subordinate participant and the male can stop thinking of himself as the aggressive, dominant participant, dating will begin to lose some of its game-like qualities. Also when females learn to add assertiveness to their behavioral repertoire and males learn to add empathy and sensitivity to theirs, sexual activity on dates may then reflect consent and negotiation rather than intimidation and force. Dating should not be a contest, but a relationship of mutuality, for no one should have to take "date assault for granted" (Barrett, 1982).

According to Brodsky (1976b), we need to teach women "to say what they mean, openly and directly, and not to play games." And we must also teach males "to take refusals seriously." A no is a no is a no. Barrett (1982) agrees that we need to communicate to women that they must be "self-assured, forthright, and definite

in encounters with men," for "the evidence suggests that a female student may have to contend with a sizable minority of men who will press her to go to bed with them whether she wants to or not." If women do not want to participate in sexual activity, they must let their dating partners know "in no uncertain terms what they want or don't want" (Storaska, 1975). "In the present dating system, however, women commonly expect men to take care of them, and therefore situations develop in which a women can't take care of herself. This leaves her vulnerable to men she may scarcely know" (Medea and Thompson, 1974:41).

Besides assertiveness, other strategies are also recommended for avoiding date assault. Because they recognize that there is a high risk of assault among acquaintances, Medea and Thompson (1974) admonish women to stay out of unusual situations with men they don't know well and also recommend that women participate in the planning of a date, pay their own way, and always carry money with them on dates, so that they are able to get themselves out of difficult situations that may arise. And Driscoll (1971) and Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) feel there is a need for educational means to inform students about how men and women do react to each other and to point out areas where misunderstandings may occur and reasons for those misunderstandings.

All of these suggestions seem laudable. But no research, thus far, has looked at whether or not these strategies do, in fact, decrease the level of sexual offending. Currently, we know through research that assaults are taking place, and though there has been speculation as to why, no research has really attempted to look

at the part the dating game contributes to potentially assaultive situations. Several questions, then, must be asked, among them: Is there more sexual offending in dating situations where one individual is in control? Does less offensive behavior occur on dates where there is equal input? Are stereotypical attitudes about dating activity and stereotypical attitudes towards sex roles positively correlated with frequency of offending? Are stereotypical attitudes about sex roles positively related to miscommunication and conflict over sexual activity? Are women who participate in a dating style commensurate with traditional sex roles, more likely to experience sexual offending than those who do not? Are men who date traditionally more likely to use aggression to achieve sexual compliance from their dates and to sanction such behavior? And are men and women who subscribe to sex-role stereotypes likely to date in a traditional way? By studying the dating interaction, we should be able to answer some of these questions. And the answers should provide us with suggestions for preventing date assault.

In sum, many studies have reported a high level of sexual offending among college couples who date. And this offending seems to be related to the way dating has been traditionally organized. However, no research has been done to firmly establish this link. Furthermore, even though college women fall within the age group of 16-24, which is especially vulnerable to rape in general (Amir, 1971; Bowker, 1980, 1981a; Hindelang, 1976, 1977), and also belong to the age group most frequently involved in dating, they continue to think of rape as a stranger event. Riger, Gordon, and LeBailley (1978) found that women still tend to think of streets, alleys, and parks

as the most dangerous places with regard to rape. Consequently, when college women do take precautions against victimization, these precautions are almost entirely stranger-oriented. They may be protecting themselves by taking self-defense classes or by not going out alone at night, but they are not prepared to protect themselves from being assaulted by their dates. In large part, this is because they do not think of rape within the context of dating.

### Purpose of the Study

The goals of the present study were threefold. First of all, as an exploratory investigation, the aim was to obtain clarification of the concept of dating. It was hoped that by identifying dimensions of dating, for example, various dating style and dating belief clusters, a better understanding of the nature of contemporary college dating would be obtained. A second goal was to assess whether or not particular dimensions of dating were related to verbal and physical sexual offending. The final goal was to demonstrate the utility of a symbolic interactionist perspective for understanding sexual assault within the context of the dating interaction (specified in Chapter II). Overall, the present research was seen as a preliminary venture--one that would help establish priorities for carrying out a subsequent, more highly structured and controlled survey design.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Overview of the Literature on Rape

When reviewing the literature relevant to rape, one finds that numerous books and articles have been written on this subject, especially during the past two decades. Very little of this material, however, focuses on dating behavior and its relationship to sexual assault. In fact, acquaintance rape, in general, has received meager attention. Only recently has date rape emerged as a viable topic.

The bulk of the literature on rape reflects a feminist perspective--one that believes rape is a result of a sexist society where men are in a position of power and women are viewed as property (Brownmiller, 1975; Calvert, 1974; Chapman and Gates, 1978; Clark and Lewis, 1977; Davis, 1975; Gager and Schurr, 1976; Griffin, 1979; Holliday, 1982; Holmstrom, 1983; Holmstrom and Burgess, 1983a & b; Hursch, 1977; Lagen, 1976; Manhard and Rush, 1971; Mauss and Wolfe, 1977; Metzger, 1976; Rose, 1977a & b; Scherer, 1982; Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974; Williams and Holmes, 1981). But this literature either mentions date assault not at all or only in passing. It is not being suggested, however, that the feminist literature is unimportant for it can be credited with calling attention to the crime of rape in the first place, and in the second, for

generating many books and articles on coping and adjustment behavior of victims after assault (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1976; Hilberman, 1976; Notman and Nadelson, 1976; Resik et al., 1981) and on victim-interaction with the criminal justice system--police, prosecution and courts (Bode, 1978; Chappell, 1976; Holmstrom and Burgess, 1983; LaFree, 1981; Peters, 1977; Sanders, 1980; Sheppard, Giancinti and Tjaden, 1976). But it is also responsible for generating a considerable amount of literature which displays a stranger-rape bias, for example, emphasis on environmental protection strategies such as "make sure your doors are locked," "don't go out alone at night," "don't be overly friendly with someone you don't know" (Offir, 1975; Selkin, 1975; Stone, 1983) and emphasis on the use of self-defense against stranger assault (Molmen, 1982). Most of these works, though, fail to address the potential of assault by someone who is known, either as a casual acquaintance or a date, in which case, a warning of "don't be overly friendly with someone you don't know" is not going to be all inclusive; it is not going to cover all situations of rape.

Admittedly, women need advice on how to prevent stranger rape and the many books and articles which give advice on how to do so are an important contribution to the rape literature. But as mentioned in Chapter I, the image of stranger rape isn't incorrect; it is just incomplete (Mithers, 1980). Overall the rape literature leaves a void by not giving women strategies on how to protect themselves from acquaintance assault, especially that occurring in dating situations. Most likely, suggestions are slow in coming, because date rape is still an unknown commodity. While few researchers



would contest the claim that date assault is occurring and much too frequently, few have a clear understanding of the dating event and how it may contribute to offending. Consequently, there are few suggestions on how to prevent date victimization.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the tendency to focus on stranger rape remedies remains in the literature.

A good example is a recent book by Carol Pritchard (1985), Avoiding Rape on and off Campus. She discusses date rape in the introductory chapter:

Studies indicate that the majority of college women who are raped are victims of "date rapes." These "date rapes" tend to take place on weekends during the late evening and early morning hours, frequently occurring at the rapist's place of residence. The majority of victims range in age between mid-teens to mid-twenties. (p. 11)

But her "19 Precautions" or recommendations for rape prevention (pp. 25-34) primarily deal with stranger rape prevention, for example:

- Do lock your apartment and dormitory doors;
- Close your blinds and shades at night;
- Keep one hand free when walking;
- Lock your car doors;
- Vary routes on campus;
- Walk briskly and look alert.

Although she acknowledges that college women are often victims

---

<sup>1</sup>Even though there is a paucity of literature on preventing date assault, a growing number of programs and workshops are being conducted on campuses across the country. According to Sherman (1985), several such sessions have been held at the University of Wisconsin. A group called "Men Stopping Rape" has sponsored "workshops and seminars that explore the topic of date rape, where men and women discuss dating expectations. The goal "is to get women to say clearly what they want, or don't want and to get men to listen to women and to talk to them." And at Swarthmore video dramatizations are used to acquaint students with the problem and ways of preventing victimization.

of date rape, she offers few strategies for preventing date assault. The only strategy relating directly to the dating situation was "When you first meet a man, stay in public places or double date. Avoid being alone at either your or his apartment" (p. 12). Pritchard, a rape referral counselor at Glassboro State College, has the best of intentions, but like others before her, has had little research to draw from when it comes to date assault.

In addition, by focusing the problem at the societal level, much of the literature on rape has tended, perhaps inadvertently, to ignore victim-offender interaction. Consequently, date assault didn't receive much attention until the 1980s, when several articles on the subject began to appear in the popular literature (Barrett, 1982; Christopherson, 1983; Dowd, 1983; Mithers, 1980; Schwartz *et al.*, 1986; Seligmann *et al.*, 1984; Sherman, 1985). Therefore, the material most germane to the topic at hand--that of the role traditional dating plays in sexual assault--is rather sparse relative to the substantial amount of literature on rape in general.

### Sexual Behavior in the Dating Relationship

While the issue of date rape appears to have emerged only recently, there were earlier works, nonetheless, that touched on the subject. Calvert (1974), Hilberman (1976), Klemmack and Klemmack (1976), Medea and Thompson (1974), Storaska (1975), and Weis and Borges (1973) were among the first to discuss the way in which dating is organized and its potential for sexual offending. Having sex on dates may be a common dating activity, but according to these various authors, dating involves game-like behavior where

sex is not a free exchange, but is won or obtained according to the rules of the game. And game rules for dating appear to be long established.

As early as 1937, Waller described dating or courtship as a "thrill-seeking," exploitative relationship where the "female exploits for presents and expensive amusements." Weis and Borges (1973:88) also refer to the dating relationship as a "mutually exploitative arrangement of self-role expectations which limit and direct behavior of both parties and determine the character of the relationship." According to them:

Men generally initiate the social interaction by asking a member of the opposite sex out for an evening of entertainment. Many aspects of the date are highly ritualized; he is expected to show her a good time and pay all of the expenses. The time and frequency with which a couple has been dating is expected to have some impact on the degree of intimacy she will allow. Dating is often seen as the first step toward courtship and eventually marriage. She may stress the latter development, whereas he may be interested in maintaining a less serious involvement. This gives the interaction a game-like quality, in which the participants may be dishonest about the goals they are pursuing and operate under different guises depending on their sex.

...Built into the concept of dating is the notion that the woman is an object which may be purchased. The man is taught to anticipate a sexual return on his financial and social investment. (pp. 87-88)

Klemmack and Klemmack (1976) also contend that "in the American dating system females are viewed as sexual objects; men are socialized to expect a sexual reward (or at least to try for that reward)."

Traditionally, then, dating has been characterized by different goals and expectations, a double standard of sexual behavior, and game-like properties that imply one partner in the dating relationship will emerge a winner and the other a loser. Contributing to the win-lose nature of the game is the notion that the female will

set a sexual limit which the male, in turn, will try to extend either by pressure, deception, intimidation, or force. Women, of course are expected to rebuff, initially at least, all sexual advances. MacDonald (1971:84) believes "a certain measure of forcefulness is expected by many women in lovemaking or courtship. Likewise, the man expects some resistance to his efforts at seduction." Similarly, Medea and Thompson (1974:23) claim "the man has always been taught that no women really wants to have sex and that he will have to bargain for it." And according to Klemmack and Klemmack (1976), there is a double standard of sexuality: "man's sexuality is something to be enjoyed and given when it pleases him; a woman's sexuality has to be persuaded or forced out of her." Moreover, Calvert (1974) feels that a "man starts with the assumption that any woman is sexually available to him, if he is persistent enough." And "any reasonably experienced male has learned to disregard a woman's minor protestations." And finally MacKellar (1975:6) states:

There are still a great many men to whom forcing a woman sexually is not a crime. Resisting sexual advances is the normal way for a woman to act, and overcoming this resistance is the way a man is supposed to act.

It is also expected that males will assume the dominant role in the dating relationship, and females the subordinate. Falbo and Peplau (1980), in a study of power strategies used by single college men and women in their relationships, found that most of the women perceived themselves to be in a weaker or subordinate position, in contrast, to most of the males, who perceived themselves to be in the dominant position. Accordingly, males expected compliance when trying to influence their partners, where females assumed non-compliance to their influence attempts. Under these circumstances,

dating becomes a no-win situation for most women. It comes as no surprise, then, that "many women take date assault for granted; something they must put up with if they go out with men" (Barrett, 1982). Medea and Thompson (1974) concur, "many young women on a first date feel fortunate if the evening ends quietly rather than in a wrestling match or an actual rape."

The importance to males of winning sexual contact in the dating game, from a few grabs to the ultimate--sexual intercourse--is illustrated again and again in the literature. Komarovsky (1976), in interviews with 62 college senior males, found the majority (56) believed, to varying degrees, that "sex as a conquest of a resisting female" is a desirable goal. In fact, one male "was known to place a mark on the wall of his dormitory room for every new conquest" (p. 64). In this sense, dating is a sport, where women who participate are potential trophies for some game hunter's wall. In a parallel vein, Thio (1983:144) sees dating as a "masculinity contest," where women are the prize:

This society places a high premium on competition, men are pressured to engage in what may be called a masculinity contest. In order to come out as a winner, a man has to make out with the largest number of women possible.

And according to Clark and Lewis (1977), "men who identify masculinity with sexual dominance and aggression are not likely to see any difference between what they call seduction and women call rape."

To win the contest, males, especially those who adhere to traditional sex-role values (Taylor and Smith, 1974), appear to frequently resort to covert as well as overt methods to "persuade" their partners to comply sexually. Gorer (1948) and Balswick and Anderson (1969) claim that a technique often used by males to get

females to acquiesce sexually is the "line, "for example, a profession of love. And according to Gorer, the use of such "lines" is merely a "friendly deception"--an accepted dating procedure. Corroborating the above claim, Kanin (1967), in a study of male sexual aggression on college campuses (Kanin defines sexual aggression as "the male's quest for coital access of a rejecting female during the course of which physical coercion is utilized to the degree that offended responses are elicited from the female"), found that 80.5 percent of the sexually aggressive males (as opposed to 27.3 percent of the non-aggressive males), in addition to using physical coercion, indicated having used one of the following "surreptitious maneuvers": "attempted to get girl intoxicated," "falsely promised marriage," "falsely professed love," "threatened to terminate relationship." According to Kanin, "exploitation of the female for erotic gratification permeates the entire approach of the aggressive male." And as shown below, this exploitation isn't always so "friendly," nor is it infrequent.

In a study done by Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957), 55.7 percent of the dating college females in their sample (162) indicated having been sexually offended while at college, and of this number, 20.9 percent were offended by "forceful attempts at intercourse and 6.2 percent by aggressively forceful attempts of which menacing threats or coercive infliction of physical pain were employed." Overall, these women experienced 1,022 sexually offensive episodes. Kanin (1957) concluded that dating relationships were characterized by exploitation and that misunderstanding and miscommunication were factors associated with offensive episodes. In a replication

of the 1957 study, Kanin and Parcell (1977) found an even higher incidence of offending; 83 percent of the 282 college females surveyed in this sample reported having been sexually offended during high school and/or college. And in further support of sexual aggression among college couples who date, over 70 percent of the women in Koss's study (1982) acknowledged being pressured to some degree to have sex in excess of what they desired and "38 percent reported sexual victimizations that met the legal definition of rape" (p. 16). In addition, many participants in this study felt that all heterosexual relationships were a form of game playing.

Based on the research above, it would appear that the traditional dating game is alive and flourishing. A significant number of young men and women, especially those of college age, seem to be playing the game according to traditional rules with male sexual aggression being taken for granted by both sexes. Consequently, women often give in to sexual demands that do not match their own because they perceive themselves powerless, or because they want to be liked, or because they are afraid of offending males. College females in a study done by D'Augelli and Cross (1975) indicated they "often participated in sexual activity in excess of their personal preference." But some dating women, who don't comply, are physically forced to engage in sexual activity against their will; in other words, they are sexually assaulted or raped. Indeed, without great difficulty, one can envision how sexual assault may be a natural consequence of the dating game. As Medea and Thompson see it (1974:23):

If he knows the woman and she lets herself be put into the situation that allows him to rape her, he will almost certainly not think that he has raped her; she has made a false move in the game and it only makes sense for him to take advantage of it.

Even though our society encourages males to use deception and intimidation to "persuade" females to have sexual contact with them, and even though many women take this kind of behavior for granted, these females, nonetheless, find it offensive as indicated in the research above. Also some of these so-called techniques of courtship qualify as sexual assault or rape.

While few researchers have attempted to directly investigate the relationship of the dating format to sexual offending, there has been work peripheral to the problem.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the work done by Kanin (1957), Kanin (1967), Kanin and Parcell (1977), Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957), Komarovskiy (1976), Koss (1982), and Koss and Oros (1982), there have been several studies, multidisciplinary in nature, which have attempted to examine the relationship of traditional sex role attitudes to attitudes about rape (Calhoun, Selby and Warring, 1976; Feild, 1978; Krulewitz, 1981; Krulewitz and Nash, 1979; Krulewitz and Payne, 1978; Scroggs, 1976), the relationship of premarital sexual attitudes of American college

---

<sup>1</sup>While an understanding of the dating event and its relationship to sexual assault was not a main goal of their investigation, a few items from the Sexual Experiences Survey designed by Koss and Oros (1982) do measure some game-like aspects of dating behavior. For example, misinterpretation of sexual intimacy and use of the "line," are included in two of the items: (1) "Have you ever had a man (woman) misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?", and (2) "Have you ever found out that a man had obtained sexual intercourse with you by saying things he didn't really mean?" (p. 456)



students to sexual behavior or standards (Croake, 1973; Driscoll, 1971; Kaats and David, 1970; Spence and Helmreich, 1972), and the relationship of stereotyped sex role attitudes to miscommunication in dating (Balswick and Anderson, 1969; Rosenkrantz et al. 1968).

When college students were given hypothetical situations of rape, several authors found a strong relationship between stereotyped attitudes towards sex roles and stereotyped attitudes about rape. Krulewitz and Nash (1979) found that both college men and women tended to apply sex-role stereotypes when evaluating rape situations. With regard to victim precipitation, Krulewitz and Payne (1978) found that women in their study attributed more responsibility to the victim than did men, while Calhoun, Selby and Warring's (1976) research showed males to view rape as the victim's fault to a greater extent than did females. And data from the Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1967) and Kanin (1957) studies showed that both males and females involved in actual cases of sexual aggression or victimization on campus believed that the aggression was somehow the fault of the female (e.g., "she let it get out of hand," or "she was asking for it"). As far as force and resistance to rape are concerned, females as well as males seem to need evidence of force and resistance to that force, before they can define a situation as rape, with traditional females being the most influenced by the assailant's force (Krulewitz and Payne, 1978). Furthermore, some males interpret a failure to resist as a "conscious or unconscious desire for sexual intercourse" (MacDonald, 1971).

It is rather disconcerting to find that college women seem to require, as a criterion for rape, strong physical resistance,

because when asked about defense against assault in general, they tend to endorse nonaggressive responses (Krulewitz, 1981; Scroggs, 1976). Men, on the other hand, strongly endorse aggressive responses to assault. In the Krulewitz study, "women believed physically aggressive victims were the most likely to be physically injured," while "men believed that physical aggression was the most effective method for averting attack." Likewise, Scroggs found that "men feel that not to defend oneself is to ask for it," while "women feel that not to defend oneself is to give notice of one's helplessness and consequently, of the inappropriateness of oneself as a target for aggression." This research suggests that male and female college students who hold stereotyped attitudes toward sex roles are apt to carry those attitudes into the dating environment and when assault or rape does occur, females will have difficulty in defining it as such and will also have difficulty in responding in an appropriate manner to a sexually aggressive event. Also males will have difficulty in interpreting female responses to their sexual overtures.

Concerning sex-role stereotypes and sexual behavior, some researchers have found that college students, both female and male, appear to continue to strongly adhere to traditional role stereotypes (Driscoll, 1971; Kaats and David, 1970; Krulewitz, 1981; Krulewitz and Nash, 1979; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968); others have found a considerable shift away from traditional to more liberal attitudes towards women (Spence and Helmreich, 1972), and a shift towards more liberal attitudes about sex (Croake, 1973). This would suggest that there is a group of students engaging in non-stereotypic behavior; a group which may be tapped by research. However, Kaats and David

(1970) found that in spite of more liberal sexual attitudes, dating couples were still experiencing a double standard in actual sexual behavior. And Balswick and Anderson (1969) and Driscoll (1971) found that both males and females tended to misread sexual expectations because of discrepancies in perception about sexual standards, attitudes, and behavior that were in accordance with their prescribed roles.

Much of this research strongly suggests that attitudinal shifts away from stereotypes about sex roles may significantly help reduce the incidence of date assault. The contemporary dating scene, with its emphasis on traditional role-playing, is an ambiguous situation characterized by tension and unclear and contradictory sex role expectations, which frequently result in miscommunication, misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the degree of sexual intimacy desired by either sex.

### Theoretical Perspectives

While articles have been written on date rape and investigations have been conducted to determine the prevalence of date assault, a review of the literature shows that few attempts have been made to understand it from a sound theoretical standpoint. In fact, Burt (1980:229) claims:

Until quite recently the whole area of rape research proceeded on largely atheoretical grounds while at the same time implicitly incorporating many cultural stereotypes into its hypotheses, methodologies, and interpretations of results.

Early theories of rape were mainly psychopathological orientations where rape was seen as a symptom of some psychological dysfunction

in the male (Groth and Birnbaum, 1979). But these clinical theories have been based on a very small sample of the real population and have failed to take into account either victim-offender interaction or the input of socialization. Also these studies have focused on either the offender or the victim, not the interaction.

Later efforts at theorizing produced a subcultural perspective, which asserts that rape is due to a lower-class subculture of violence where aggressive and exploitative behavior towards women is a normative part of the subculture and a victim precipitation model which suggests that characteristics or behaviors of females are to blame for rape events. For example, a woman can precipitate rape by placing herself in a vulnerable position (e.g., agreeing to drink or ride with a stranger), by wearing seductive clothing, by using obscene language, or by not resisting strongly enough when attacked. These actions or non actions by the female imply consent. Within this framework, the "victim is always the cause of the crime," because "the victim creates the possibility of the crime" (Schafer, 1968:79).

According to Schwendinger and Schwendinger (1974) victim precipitation also "assumes that rape involves a degree of overwhelming passion on the part of men." A not uncommon statement of reproach would be: "You have led him on, so what do you expect?" Furthermore, they believe that maintaining a woman is a contributor to the event "normalizes" rape as "consensual heterosexual sex." The victim precipitation model is most frequently used to explain assault situations where the victim knows the offender.

Amir (1971), in a study of all forcible rape cases listed with the Philadelphia police department for the years 1958 and

1960, draws from both the subcultural and victim precipitation perspectives. In support of subcultural theory, he claims:

Because the highest rates of the offenses studied occurred among relatively homogeneous groups, it is, therefore, assumed that these groups situated in a subculture, hold a particular set of conduct norms which emphasize and condone aggressive behavior, and have also the least 'resistance potential' toward aggressive sexual behavior. Thus, under special circumstances, violence, including sexual violence towards women, is more likely to occur. Furthermore it is contended that members of these subcultures are more likely to react aggressively than non-members. Hence, individual differences in aggressive behavior may also reflect different degrees of integration with the subculture rather than only personality differences of a pathological nature.

It is not contended, however, that there is a unique subculture of rape. Rather, there exists a ubiquitous or "parent" subculture of violence. Rape is, therefore, only an epiphenomenon occurring under special circumstances. (pp. 319-320)

But in an analysis of stranger versus non-stranger rape, he relies on the victim precipitation perspective. In his study, he found that in more than one-third of the cases (N=646), the victim and the offender "knew each other as close neighbors or acquaintances" and that "offenders and victims frequently met in the home or place of sojourn of either one of them and that the offense also occurred in that place" (p. 336). While "date rape" terminology isn't used, some of the rapes described in Amir's study would have clearly fallen into this category. He, at least, admits (1971: 245:246) that "the foregoing analysis already tends to discard the assumption that forcible rape is an event where a woman is attacked, without warning, by an offender who is unknown to her." But he then appears to discredit many of the non-stranger rapes in his study by assuming complicity on the part of the victim and uses the following as a "working definition" of victim precipitation to identify whether

or not a rape fell into this category:

. . . those rape situations in which the victim actually, or so it was deemed, agreed to sexual relations but retracted before the actual act or did not react strongly enough when the suggestion was made by the offender. The term applies also to cases in risky situations marred with sexuality, especially when she uses what could be interpreted as indecency in language and gestures, or constitutes what could be taken as an invitation to sexual relations.  
(p. 266)

He further subdivides the model (p. 493): "victim behavior may consist of an act of commission (e.g., she agreed to drink or ride with a stranger), or omission (e.g., she failed to react strongly enough to sexual suggestions and overtures)." Police comments found in some of the case files obviously biased this labeling process, for example, "she behaved provocatively," "it seems she was seductive" or "irresponsible."

All in all, Amir claimed that 71 percent of the acquaintance rapes were victim precipitated as opposed to 43 percent of the stranger rapes. The irony here is that all of these rapes, according to the police files, were cases of forcible rape without consent, and yet, by labeling a great many of the rapes, especially the acquaintance rapes, victim precipitated, it is implied that these women did consent, to some extent anyway, by contributing to the crime.

The literature abounds with such examples, among them, MacDonald (1971:3), who feels that "some women, by their reckless behavior, tempt fate," and Clinard and Quinney (1973:42), who state "the victim of rape often appears to have much to do with the fact that she is raped." And in a content analysis of 13 criminology textbooks published between 1970 and 1977, Wisan (1979) found victim precipitation

to be a major theme.

Following in Amir's footsteps, Schiff (1979), in an analysis of 100 cases of rape, excluded those where he "questioned whether all or any of the components of the crime were factual." Most of the cases he dismissed as not being rape were those where the victim knew the assailant. For example, he excluded a case "where a woman on a date had been intoxicated and claimed that her date raped her while she was sick." And another case was excluded because it involved an 18-year-old girl who had been having sexual intercourse with the alleged assailant on a regular basis. Schiff, however, doubts the credibility of most rape victims as demonstrated by this quote from an earlier work:

The determination as to whether a female has or has not been sexually attacked is often difficult, if not impossible, to make and the truth is known only to two people, one saying yes and the other no . . . He (the medical examiner) must rely upon whatever the victim tells him, distilling out what he believes to be fact, physical signs which, at times, are difficult to unravel, and a sixth sense derived from interviewing hundreds of patients. In arriving at a conclusion, he must weigh carefully the words and the attitude of the victim as well as to seek out any hidden, ulterior motives. He must keep his index of suspicion high because, not infrequently, false accusations of rape have been made against innocent persons (1973:345).

Amid such skepticism, the issue of rape in general had difficulty surfacing, let alone the issue of date rape. While mention of acquaintance rape began to appear in the literature in the late 1960s and early 1970s, invariably, it was linked to the victim precipitation model, which tended to minimize the legitimacy of these rapes. The paucity of literature on acquaintance rape and date rape, in part, can be attributed to this perspective.

By the mid to late 1970s the idea of victim precipitation

was beginning to be vigorously challenged, particularly by those belonging to the feminist camp. The wave of feminist literature stimulated new ways of thinking about rape. As a result, the concept of rape took on a new look--that of a violent crime as opposed to a sex crime. Rape was now an act of power, violence, aggression, and degradation (Becker, Abel and Skinner, 1979; Bode, 1978; Brownmiller, 1975; Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974). A theory typifying this new orientation is that of sexual stratification which asserts that rape is a direct result of our society's differential sex-role socialization, which places men in a position of power and dominance (Jackson, 1978; Rose 1977b, Schlegel, 1977; Williams and Holmes, 1981).

Much of the research on date assault has as Burt put it "proceeded on largely atheoretical grounds." Those studies which have utilized theoretical frameworks most often have used combinations or variations of several longstanding sociological orientations. Wilson, Faison and Britton (1983) combined structural strain theory with social learning to explain male sexual aggression on campus:

. . . anomie results from the acceptance of a double standard. If a society encourages sexual encounters for males, and discourages sexual encounters for females, a clear disjunction between goals and means results. Innovations like sex aggression should occur under these circumstances. (p. 244)

With regard to social learning they believe gender stereotypes "identify certain types of women as legitimate targets for sexual aggression" and "learned patterns of aggressive behavior" lead to abuse in other situations such as the dating event: "when abused boys grow up they abuse their dates." Similar to Wilson, Faison and Britton's structural strain theory, Kanin (1967) "studied male



sex aggression to determine whether it tends to be a response of frustrated males unable to obtain outlets by sanctioned means." Instead, he found it to be "more a function of peer group associations."

The idea of sex-role socialization or cultural conditioning has greatly influenced recent thinking about rape (Sanday, 1981). A study by Berger et al. (1986) views sexual assault "as a form of socially conditioned sexual aggression that stems from traditional gender role socialization and sexual learning." For example, few undergraduate female students in their sample took seriously unwanted sexual contacts, especially those occurring in local bars:

Many women seemed to take these types of behaviors as givens, as part of the dating game, as reasonable risks one invariably had to take when trying to meet the opposite sex. These women have been so effectively socialized to accept the cultural norms of male sexual aggression that they appeared to have difficulty imagining that things could, or should, be any different. (p. 14)

And respondents often felt responsible for nonconsensual sexual contact and even intercourse because they somehow thought they should have had more sense than to accompany men they barely knew, or because they had consented to kissing or other sexual 'preliminaries'. They knew they didn't want to go any further, but often questioned their right to withdraw consent once sexual activity had begun and the man had become aroused. (p. 15)

Traditional sex-role socialization appears to play a primary part in the way dating is organized. As Waller (1937:727) states, "although there are endless variations in courtship customs, they are always functionally related to the total configuration of the culture." And according to Storaska (1975), "men and women tend to play out the roles society currently favors, so they start out with a preconceived notion of what the date should be." Men and women, then, are "products of and potential victims of their own

social and cultural creations" (Shepherd, 1982). Typically in this society, males are socialized to be strong, aggressive, and dominant (Becker and Abel, 1978; Knox and Kupferer, 1971; Komarovsky, 1976). Most of the males in Komarovsky's study regarded these traits to characterize their notion of the "ideal man." If males are repeatedly told they should be aggressive and dominant, they come to believe it.

In contrast, females are traditionally socialized to be the weaker or more sexually passive sex (Griffin, 1979; Jackson, 1978; Klemmack and Klemmack, 1976; Riger, Gordon and LeBailley, 1978; Weis and Borges, 1973). "They are systematically instructed in the feminine virtues of ladylike behavior, particularly to be submissive to men" (Weis and Borges, 1973:81). Gager and Schurr (1976) claim that socializing women to be passive prevents them from making "clear choices" and places them in a position conducive to victimization. Society has contradictory expectations of women, for while they are taught to be weak and passive, they are also expected to respond aggressively when attacked, especially in rape situations. Naturally, women are unable to meet these diametrically opposed expectations.

The dating game is a microcosm of society at large in that its participants or players tend to carry into the dating environment the roles society has taught them to play. Since our society condones that males be dominant and aggressive, they are usually the dominant and aggressive participants in the dating interaction and are expected to be the initiators of sexual activity. Likewise, women have learned to be passive participants in the interaction and are expected

to agree to sex with reluctance. And if they don't agree, males have been taught to apply pressure to overcome their resistance, since through socialization, they have come to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on a date. Overall, the game reflects the common belief in our society that it's natural for the sexes to engage in battle, whether in the dating interaction or outside of it.

To understand the dating interaction and the way it contributes to sexual assault, it is necessary to observe the roles and meanings associated with the interaction. Weis and Borges (1973:88), coming from a symbolic interactionist orientation, claim that "interaction takes place between role-carriers rather than persons." And in dating these roles are often "unclear, frequently contradictory, and sometimes mutually exclusive." In their excellent article they state:

The stereotypic notions of male and female roles and their relationships to conceptions of masculine and feminine sexuality, coupled with a situation that is fraught with ambiguous expectations, provide the ingredients for systematically socialized actors who can participate in the drama of rape. The dating system, by setting up such situations, accustoms the male to encounters in which he feels some justification and need to demand intimate sex and to approach this goal forcefully. (p. 86)

Through socialization, we learn what others expect of us as we move into role-playing in groups. Socialization involves the "acquisition of shared meanings" so that each individual coming into an interactional situation has a unique set of meanings and these meanings are derived primarily from the meaning given to these acts by the person's social and cultural environment (Lauer and Handel, 1983). Consequently, what he or she does in the interaction

depends upon the kind of person that individual is as well as meanings he or she attaches to the event. Over time, we develop definitions of different kinds of situations and base our conduct on those definitions (Stryker, 1980). Thus, these definitions give individuals a rough guide of what they should or should not do in any given situation. But according to Weis and Borges (1973:89), individuals involved in the dating interaction have "difficulty in coming to a consensus about the definition of the situation." Consequently, "misunderstandings may occur on both sides."

Each participant, in accordance with his or her prescribed role expectancies, has formed a definition of what the dating encounter will be and these definitions are often opposed to one another. For example, not included in the definition of dating, especially for the female, is sexual assault or rape. A dating relationship is most frequently seen as one in which rape cannot occur (Barrett, 1982; Klemmack and Klemmack, 1976; Koss, 1982; Mithers, 1980). A woman often assumes that the person she is with is trustworthy because he is known to her regardless of whether or not it is a casual date or one of long standing. As Hilberman states (1976:xi):

Rape can occur in a social situation as well as in surprise attacks, but in the former non-consent is often overlooked or misinterpreted by assuming that certain situations imply a willingness for a sexual relationship.

And "since having sex on dates is a normal dating activity, many rape victims may interpret rape as overly aggressive sexual advances" (Sanders, 1980:50). Koss (1982:22) found that women who were identified

as "unacknowledged victims" of rape, were often romantically involved with their offender and were unable to define the situation as rape. Consequently, women seldom report date rapes, because they are convinced it couldn't have happened since it occurred within the framework of a date or because they feel they did something to bring it about.

When participants have definitions in opposition to one another, the gestures or symbols used in the interaction lead to conflict as both parties try, often in vain, to interpret what the other expects or is doing within the framework of their definition. As Weis and Borges state, "in a conflict situation the participants often struggle to interpret the verbal and nonverbal gestures of the other and to assign them social meaning which allows a definition of the situation." And the most common conflict for participants in a heterosexual dating interaction is interpreting the sexual intent of the other. Therefore, participants frequently misinterpret the sexual expectations of their dating partners. In the study done by Balwick and Anderson (1969:777), in response to the question, "If a boy offers you a ride home from a bar, do you expect to make out for a while? over twice as many males as females predicted that a girl would respond in the affirmative." And in response to the question, "If a boy offers to walk you home from a bar, do you expect to make out? almost three times more males than females felt that a girl would respond in the affirmative." They concluded that both males and females were far from accurate in reading the sexual expectations of their dates. And when there is a sexual misunderstanding, males have frequently been able to

convince their dating partners that the responsibility for the misunderstanding is theirs.

Similarly, Jackson (1978:34) claims:

Competing definitions of the situation are a constant source of misinterpretation and misunderstanding in the unfolding of the sexual drama. The man has to rely on successfully decoding the gestural and verbal cues which she provides and it is therefore possible for him to perceive a sexual invitation where none was intended. It is also possible that the woman might not realize that he has defined a situation in sexual terms when she has not. This ambiguity may provide a pretext for the mobilization of the appropriate techniques of neutralization. If the man does not reassess his initial definition of the situation and proceeds to interpret all that transpires within its terms, the likely outcome is rape.

And Goodchilds and Zellman (1984) postulate that "sexual signaling" --various verbal and nonverbal behaviors--can influence expectations and behavior during a relationship. To see whether or not males and females interpret behavioral cues the same and to see whether or not these interpretations relate to aggression, they surveyed 432 adolescents between 14 and 18 years of age. They found that "male respondents consistently scored behaviors as more indicative of sexual interest than did their female counterparts," concluding that "males have a more sexualized view of the world than females, attributing more sexual meaning to a wide range of behaviors" (p. 239). For example, males in their study viewed certain items of female apparel (e.g., low-cut blouses and tight jeans) as "potent sexual signals" while females were not as certain of their meaning. Some teenagers are more apt to wear such clothing as part of a fashion statement than as a lure for males. And while going to a man's home was a less ambiguous set of signals, "male interviewees were more confident than females that the dating pair wanted to

have sex."

Goodchilds and Zellman also presented several rape scenarios to their subjects and found that 79 percent of their sample believed that under some circumstances it was all right for a male to hold his date down and force her to have sexual intercourse. "While the extent to which male adolescents accept sexual assault as justified is surprising, the numbers of female adolescents who also condone a male attack is truly astounding. While female acceptance was less, the fact that females could accept such behavior at all is deeply disturbing" (p. 242). (Twenty-one percent of the sample--two-thirds female--replied that no circumstances would justify such behavior.) These findings related to interpretations respondents made of certain behaviors. For example, force was considered justified if the couple had dated a long time, the female said she would have sex but then changed her mind, and the female's behavior was seen as responsible for getting the male sexually excited.

In conclusion, Goodchilds and Zellman found that many behaviors were still being interpreted in accordance with traditional stereotypes about male and female behavior. Males were expected to be aggressive and females were expected to be responsible for controlling sexual activity on dates and thus were responsible for sexual outcomes. And data from their study indicated that adolescents seem to accept adversary as part of the male-female relationship, especially where sex is concerned. In summing up the relationship of sexual signaling to the dating interaction they state:

A system that works (i.e., one in which signals are clear and straightforward) allows relationships to proceed (or not) based on accurate readings of the partners' needs and wishes. A dysfunctional system, in which signals

are distorted by the sender, the receiver, or both, results in relationships that run the risk of being dishonest, exploitative, stereotypical, and unsatisfying. (p. 235)

Other conflicts in the dating relationship include differences in perceptions of sex (biological need for males versus sex as a manifestation of love for females), differences in behavioral styles (aggressiveness for males versus passivity for females), and the male's perception that sexual activity is a fair exchange for his input into the date. "In the process of learning the female role, (the woman) is taught to value her sexual favors as an important item of exchange, to be used, ideally, to transact a marriage contract" (Weis and Borges, 1973:81). Thus, the dating system "leaves the woman in a position of being a sexual object that is bought and paid for" (p. 108). Therefore, it is assumed that if the male provides the economic resources for the date, the female, in return, will provide physical gratification as a reward or payment.

On the whole, dating is characterized by conflicts which hinder its participants from taking part in a relationship with common goals or expectations. Because of sex-role socialization, participants often have different expectations for the event which, in turn, often lead to misunderstandings about sexual activity. And these misunderstandings can sometimes lead to offensive sexual behavior or rape.

The symbolic interactionist perspective provides a useful framework for viewing sexual assaults on dates and is the frame of reference employed in the present research. As Jackson (1978:29) contends:



If rape is to be understood, then, it must be placed within the context of the patterns of sexual relationships typical of our society. Rather than asking why some men rape we should ask how rape is possible within certain situations, how features of conventional sexual scenes create the potential for rape.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

As mentioned in Chapter I, the present study had three major goals: (1) to identify dimensions of dating that would help clarify the dating construct, (2) to assess whether or not particular dimensions are related to verbal and/or physical sexual offending, and (3) to assess the utility of using a symbolic interactionist perspective for understanding sexual assault within the context of the dating interaction. This study is an exploratory investigation and uses the symbolic interactionist perspective as its theoretical orientation.

#### Hypotheses

Because the first goal of this study was to discover and identify dimensions of dating beliefs and dating style that might clarify the dating interaction, hypotheses concerning dating dimensions were, of necessity, somewhat general. But based on the symbolic interactionist perspective and implications from prior research, it was believed that dating dimensions would be subsets for the traditional/non-traditional continuum, that is, college students would be dating in a way which reflected sex-role socialization. And it was expected that students who were more traditional in their orientation on beliefs and style of dating dimensions would be more likely to experience or use sexual aggression than those who had a non-traditional orientation on these dimensions. Furthermore, research has indicated that

traditionally females are the ones offended and males have been the offenders. Thus, the following hypotheses were proposed to guide the research study:

Hypothesis 1: Females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 2: Females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 3: Females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 4: Females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females with a non-traditional orientation.

Corresponding hypotheses for males were:

Hypothesis 5: Males who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion and manipulation) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 6: Males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion and manipulation) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 7: Males who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs

are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation;

Hypothesis 8: Males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than are males with a non-traditional orientation.

The independent variables in this study were traditional beliefs and traditional dating style and the dependent measures were sexual offending--verbal and physical. Traditional dating beliefs were operationalized in terms of factor scores obtained for four dating belief dimensions. Dating style was operationalized in terms of factor scores obtained on four dating style dimensions and scores obtained on 18 individual style variables. Sexual offending--verbal and physical--was operationalized in terms of factor scores on four offending dimensions.

#### Definition of Terms

DATE refers to a social engagement with a person of the opposite sex, in other words, a situation where there is an understanding that the heterosexual pair is together for a focused interaction usually of a social nature.

TRADITIONAL DATING FORMAT refers to a dating interaction where the male assumes the dominant role in the relationship and assumes the social and financial responsibility for the date (i.e., initiates the dating interaction, pays expenses, provides transportation, decides where to go and what to do).

NON-TRADITIONAL DATING FORMAT refers to a dating interaction where both participants share in the social and financial responsibility

for the date with neither assuming a dominant role.

TRADITIONAL DATING BELIEFS refer to beliefs that are commensurate with a traditional dating style and with stereotypical attitudes about male and female behavior.

UNARRANGED OR "PICK-UP" DATE refers to an occasion where the date is considered to begin at the time the female or male accepts an offer to pair off (e.g., meeting in a bar); and pick-up dates are usually with someone unknown prior to the pairing.

PRE-ARRANGED DATE refers to a date planned prior to the actual time the date begins either with someone already known (casually or long-term) or with someone unknown, e.g., a blind date.

SEXUAL OFFENDING OR AGGRESSION is defined operationally in this study as all reported "unwanted sexual overtures," verbal and/or physical, made by one dating partner to obtain sexual compliance from the other, for example, forceful maneuvering of a partner into a sexually convenient position, the forceful removal of clothing, verbal threats, etc. (This study defines sexual aggression more generally and considers a wide range of offending behaviors, that is, a continuum of sexually offensive behaviors ranging from verbal coercion to the ultimately aggressive act, rape.

GAME PLAYING specifically refers to the use of types of verbal manipulation to obtain sexual compliance from a dating partner, for example, threatening to end a relationship if a dating partner doesn't comply sexually, and using "lines" to convince a date to participate in sexual activity.

### Sample and Sampling Procedure

A total of 241 undergraduate students enrolled at Michigan State University during the fall of 1985 comprised the sample for this study. These subjects were drawn from five courses purposively selected to maximize the heterogeneity of respondents. Two courses approved to meet the University's general education requirement in the social and behavioral sciences (SS 201 - Americans and Their Values and SOC 241 - Introduction to Sociology) were chosen because of diversity in class composition. (All undergraduate students attending Michigan State University are required to complete 45 credits of general education as a part of their degree programs.) Two courses approved for the Women's Studies-Thematic Program (CJ 425 - Women in Criminal Justice and IDC 233 - Introduction to Women's Studies) were included to increase the likelihood of obtaining respondents who may have dated in a non-traditional manner. The fifth course-ATL 181 - Writing: Women in America--was approved as a course for the Women's Studies-Thematic Program and for the general education requirement in written and oral communication.

Data were collected with a 140-item questionnaire administered by the researcher in the classroom. The investigator supervised the testing procedure--giving instructions for completing the survey, ensuring anonymity, and distributing and collecting completed questionnaires. Because the questionnaire was quite long and took, on the average, 40 minutes to complete, students who did not complete the survey during the class period were allowed to finish it out of class with the understanding they would return the instrument at the next class meeting. (Envelopes were provided to those students who wished

to return the survey directly to the researcher's on-campus office.)

Of the students attending the five courses mentioned above, 43 did not participate in the study. Eight students were married; 6 had not dated anyone of the opposite sex during the past year; 18 preferred to not participate; and 11 cited other reasons (including 2 foreign students whose religion did not permit dating). A subsequent check of the completed instruments resulted in the decision to delete 22 cases because of substantial item nonresponse, especially nonresponse to demographic questions. This resulted in a sample size of 241. (Demographic variables were located at the end of the survey instrument. Consequently, students who had not completed the survey by the end of the class period but, nonetheless, opted to return it at that time failed, in most cases, to respond to these items, rendering their questionnaires inadequate for analysis.)

### Instrumentation

The basic instrument was an anonymous 140-item questionnaire (Appendix A) with total administration time approximating 40 minutes. The questionnaire was designed to be as simple and visually appealing as possible so that questions could be answered quickly by filling in the appropriate circle on the accompanying answer sheet. The cover page explained the study briefly and assured the student of anonymity. And students were asked to place their responses to questions within a time frame: the last 12 months.

Fifty-eight items reflecting beliefs about dating were included in the instrument; each item had five Likert-type responses (agree strongly, agree mildly, undecided, disagree mildly, disagree strongly).

The dating belief items were culled from a systematic search of the literature for items that would be useful for characterizing people's beliefs about dating behavior and the dating event. Furthermore, these items were designed to measure the degree to which a respondent had a traditional or non-traditional orientation to dating. For example, it has been traditional for men to take the social and sexual initiative in dating relationships. Thus several items in this subset of questions tapped this particular facet of traditionality.

Sixty-eight items were designed to measure actual dating experiences. These items were subdivided into the following categories: (1) style of dating variables (e.g., pick-up dates, steady dates, etc.), (2) game playing or manipulation variables (e.g., "When dating during the past year, did you ever use drugs?"), (4) date dominance variables (e.g., "When dating during the past year, how often did you feel like you were the stronger or more dominant person on the date?"), and (5) physical sexual offending variables (e.g., "Did a date ever use some degree of physical force to try and make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn't want to?"). The sexual offending items were suggested by the Sexual Experiences Scale developed by Koss and Oros (1982). So that both males and females could respond to these items, they were modified to some extent for inclusion in this questionnaire. And most of the items included under dating experiences were answered using a frequency continuum (e.g., "none," "a few," "half," "most," "all").

Finally, four items reflected the main reason a respondent dated and the last 10 variables characterized respondents by age, sex, year in college, college of major preference, religious affiliation, ethnicity,



residence, participation in a women's study course, participation in a rape awareness program and class surveyed.

### Data Analysis

To meet the objectives of this study, factor analysis, simple bivariate correlation, and stepwise multiple regression techniques were used to test the hypotheses. First, factor analysis was used to reduce the data set and to identify valid dimensions or clusters of various subsets of data, for example, the 58 dating belief variables were subjected to a principal components analysis. After extraction of roots and VARIMAX rotation, factor solutions that were most meaningful were chosen for further study. The new factor variables were first subjected to a simple correlational analysis (Pearson's  $r$ ) and then to multiple regression, a higher order analysis, to determine "best fit" models for predicting sexual offending. Findings from the data analysis are reported in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Introduction

The present study, exploratory in nature, had three major goals: (1) to identify dimensions of contemporary dating--dimensions that reflect dating belief or behavioral style orientations, (2) to assess whether or not these dimensions are related to verbal and/or physical sexual offending on dates, and (3) to demonstrate the utility of using a symbolic interactionist perspective to better understand sexual offending within the context of the dating interaction.

The procedures employed for data analysis are suggested not only by the nature of the data, but also by the overall intent and purpose of the investigation. While various statistical procedures were performed, it must be recognized that the uniqueness and exploratory nature of this investigation restricts and limits the generalizability of the results.

By way of orientation, this chapter will begin with a description of the sample, then will proceed to a discussion of the factor analysis of various data subsets. Then, to test the hypotheses, the discussion will turn to correlational analysis and stepwise multiple regression.

### Sample Characteristics

The data collected are from a sample of 241 undergraduate students who attended Michigan State University during the fall of 1985. A breakdown of the sample by sex shows that there were more female (170 or 70.5%) than male (71 or 29.5%) respondents. (Absolute and relative frequencies for the demographic variables are presented in Table 1). With respect to age, 92 percent were 21 years of age or younger with the largest percentage (40.7%) falling in the 18-year old category.

Because general education classes were surveyed, it was not surprising to find that the majority or 72.2 percent of the respondents were either freshmen (48.1%) or sophomores (24.1%). Most students attending Michigan State University attempt to complete general education requirements by the end of their sophomore year. Thus only 27.8 percent or 67 respondents were upperclassmen.

The frequencies further reveal that the sample was dispersed rather evenly with respect to college of major preference. The colleges with the largest percentage of respondents were the College of Business (27.8%), the College of Social Science (14.5%), and the College of Communication Arts (11.6%). Once again, the nature of general education classes seems to influence this distribution. Because all students are required to take 45 credits of general education, class composition was expected to reflect a variety of majors.

As shown in Table 1, respondents were disproportionately white with few students belonging to ethnic minorities. Of the 240 students responding to this item, (there was missing information for one case), 215 or 89.2 percent were white, 10 (4.1%) were black, 5 (2.1%) were

TABLE 1.--Demographic Variables for the Sample.<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Sex		
Male	71	29.5
Female	170	70.5
Age		
17	1	.4
18	98	40.7
19	61	25.3
20	32	13.3
21	26	10.8
22	9	3.7
23	4	1.7
24	5	2.1
25	1	.4
Year of College		
Freshman	116	48.1
Sophomore	58	24.1
Junior	40	16.6
Senior	26	10.8
Off Campus/Lifelong	1	.4
Major		
Agriculture	10	4.1
Arts & Letters	10	4.1
Business	67	27.8
Communication Arts	28	11.6
Education	9	3.7
Engineering	25	6.2
Human Ecology	12	5.0
Human Medicine	6	2.5
James Madison	5	2.1
Natural Science	12	5.0
Nursing	2	.8
Osteopathic Medicine	5	2.1
Social Science	35	14.5
Veterinary Medicine	3	1.2
No Preference	22	9.1
Ethnicity		
Black	10	4.1
Hispanic	5	2.1
White	215	89.2
American Indian	3	1.2
Oriental	5	2.1
Other	2	.8

Table 1 (cont'd.)

<b>Religiosity</b>		
Catholic	102	42.3
Jewish	9	3.7
Baptist/Bible/Nazarene/ Pentecostal Gospel	20	8.3
Methodist/Episcopal/Presbyterian/ Lutheran	68	28.2
Seventh Day Adventist	1	.4
Interdenominational/Non- Demoninational	1	.4
Christian Scientist	3	1.2
Other	16	6.6
None	21	8.7
<b>Place of Residence</b>		
Dormitory	94	39.0
Sorority	5	2.1
Fraternity	3	1.2
Off campus, parents	99	41.1
Off campus, alone	7	2.9
Off campus, with roommate(s)	24	10.0
Off campus, steady boyfriend	3	1.2
Off campus, steady girlfriend	1	.4
Other	5	2.1
<b>Women's Study Courses</b>		
No	174	72.2
Yes	66	27.4
<b>Participated in Rapeawareness</b>		
No	210	87.1
Yes	27	11.2
<b>Course Surveyed</b>		
SS 201	172	71.4
SOC 241	24	10.0
CJ 425	26	10.8
ATL 182	14	5.8
IDC 233	5	2.1

---

<sup>a</sup>There were 4 missing cases for the variable age and 1 missing case for the variable ethnicity.

Hispanic, 3 (1.2%) were American Indian, 5 (2.1%) were Oriental, and 2 students fell into the "other" category.

Looking at religiosity, the data reveal that a preponderance of students (42.3%) designated Catholicism as their religious preference. It should be noted, however, that students were asked to respond to this item within a particular time frame, namely, "when they were growing up." Consequently, the designated preference, that of their family, may not necessarily be the one to which they currently ascribe. The second largest grouping was that of the "Methodist/Episcopal/Presbyterian/Lutheran" category, containing 68 responses or 28.2 percent of the sample.

Finally, with respect to place of residence, 94 (39%) lived in one of the dormitories on campus, 99 (41.1%) lived off campus with parents, 24 (10%) lived off campus with same-sex friends, 5 (2.1%) lived in a sorority, 3 (1.2%) lived in a fraternity, 7 (2.9%) lived off campus alone, 3 (1.2%) lived with a steady boyfriend, 1 (.4%) lived with a steady girlfriend, and 5 or 2.1 percent fell into the "other" category. Again, the large number of students living off campus with parents is reflective of the time frame of the instrument--"the past 12 months." As mentioned above, 72.2 percent of the students in the sample were freshmen and since the instrument was administered during the fall of 1985, typically a first term for new freshmen, responses for many students in the sample indicated where they were living during their senior year of high school.

With regard to participation in a women's study course or a rape awareness program (items 139 and 140), 174 or 72.2% of the respondents said they had never taken a women's studies course and 210

or 87.1% said they had never participated in a rape awareness program.

### Factor Analysis of Data Subsets

There were two primary motivations behind using factor analysis in the present study. First of all, it was used as an exploratory device to locate or identify dimensions of dating beliefs and dating behavior which would better define or explain the dating construct. Secondly, factor analysis was used to reduce the large number of variables to a smaller number of homogeneous subgroups which could then be used in subsequent analysis. By looking for interrelationships among the many variables in the instrument, considerable parsimony was achieved.

Items were initially factor analyzed using the principal components method with VARIMAX rotation. The number of factors extracted was based on (1) the eigenvalue associated with each factor (i.e., only factors with eigenvalues greater than one were extracted), (2) the number of items with meaningfully large loadings on each factor (i.e., loadings equal to or exceeding .30 were considered significant), and (3) the ability to reach a theoretically interpretable simple structure. (Eigenvalues for each set of variables factor analyzed are reported in Appendix B.)

### Dating Belief Variables

The matrix of intercorrelations among the 58 Dating Belief variables was subjected to a principal components extraction of roots, which yielded 17 eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0. The 17-corresponding factors accounted for 63.4 percent of the total variance

(Appendix B). The 17-, 7-, 6-, and 5-factor solutions were then examined, but did not collapse the data enough or provide meaningful distinctions among the factors. The 4-factor solution, while not explaining a large amount of variance (32.1%), was the most theoretically meaningful. Each factor in this solution was named based on the intent of items loading highest in the factor (Table 2).

The Belief variables loading high on Factor 1, NOTSEXEV, concerned the overall dating event--whether or not respondents perceived dating as a sexual or non-sexual interaction. For example, strong agreement with the following beliefs (Questionnaire, Appendix A, items 1-58) indicated that a respondent viewed dating primarily as a sexual event--an interaction where sexual behavior was central to the interaction:

Belief 9: A woman who goes with a man alone to his room, apartment, or home on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex;

Belief 10: It's normal to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on dates with a steady boyfriend or girlfriend;

Belief 26: The longer and more frequent a woman dates a man, the more sexual intimacy she should allow;

Belief 52: It's normal to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on "pick-up" dates;

Belief 55: Dating is more fun when it includes some form of sexual activity.

On the other hand, respondents who disagreed with these items seemed to view dating as a non-sexual event or interaction--or, at least, an event where sexual behavior was not necessary to the interaction. In other words, these individuals did not seem to associate or pair



TABLE 2.--Factor Loadings to Determine Dating Belief Orientations,  
VARIMAX Rotation (n=241).

Variable	FACTORS			
	1 NOTSEXEV	2 MUTUALSX	3 PROSHARE	4 NOSTEREO
Belief 1	.09	-.06	.68*	.01
Belief 2	.32*	.00	-.07	.14
Belief 3	.00	.03	-.45*	.02
Belief 4	.10	-.06	.57*	.11
Belief 5	.15	-.03	.39*	.05
Belief 6	-.04	-.10	-.58*	.06
Belief 7	.33	.42*	-.06	.04
Belief 8	.29	.29	.17	.15
Belief 9	.34*	.07	.05	.20
Belief 10	.34*	.06	.08	.00
Belief 11	.28	.17	.18	.08
Belief 12	-.33	-.34*	.13	.06
Belief 13	-.12	-.09	-.57*	.01
Belief 14	.26	.44*	-.10	.22
Belief 15	.08	.07	.55*	.07
Belief 16	.06	-.03	-.41*	-.01
Belief 17	.37*	-.00	.21	.32
Belief 18	.23	.39*	-.04	.25
Belief 19	.10	.00	.55*	.18
Belief 20	.30	.49*	-.09	.30
Belief 21	.54*	.18	.08	.09
Belief 22	.07	-.07	.62*	.18
Belief 23	.16	-.08	.13	.59*
Belief 24	.41*	.19	.21	.31
Belief 25	-.27	-.28	-.04	.16
Belief 26	.54*	-.01	.13	.21
Belief 27	.09	.02	.21	.07
Belief 28	.08	.05	.37	.43*
Belief 29	.45*	.04	.23	.22
Belief 30	.48*	.18	.16	.28
Belief 31	.35*	.10	.12	.31
Belief 32	.40*	.02	.05	.36
Belief 33	.14	.21	.16	.43*
Belief 34	.16	.06	.21	.47*
Belief 35	.23	.29	.03.	.15
Belief 36	.28	.31	.08	.46*
Belief 37	-.02	-.44*	-.27	-.14
Belief 38	.46*	.16	.08	.23
Belief 39	.50*	.23	.03	.22
Belief 40	.12	.40*	.04	.28
Belief 41	-.19	-.23	-.04	-.25
Belief 42	-.12	-.07	.25	.17
Belief 43	.00	-.66*	-.04	-.12
Belief 44	.29	.28	.08	.29

Table 2 (cont'd.)

Belief 45	.25	-.34*	-.05	-.08
Belief 46	.08	.29	.22	.15
Belief 47	-.21	-.37*	.01	-.07
Belief 48	.23	.01	.12	.36*
Belief 49	.27	.38	-.02	.40*
Belief 50	-.18	-.16	-.11	-.29
Belief 51	-.09	-.61	-.02	-.03
Belief 52	.56*	.02	.14	.19
Belief 53	.19	.17	.00	.55*
Belief 54	.08	.24	-.00	.35*
Belief 55	.49*	.16	-.00	.10
Belief 56	.02	-.50*	.03	-.07
Belief 57	.17	.28	-.06	.37*
Belief 58	-.03	-.47*	.06	.06

---

\*High loadings which characterize the factor.

dating with sexual behavior and thus were considered non-traditional on this dimension. For those who agreed with these items, sexual behavior seemed to be an essential component of the dating interaction. Again, these respondents were viewed as traditional in their orientation.

Items loading high on the second factor, MUTUALSX, dealt with whether or not sexual behavior, when it did occur on dates, was consensual or coercive. For example, agreement with the beliefs below:

Belief 51: Males and females should share in the responsibility for setting sexual limits;

Belief 56: Both men and women should be allowed to say no to sexual activity on dates and to have their dates take them seriously;

Belief 58: Each level of sexual activity on a date (e.g., necking, petting, and intercourse) should be mutually agreed upon by both people;

and disagreement with

Belief 7: It's all right for men to test their dates to see how far they can get them to go sexually;

Belief 20: When there is a disagreement over sexual activity, the man should keep trying until his date gives in; and

Belief 40: It's all right for a man to physically force his date to have sexual intercourse, if she participated in sexual activity that got him sexually excited;

indicated that a respondent viewed sexual activity on dates as consensual or mutually agreed upon behavior--a non-traditional orientation.

The opposing viewpoint indicated a more traditional orientation,

one where it was considered "normal" for males to be aggressive sexually and to force sexual activity on their dates under various circumstances.

The third factor, PROSHARE, dealt with control of or responsibility for the dating event primarily in terms of which dating partner was to assume the financial burden of the date, provide the transportation for the date, do the asking out, and which partner was responsible for initiating sex. Those who reported agreement on the following variables were considered traditional in their orientation towards dating:

Belief 1: A man should always ask the woman out;

Belief 4: Men should always be the ones to initiate sexual activity on dates;

Belief 15: Men should always pay for the date;

Belief 19: It's the man's responsibility to plan the date (e.g., decide what to do or where to go); and

Belief 22: It should be the man's responsibility to provide the transportation for the date.

Conversely, those who indicated disagreement with the measures above and agreement with the variables listed below were considered non-traditional or egalitarian on this dimension:

Belief 3: Women should share equally in the expense of a date;

Belief 6: It is perfectly all right for women to ask men out;

Belief 13: Women should share in the responsibility for providing the transportation for the date; and

Belief 16: Women have as much right as men to initiate sexual activity on a date.

The fourth factor, NOSTEREO, concerned whether or not respondents

subscribed to sex-role stereotypes, especially stereotypes dealing with female sexual behavior. For instance, respondents who indicated agreement with the following belief variables were considered to be traditional on this dimension:

Belief 23: If a woman engages in sexual activity and lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sexual intercourse on her;

Belief 28: A woman who initiates sexual activity will probably have sex with anyone;

Belief 34: Men are biologically driven by sexual desires and once they reach a certain level of sexual excitement, they can't stop themselves;

Belief 36: Most women are sexually available, a man just has to be persistent enough;

Belief 48: Women often want a certain degree of forcefulness in lovemaking;

Belief 53: When women say no to sexual activity, they usually don't mean it and would feel offended if their dates didn't push the issue.

Those who disagreed with these items were viewed as non-traditional in their orientation.

In sum, a factor analysis of the dating belief subset identified four theoretically sound belief dimensions, especially from a symbolic interactionist perspective. (See Table 3 for a description of these new variables and their means and standard deviations.)

According to this perspective, individuals carry into interactional situations meanings derived from their social and cultural environment.

TABLE 3.--Description of the New Belief Variables (4-factor solution)  
and their Means and Standard Deviations (n-241).

Variable Name Dev.	Description	Mean	Std.
NOTSEXEV	Dating is more a social than sexual interaction (scores range from -2.628 to 2.055) high scores indicate a non-traditional orientation.	-.015	.910
MUTUALSX	Sexual behavior that does occur on dates should be mutually agreed upon behavior (scores range from -4.392 to 1.185) high scores indicate a nontraditional orientation.	-.031	.925
PROSHARE	Males and females should share responsibility for the dating interaction, e.g., they should share in expenses (scores range from -3.239 to 1.658) high scores indicate a non-traditional orientation.	-.021	.922
NOSTEREO	No ascription to sexual behavior stereotypes, e.g., women really mean yes, when they say no (scores range from -3.260 to 2.192) high scores indicate a non-traditional orientation.	.024	.819

Thus, beliefs and attitudes towards the dating event should reflect those of the larger cultural configuration. As can be seen from the factor loadings in Table 2, the belief variables clustered around three dimensions which are closely related to some facet of sex-role socialization: NOSTEREO, PROSHARE, and MUTUALSX. For example, the PROSHARE dimension deals with the control of the dating event. In our society, males traditionally have assumed responsibility for interactions with females. It is interesting to note that 86 (36%) of the respondents in this study disagreed to some extent with Belief 3 (an item characterizing the PROSHARE dimension: "Women should share equally in the expense of the date"--indicating an orientation in line with traditional socialization. On the other hand, 96 (40%) agreed with this statement and 58 (24%) were undecided. This, too, is reflective of sex-role socialization, in that, our society is in a state of flux with regard to male and female roles.

#### Dating Style Variables

Four subsets of variables were factor analyzed with regard to style of dating. A principal components extraction of roots for the first subset (10 items) yielded three eigenvalues greater than 1.0, accounting for 57.4 percent of the total variance (Appendix B). However, the two-factor solution for these variables (accounting for 45.8% of the variance) was the most meaningful. (See Table 4 for factor loadings for this data subset.)

Since pick-up dates in general, and pick-up party dates and pick-up bar dates specifically, loaded high on the first factor, it was named PICUPDT. The second factor was named FSTEADY, because of the high loadings of items reflective of steady dating, in other

TABLE 4.--Factor Loadings to Determine Dating Style Orientations,  
VARIMAX Rotation (n=241).

Variable	Factors	
	1 PICUPDT	2 FSTEADY
DATEWEEK	-.11	.60*
DIFFDATE	.53*	-.28
STEADY	-.14	.95*
PICKUPDT	.77*	-.00
PICUPPTY	.85*	.02
PICUPBAR	.71*	.04
PREARRDT	-.26	.02
BLINDDAT	.29	-.08
SPURMOMT	.15	.16
DOUBLEDT	.20	.15

\*High loadings which characterize the factor.



of the high loadings of items reflective of steady dating, in other words, dating which centered around one particular individual. Respondents with high scores on Factor 1 generally dated many different people and these dates were often pick-up dates. Respondents with high scores on Factor 2, on the other hand, were more likely to be involved in a relationship with one person. Fifty or 21 percent of all respondents in this study reported being involved in a steady relationship with one person for the entire year; 68 (28%) reported a steady relationship with one person for most of the year; 64 (27%) reported a steady relationship with one person "off and on"; and 59 (24%) reported no steady relationship for the year. Eighty-one respondents claimed that at least 25 percent of all their dates for the year were pick-up dates ("leaving a social event with someone you just met there") and 23 of the 81 said that 50 percent or more of their dates for the year were pick-up dates. Furthermore, pick-up dates occurred more frequently at parties (32%) than at bars (16%). (See Table 5 for a description of these new factor variables and their means and standard deviations.)

A two-factor solution emerged for the second data subset under this heading. These were labeled DRUGS and ALCOHOL and accounted for 68.9 percent of the total variance. Table 6 presents the factor loadings for the 2-factor solution.

When asked "Did you ever drink alcoholic beverages when dating during the past year?", well over half (63%) of the students in the sample responded "yes, about half the time," and 34 percent responded "yes, most of the time." Concerning drug usage, 9 percent of the sample reported using drugs "about half the time" when dating during

TABLE 5.--Description of the New Dating Style Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241).

Variable Name Dev.	Description	Mean	Std.
PICUPDT	Dating someone who is picked up (scores range from -.850 to 4.029) high scores indicate a pick-up dating style orientation	.017	.956
FSTEADY	Dating one person steadily (scores range from -1.555 to 2.138) high scores indicate a steady dating style orientation	.001	.962

TABLE 6.--Factor Loadings to Determine Alcohol and Drug Orientations, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241).

Variable	Factors	
	1 DRUGS	2 ALCOHOL
PREPTYDT	.18	.53*
PREBARDT	.08	.36*
DRKB00Z	.11	.93*
HIB00Z	.34	.64*
USEDRUGS	.81*	.26
HIDRUGS	.98*	.19

\*High loadings which characterize the factor.

the past year. (Table 7 contains descriptions of the new factor variables for the second subset and their means and standard deviations.)

The third and fourth data subsets were factor analyzed but because of high multicollinearity, it was decided to treat each of these items as independent variables rather than as clusters. Table 8 provides descriptions for these variables.

Students appeared to have difficulty responding to the items describing their main reason for dating (e.g., mainly to find someone to marry, mainly to develop a meaningful relationship with someone, mainly for the fun of it, or mainly to find sexual partners). In other words, students tended to respond affirmatively to more than one of the above reasons, for example, agreeing with the statement that the main reason they dated during the past year was not to find a marriage partner but to develop a meaningful relationship with someone, as well as not being interested in having a relationship, but dating mainly for the fun of it. Nonetheless, respondents seemed to be more interested in dating as a means of developing a relationship (186 students reported agreeing with this statement) as opposed to dating solely to find sexual partners (28 students reported agreeing with this statement).

For this sample, traditional dating behavior appears to predominate. When asked "Of all the dates you had in the last year, how often did you take the first step and ask the other person out?", 49 or 70 percent of the males in the sample responded most to all of the time, compared to 4 or 2 percent of the females in the sample. However, 38 (22%) females responded they did the asking out "about half of

TABLE 7.--Description of the New Alcohol and Drug Variables (2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations (n=241).

Variable Name Dev.	Description	Mean	Std.
DRUGS	Uses drugs when dating (scores range from -8.21 to 5.498) high scores indicate frequent use of drugs.	-.002	.999
ALCOHOL	Uses alcohol when dating (scores range from -1.802 to 2.032) high scores indicate frequent use of alcohol and/or frequent attendance at bars or parties where alcohol is served.	-1.802	2.032

TABLE 8.--Description of Third and Fourth Subset Variables (n=241).

Variable Name	Description
MARRY	Main reason for dating was to find someone to marry
RELATSHP	Main reason for dating was to develop a relationship
FUNOFIT	Main reason for dating was for the fun of it
SEXPART	Main reason for dating was to find sexual partners
UASKOUT	Respondent usually initiated the dating interaction
WASASKED	Respondent was usually asked out
DTDECGOD	Respondent's date usually decided what to do and where to go on date
UDECGODO	Respondent usually decided what to do and where to go on date
SHAREDECI	Respondent and date shared in decisionmaking
DTPAYALL	Respondent's date usually paid for the date
UPAIDALL	Respondent usually paid for the date
SHAREXPS	Respondent and date usually shared expenses
DTTRANSP	Respondent's date usually provided transportation
UTRANSP	Respondent usually provided transportation
MONEYCDS	Respondent usually carried money or credit cards in case of unexpected situations
WAYHOME	Respondent usually had a way home if something unexpectedly happened on date
SUBORDIN	Respondent usually felt he/she was the subordinate one on the date
DOMINANT	Respondent usually felt he/she was the dominant one on the date

the time," with 82 or 48 percent responding they did the asking out "a few times." Forty-six (27%) of the females in the sample said they "never" did the asking, compared to only 2 or 2 percent of the males.

When females were asked how often their dates paid for expenses, 141 (83%) responded "about half of the time" with 106 (62%) saying their dates paid most to all of the time. In comparison, only 8 or 11 percent of the males in the sample responded that their dates paid for expenses half of more of the time. Likewise, 152 or 92 percent of the females responded that their dates provided transportation for the date "about half of the time," with 132 (78%) reporting that their dates provided transportation most to all of the time. Conversely, 9 or 13 percent of the males said their dates provided transportation most to all of the time.

With regard to decision-making (e.g., deciding where to go or what to do), 146 or 86 percent of the females said their dates decided where to go or what to do at least half of the time, with 58 (34%) stating most to all of the time. On the other hand, only 11 (16%) of the males in the sample, said their dates made the decisions on where to go or what to do most to all of the time, with 30 (43%) reporting "about half of the time."

Finally, when asked, "When dating during the past year, how often did you feel like you were the weaker or more subordinate person on the date?", 126 or 74 percent of the females in the sample reported at least a few times with 31 (18%) reporting "about half of the time," and 18 (11%) reporting most to all of the time. In contrast, only 1 male reported feeling subordinate most to all of the time and 5

(7%) reporting "about half of the time."

Overall, style of dating was characterized by (1) the number of different dates a respondent had during the past year, (2) whether or not these dates were steady or pick-up dates, (3) whether or not drugs and alcohol were used during the dating interaction, (4) control of the dating event--whether or not the individual made dating decisions, his or her date made the decision, or they shared in decisionmaking, (5) whether or not the individual had a way home and money or credit cards in case a problem arose, and (6) the reason an individual dated (e.g., to develop a relationship.)

#### Offending and Game-Playing Variables

Two data subsets were factor analyzed for the dependent measures. A principle components extraction of the 10 items in the first subset resulted in a 2-factor solution accounting for 40.5% of the total variance (Appendix B). Table 9 contains the factor loadings for the 2-factor solution.

Items loading high on factor 1, UMANIPUL, indicated a respondent's use of game-playing techniques to obtain sexual compliance. For example a high score on USAYTHNG indicated a respondent's frequent use of lines to persuade a date to engage in sexual intercourse ("Did you ever say things you really didn't mean to get a date to participate in sexual intercourse with you (i.e., telling your date that you loved him/her when you really didn't mean it?"). Items loading highest on factor 2, UFORCE, measured actual use of physical force to obtain sexual goals. For example, a high score on UPFORCKP, indicated frequent use of some degree of physical force to get a date to take part in

TABLE 9.--Factor Loadings to Determine Gameplaying or Offending Orientations used by Respondents, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241).

Variable	Factors	
	1 UMANIPUL	2 UFORCE
PLAYGAME	.30*	.02
UGOTDTHI	.48*	-.05
USAYTHNG	.76*	.14
UARGUMTS	.44*	.16
UTHRETRS	.33*	-.02
UTHRETFC	-.01	.31*
UPFORCKP	-.03	.74*
UPFORCSI	.13	.30*

\*High loadings which characterize the factor.



kissing or petting.

Gameplaying techniques were used more frequently by males than females for this sample. For instance, when respondents were asked "Did you ever attempt to get a date intoxicated or high hoping that he/she would then take part in sexual activity?", 23 or 33 percent of the males reported using this strategy "one or more times" compared to 14 or 8 percent of the females. In response to the question "Did you ever say things you really didn't mean to get a date to participate in sexual intercourse with you?", 15 or 21 percent of the males responded "yes, one or more times" compared to 10 or 6 percent of the females. Overall, 53 percent of the entire sample felt that dating, at least some of the time, involved gameplaying. When asked "When dating during the past year, did you ever feel like you were playing a game, where you had to outsmart your date(s) to get what you wanted?", 88 (52%) of the females reported feeling this way "a few times" with 33 (19%) reporting "half to all of the time" and 40 (58%) of the males reporting "a few times" with 5 responding "most to all of the time."

For this sample, use of actual physical force to obtain sexual compliance was less evident than the use of gameplaying strategies. For example, only 1 male reported ever using "some degree of physical force to try and get a date to have sexual intercourse." Surprisingly, 5 females reported using physical force at least once to get a date to have sexual intercourse. And in response to "Did you ever use some degree of physical force (i.e., twisting an arm, holding the other person down, etc.) to get a date to take part in kissing or petting?", 6 females reported using force one or more times compared

to 5 males reporting use of force at least once. (Table 10 provides a description of the new factor variables UMANIPUL and UFORCE and their means and standard deviations.)

Upon analysis of the second subset, a 2-factor solution was arrived at. A principal components extraction of roots yielded 6 eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Appendix B), accounting for 66.8 percent of the total variance. The 6-, 5-, 4-, and 3-factor solutions were rotated by the VARIMAX procedure and then examined, but did not reduce the data enough or provide interpretable factors. The 2-factor solution, accounting for 44.0 percent of total variance, was the most meaningful. Factor loadings for the 2-factor solution are reported in Table 11.

Inspection of Table 11 reveals that Factor 1, OFFENDNG, had substantial loadings for 7 items. These items are indicative of interactions where the respondent experienced threats of physical force or actual physical force by a date. For example, a high score on DTHRETF ("Did you ever have a date threaten to use physical force if you didn't cooperate to get you to have sexual intercourse, but for various reasons sexual intercourse didn't occur?"), on DPFORCKP ("Did a date ever use some degree of physical force to try and make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn't want to?"), and on RAPE ("Were you ever in a situation where you actually had sexual intercourse with a date because you were physically forced?") indicate the presence of sexual offending.

Factor 2, GAMEPLAY, had high loadings on items indicative of gameplaying--where the respondent was in a situation where gameplaying

TABLE 10.--Description of the New UMANIPUL and UFORCE Variables  
(2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations  
(n=241).

Variable Name	Description	Mean	Std. Dev.
UMANIPUL	Respondent uses game playing techniques or strategies to obtain sexual compliance (scores range from -.759 to 999.000) high scores indicate frequent use of game playing techniques	8.290	90.820
UFORCE	Respondent uses physical force to obtain sexual compliance (scores range from -.424 to 7.375 high scores indicate frequent use of physical force	-.000	.766

TABLE 11.--Factor Loadings to Determine Gameplaying or Offending Orientations Experienced by Respondents, VARIMAX Rotation (n=241).

Variables	Factors	
	1 OFFENDNG	2 GAMEPLAY
UNCOMFBL	.08	.58*
DTMISINT	.17	.56*
USEXINTM	.17	.54*
MISLEVSX	.14	.57*
ENEDDT	.30	.50*
UBGNSXDW	.16	.44*
KISPETDW	.16	.58*
HADSIDW	.16	.59*
CUZDTPAY	.27	.29
CUZDLOTS	.22	.37*
USXARDCS	-.01	.33*
DSXARDCS	.12	.52*
DCONVCS	.24	.53*
DSAYTHNG	.32	.53*
UGAVINTG	.39	.48*
DARGUMTS	.38	.51*
UGAVINAR	.12	.48*
DTHRETRS	.70*	.29
UGAVINTH	.81*	.15
DTHRETFC	.81*	.21
UGAVINTF	.90*	.05
DPFORCKP	.52*	.35
DFORCNSI	.58*	.30
RAPE	.90*	.08

\*High loadings which characterize the factor.

took place.<sup>1</sup> In other words, respondents reported having dates use arguments, "lines," or other verbal techniques of coercion (DCONVCS, DSAYTHNG, DARGUMTS) to obtain sexual compliance. And they reported varying levels of miscommunication and/or misinterpretation concerning sexual activity (DTMISINT, MISLEVSX, ENEDDDT, DSXARDCS). Miscommunication and verbal coerciveness help define this factor. A description of these factor variables and their means and standard deviations are reported in Table 12.

Just as game playing strategies were used more frequently by respondents than physical force to obtain sexual compliance, respondents reported that their dates were more likely to use game playing techniques than physical force. For example, when asked "Did a date ever try to convince you to have sex with him/her, because you had dated that person several times?", 51 or 30 percent of the females in the sample responded "one or more times;" fewer males (11 or 16%) found themselves in a similar situation. In response to "Did a date ever try to convince you that you had to go along with sexual activity because you got him/her so sexually excited that he or she couldn't stop?", 63 (37%) of the females reported "one or more times" compared to 20 or 29% of the males in the sample.

With regard to dating situations involving actual physical force, 31 (18%) of the females and 5 (7%) of the males reported dates "using some degree of physical force to try and make you engage in kissing

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that GAMEPLAY differs from the factor variable UMANIPUL in the first data subset. UMANIPUL is an active variable indicating the respondent is doing the manipulating or game playing and GAMEPLAY is a passive variable in that the respondent is experiencing gameplaying in a dating situation.

TABLE 12.--Description of the New OFFENDNG and GAMEPLAY Variables  
(2-factor solution) and their Means and Standard Deviations  
(n=241).

Variable Name	Description	Mean	Std. Dev.
OFFENDNG	Dates use physical force to obtain sexual compliance (scores range from -8.29 to 13.847) high scores indicate frequent victimization	-.001	.955
GAMEPLAY	Dates use gameplaying techniques to obtain sexual compliance (scores range from -1.088 to 3.350) high scores indicate frequent victimization	-.004	.915

or petting when you didn't want to," one or more times. And when asked "Did a date ever use some degree of physical force to try and get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn't want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse didn't occur?", 19 females responded, "yes." Only 1 male responded likewise. For the RAPE variable, 6 female respondents (3%) reported being physically forced to have sexual intercourse at least once, and 1 female respondent indicated having been raped more than once. No males responded affirmatively to this item.

### Summary

In conclusion, two of the three goals of the present study were reached by employing factor analysis. First, data reduction was achieved by reducing 106 variables to 12 new factor variables.<sup>1, 2</sup> Table 13 summarizes the new factor variables.

Secondly, these new factors or dimensions help define the dating construct. The dating event, a complex interaction, is composed of several belief and style dimensions. For example, a dating individual may view the interaction as primarily a sexual one (a low score on NOTSEXEV), feel that sexual initiation is the male's responsibility (low score on a dating control variable), prefer picking up dates

---

<sup>1</sup>As noted earlier, all dating style variables were not reduced to new factor variables because of high multicollinearity, specifically those related to control of the dating interaction (e.g., UASKOUT, SHAREEXPS, etc.)

<sup>2</sup>Factor scores were obtained for each new factor variable (factor loadings were used to calculate weighted scale scores for all respondents).

TABLE 13.--Summary of New Factor Variables.

Belief Subsets (Ind. vars.)	Dating Style Subsets (Ind. vars.)	Gameplaying/Offending Subsets (Dep. vars.)
NOTSEXEV MUTUALSX PROSHARE NOSTEREO	PICUPDT FSTEADY  DRUGS ALCOHOL	UMANIPUL UOFFEND  GAMEPLAY OFFENDNG



as opposed to dating one person on a regular basis (high score on PICUPDT), and may drink alcohol frequently when dating (high score on ALCOHOL). By examining these various dimensions, we may discover which, if any, are related to sexual offending--the subject of the following data analysis.

### Simple Bivariate Correlation Analysis

The dependent measures were first tested for association with each of the independent variables using simple correlation analysis. Table 14 presents zero-order correlations of dating belief and style variables with the dependent measures for females.

The simple, bivariate correlations between several independent variables and the dependent measure, GAMEPLAY, suggests that for females a traditional orientation on several belief and style dimensions (NOTSEXEV, PROSHARE, DRUGS, ALCOHOL, PICUPDT, FUNOFIT, SEXPART, DTDECGOD, MONEYCDS, WAYHOME, SUBORDIN, DOMINANT) is significantly correlated with being verbally manipulated or coerced on dates. However, while significant (all correlations were considered significant at the .05 level), these data indicate modest correlations; none of which exceed .37. Of the independent style variables, PICUPDT correlated most highly with GAMEPLAY ( $r = .37$ ,  $p < .001$ ), suggesting that gameplaying was more likely to occur on pick-up dates than with steady dates (FSTEADY did not significantly correlate with GAMEPLAY). Similarly the use of DRUGS ( $r = .23$ ), the use of ALCOHOL ( $r = .25$ ), dating for the FUNOFIT ( $r = -.16$ ), and dating for sex partners, SEXPART ( $r = -.26$ ), significantly correlated with this dependent measure. In addition, having dates decide where to go and what to do, DTDECGOD,

TABLE 14.--Bivariate Correlations (Pearson's  $r$ ) for Dating Belief and Style Variables with all Dependent Measures, Females ( $n=171$ ).

	UMANIPUL	UFORCE	OFFENDNG	GAMEPLAY
NOTSEXEV	.06	-.07	-.02	-.20*
MUTUALSX	.03	.00	.03	-.06.
PROSHARE	.02	-.00	-.03	-.21*
NOSTEREO	-.08	-.06	-.02	.10
PICUPDT	-.05	.07	.08	.36**
FSTEADY	.09	-.01	-.14*	-.00
DRUGS	-.02	.00	.06	.22*
ALCOHOL	-.06	.05	.05	.25**
MARRY	.06	-.00	.06	.02
RELATSHIP	-.00	-.02	-.02	.01
FUNOFIT	.03	.03	-.09	-.15*
SEXPART	.02	-.23**	-.20*	-.26**
USAKOUT	.00	.04	.08	.08
WASASKED	.00	.00	-.14*	-.04
DTDECGOD	-.13*	.01	.11	.14*
UDECGODO	.15*	-.06	-.07	-.10
SHARDECI	.06	-.16*	-.02	-.10
DTPAYALL	.03	-.03	-.09	-.02
UPAIDALL	.01	.00	-.03	-.00
SHAREEXPS	-.02	-.06	.04	-.04
DTTRANSP	.06	-.08	-.05	-.08
UTRANSP	-.06	-.09	-.01	.04
MONEYCDS	.07	.00	.05	.17*
WAYHOME	.10	.03	.04	.18*
SUBORDIN	-.09	.12	.01	.23**
DOMINANT	.05	-.03	-.05	.14*

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

correlated positively with gameplaying ( $r = .14$ ), but weakly. Another variable on the date control dimension, SUBORDIN (feeling like the weaker person on the date--a traditional orientation for females) indicated a positive, but moderate correlation with gameplaying ( $r = -.24$ ). However, the meaning of this relationship is less clear, since DOMINANT (feeling like the stronger person on the date--a non-traditional orientation for females) was also significantly associated with gameplaying ( $r = .15$ ).

With respect to belief dimensions, a traditional orientation on NOTSEXEV (viewing the dating event as a sexual interaction) and on PROSHARE (not sharing the responsibility for the dating interaction) was significantly associated with being manipulated on dates (GAMEPLAY).

This pattern of relationships seems to offer some support for the first and second hypotheses:

$H_1$ : Females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation;

$H_2$ : Females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation.

Analysis of the OFFENDNG variable produced unanticipated findings; for example, there was no relationship between any of the belief dimensions (NOSTEREO, MUTUALSX, PROSHARE, NOTSEXEV) and this dependent measure. And there was no significant association between most of the dating style variables and experience of sexual offending. This dependent measure had significant correlations with only 3 independent variables and these correlations, FSTEADY ( $r = -.15$ ), SEXPART

( $r = -.20$ ) and WASASKED ( $r = .14$ ) were all quite low. These results offer no support for the third hypothesis:

H<sub>3</sub>: Females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females with a non-traditional orientation;

and little support for the fourth hypothesis:

H<sub>4</sub>: Females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females with a non-traditional orientation.

With respect to UFORCE and UMANIPUL, there were few significant correlations: (1) only two variables, SEXPART ( $r = -.23$ ) and SHAREDEC ( $r = -.16$ ) were significant for UFORCE, and (2) only two variables, DTDECGOD ( $r = -.13$ ) and UDECGOD ( $r = .15$ ) were significantly associated with UMANIPUL. All of these correlations were extremely low as was expected.

Because the distributions for three of the dependent measures for females (UFORCE, UMANIPUL, AND OFFENDNG) were very skewed, they were eliminated from further analysis. There was not enough variation on these measures with few females reporting frequencies at the upper end of the scale. Therefore, only variables significantly associated with gaming were considered for regression analysis.

Correlations of dating belief and style variables with all dependent measures for males are reported in Table 15. As for females, there were few significant associations for three of the dependent variables, in this case, UFORCE, OFFENDING, and GAMEPLAY. It was expected that for males there would be few, if any, significant associations for the OFFENDNG or GAMEPLAY measures. It is interesting to note, however,

TABLE 15.--Bivariate Correlations (Pearson's  $r$ ) for Dating Belief and Style Variables with all Dependent Measures, Males ( $n=70$ ).

	UMANIPUL	UFORCE	OFFENDNG	GAMEPLAY
NOTSEXEV	.16	-.09	.18	-.15
MUTUALSX	.03	-.02	-.12	-.03
PROSHARE	-.12	-.18	-.05	.09
NOSTEREO	-.12	.08	-.17	.10
PICUPDT	.53**	.04	-.21*	.18
FSTEADY	.05	-.04	-.15	-.07
DRUGS	.24*	.04	-.17	.12
ALCOHOL	.29*	-.20*	-.13	-.10
MARRY	.15	.05	-.01	.12
RELATSHIP	.03	.02	-.09	.05
FUNOFIT	-.13	.08	.05	-.15
SEXPART	-.42**	-.07	.21*	-.24*
USAKOUT	.12	.02	-.09	.10
WASASKED	-.34*	-.02	-.10	.17
DTDECGOD	-.04	-.02	.00	-.08
UDECGODO	.14	.04	.05	.07
SHARDECI	-.28*	.05	.13	-.16
DTPAYALL	.33*	-.03	-.22*	.19
UPAIDALL	-.18	.09	.12	-.10
SHAREEXPS	.17	.16	-.17	.09
DTTRANSP	.15	-.06	-.31*	.32*
UTRANSP	-.10	.06	.25*	-.26*
MONEYCDS	.10	.13	-.05	.03
WAYHOME	.10	-.13	.11	.03
SUBORDIN	.10	-.07	.13	.21*
DOMINANT	.20*	.19	-.14	.14

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

that only one independent variable, ALCOHOL ( $r = .21$ ) was associated with UFORCE, and because of its direction, it suggests non-use rather than use of ALCOHOL is related to use of physical force on dates. This finding was most certainly unanticipated. Because the distribution for UFORCE as well as those for OFFENDNG and GAMEPLAY were extremely skewed to the right, indicating little variation in the sample, these three measures for males were eliminated from subsequent analysis. And because none of the belief dimensions and basically none of the style dimensions of dating correlated significantly with UFORCE, there was no support for either the seventh or eighth hypotheses:

$H_7$ : Males who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation;

$H_8$ : Males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than are males with a non-traditional orientation.

With respect to the dependent measure, UMANIPUL, several independent variables were found to be significantly correlated with this measure. Of these, PICUPDT had the strongest association ( $r = .53$ ,  $p < .001$ ). SEXPART (dating primarily to find sex partners) was also significantly correlated with UMANIPUL ( $r = -.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Other dating style variables having a significant association with UMANIPUL included DRUGS ( $r = .24$ ), ALCOHOL ( $r = .29$ ), WASASKED ( $r = .34$ ), SHAREDECI ( $r = -.28$ ), and DTPAYALL ( $r = .33$ ). These variables, however, were more moderately related to UMANIPUL than were PICUPDT and SEXPART.

Since no belief dimensions correlated with this dependent variable,

there was no support for the fifth hypothesis:

H<sub>5</sub>: Males who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion and manipulation) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation.

But the results from this correlational analysis did seem to offer some support for the sixth hypothesis:

H<sub>6</sub>: Males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion and manipulation) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation.

The use of drugs or alcohol, a preference for pick-up dates, dating to find sex partners and rarely sharing in decision-making typify a traditional orientation, especially for males. Research has indicated that males as opposed to females prefer many dates to steady relationships and that they prefer dating for sexual experiences (Komorovsky, 1976). However, two variables correlating with UMANIPUL do not seem to fit the traditional orientation, namely WASASKED ( $r = .34$ ) and DTPAYALL ( $r = .33$ ).

Thus far the analysis has been confined to the zero-order relationships between the dependent and independent measures for males and females. It is essential, however, to conduct a higher order analysis to see which of these many variables best predict verbal offending.

### Step-Wise Multiple Regression

Stepwise regression was used to obtain the best-fitting regression equation for UMANIPUL for males and GAMEPLAY for females using the

full range of independent variables. Goodness of fit was determined by the explained variance adjusted for degrees of freedom and by beta weights for variables in the equation.

The best fitting model for UMANIPUL is presented in Table 16. As can be seen from the table, the equation which best fits the data for UMANIPUL includes only 3 of the 25 independent variables in the original model (PICUPDT, DTPAYALL, and SEXPART). Taken together, these 3 variables were able to account for 37 percent of the variance (adjusted  $R^2$ ). It can be noted that no belief factors had an impact for this measure. As with simple correlation analysis, PICUPDT was once again significantly related to UMANIPUL as was SEXPART and DTPAYALL. In fact, PICUPDT was the first independent variable entering the equation signifying the greatest effect. Pickup dates, dating for sex partners as well as paying for the date seem to be consistently important predictors of the likelihood that an individual (specifically, male) will use verbal coercion and/or manipulation on dates. Both of these variables are indicative of dating style and offer further support for hypothesis 6:

$H_6$ : Males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion and manipulation) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation.

At the same time, however, it can be noted that several dating style variables never entered the equation (e.g., DRUGS, ALCOHOL, UASKOUT, WASASKED, etc.). All of the beta weights for the independent variables that did enter the equation were significant at the .05 level.

As can be seen from Table 17, the equation which best fits the



TABLE 16.--Step-Wise Regression of all Independent Variables on UMANIPUL,  
Males (n=70).

Independent Variable	b	SE	B
PICUPDT	.341	.109	.353
DTPAYALL	.451	.162	.277
SEXPART	-.219	.096	-.252
(CONSTANT)	.470	.303	

$$R = .629$$

$$R^2 = .396$$

$$\text{adjusted } R^2 = .368$$

TABLE 17.--Step-Wise Regression of all Independent Variables on GAMEPLAY,  
Females (n=171).

Independent Variable	b	SE	B
PICUPDT	.328	.077	.284
PROSHARE	-.275	.073	-.263
WAYHOME	.161	.041	.259
DRUGS	.180	.066	.179
ALCOHOL	.186	.070	.177
USAKOUT	.187	.079	.159
SUBORDIN	.153	.069	.150
(CONSTANT)	-.573	.164	

$$R = .588$$

$$R^2 = .346$$

$$\text{adjusted } R^2 = .317$$

data for GAMEPLAY includes 7 of the 25 independent variables in the original model (PICUPDT, PROSHARE, WAYHOME, DRUGS, ALCOHOL, UASKOUT, SUBORDIN). Taken together, these 7 variables were able to account for 32 percent of the variance (adjusted  $R^2$ ). While more variables entered into this equation than for UMANIPUL, they account for less of the variance than did the 3 variable model for UMANIPUL. As in the UMANIPUL model, PICUPDT had the most influence in the GAMEPLAY equation for females. All of the beta weights for the independent variables that did enter the equation were significant at the .05 level.

Since a belief variable did enter the equation, further support was offered for the first hypothesis:

$H_1$ : Females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation.

However, evidence that beliefs have a strong impact on gaming is rather slight, as only one dimension of dating beliefs entered into the equation. On the other hand, several dating style variables did seem to influence or predict gaming, further supporting the second hypothesis:

$H_2$ : Females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation.

These findings and their implications will be discussed in detail in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Overview

This exploratory study identified various belief and style dimensions of college dating and investigated the relationship of these dimensions to verbal and physical sexual offending. Data were collected from a sample of 241 undergraduate students attending Michigan State University during the fall of 1985. Factor analysis was used to reduce the data set and to identify the various dimensions of dating. And correlation analysis and stepwise multiple regression were used to test the hypotheses as well as to indicate trends in the data.

In sum, the factor analysis identified four dating belief dimensions:

- (1) NOTSEXEV (dating primarily was viewed as either a sexual or nonsexual event),
- (2) MUTUALSX (sexual behavior on dates was considered either consensual or nonconsensual),
- (3) PROSHARE (the responsibility for the dating interaction was viewed as either the exclusive domain of one individual--specifically, the male--or was viewed as the responsibility of both parties, and
- (4) NOSTEREO (dating individuals either subscribed to sexual

behavior stereotypes or they rejected these stereotypes).

Similarly, factor analysis identified four dating style dimensions:

- (1) PICUPDT (the number of pickup dates a respondent had during the year),
- (2) FSTEADY (whether or not a respondent went steady with one individual for all of the year, most of the year, or off and on during the year),
- (3) DRUGS (the frequency with which a respondent used drugs when dating), and
- (4) ALCOHOL (the frequency with which a respondent used alcohol or attended events where there was drinking when dating).

The style of dating was further characterized by 18 separate items which tapped the following behavior:

- (1) the main reason for dating--4 items (e.g., to find someone to marry, to develop a meaningful relationship, for the fun of it, or to find sexual partners),
- (2) who did the asking out--2 items,
- (3) who decided what to do and where to go--3 items,
- (4) who paid for the date--3 items,
- (5) who provided the transportation--2 items,
- (6) whether or not a respondent carried credit cards, money or had a way home should an unexpected emergency arise--2 items, and
- (7) whether or not the respondent felt subordinate or dominant on dates--2 items.

Dependent measures were factor analyzed, resulting in four

dimensions:

- (1) UMANIPUL (whether or not during the past year a respondent used game playing techniques, e.g., use of a "line," with the hope of obtaining sexual compliance from his/her date),
- (2) UFORCE (whether or not during the past year, a respondent used physical force to obtain sexual compliance from a date),
- (3) GAMEPLAY (whether or not during the past year, a respondent was in a dating situation where a date used gameplaying strategies with the hope of obtaining sexual compliance),  
and
- (4) OFFENDNG (whether or not during the past year, a respondent was in a dating situation where a date used physical force to obtain sexual compliance).

The four factor belief variables (NOTSEXEV, MUTUALSX, PROSHARE, NOSTEREO), the four factor style variables (FSTEADY, PICUPDT, DRUGS, ALCOHOL), plus the 18 independent style variables were correlated with the four dependent measures (UMANIPUL, UFORCE, GAMEPLAY, AND OFFENDNG). Variables found to be significantly associated with UMANIPUL and GAMEPLAY were then subjected to a regression analysis.

Within the limitations of the study, the following conclusions were made (hypotheses are discussed in the order of their presentation in Chapter III):

Hypothesis 1: There was some support for this hypothesis. While it was hypothesized that females who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation (gameplaying) by their dates than females with a non-traditional orientation, there were significant correlations for only two of the

dating belief dimensions--NOTSEXEV and PROSHARE. In other words, females who tended to view the dating event as a sexual one and who tended to not share in the responsibility for the dating event, were more likely than non-traditional females to experience verbal coercion. Regression analysis offered further support that the PROSHARE dimension is related to verbal coercion or gameplaying. However, neither simple correlation analysis or multiple regression found support for the MUTUALSX or NOSTEREO dimensions. Thus, for this group of students, sex-role stereotypes and the belief that sexual behavior is the male prerogative, do not appear to be related to gameplaying.

Hypothesis 2: The data offered support for this hypothesis. Several dating style variables correlated significantly, but modestly, with GAMEPLAY, supporting the contention that females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience verbal coercion or manipulation by their dates than are females with a non-traditional orientation. Specifically, three of the four style dimensions--DRUGS, ALCOHOL, and PICUPDT--correlated with gameplaying as well as seven of the independent style variables (FUNOFIT, SEXPART, DTDECGOD, MONEYCDS, WAYHOME, SUBORDIN, DOMINANT). Stepwise regression offered further support that a traditional dating style was related to gameplaying, with PICUPDT accounting for the most variance.

Females who drank alcohol, used drugs, dated for the fun of it or for sex partners, let their dates decide where to go and what to do and went out on a lot of pick-up dates were more likely to experience verbal coercion than females less traditional on these measures. Less clear in meaning were the significant correlations for MONEYCDS, WAYHOME, SUBORDIN, and DOMINANT. Females who usually carried money or credit

cards with them and usually had a way home in case of an emergency were also likely to experience more gameplaying. Even more confusing, both SUBORDIN and DOMINANT were related to gameplaying. For this group of college females, then, both perceiving oneself to be the subordinate member of the dating relationship and perceiving oneself to be the dominant member of the dating relationship were significantly correlated to gameplaying.

Style variables that did not correlate with GAMEPLAY included: FSTEADY, MARRY, RELATSHP, UASKOUT, WASASKED, UDECGODO, SHAREDECI, DTPAYALL, UPAIDALL, SHAREXP, DTTRANSP, and UTRANSP. Thus, a steady relationship with one person for at least part of the year and dating to develop a relationship or to find someone to marry, seemed to minimize the chances a female would experience verbal coercion. Furthermore, responsibility for the dating interaction, for example, who provided the transportation, who paid for the date, who took the first step and asked the other person out, and who made the decisions, seemed to have no bearing on whether or not a female would experience verbal sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 3: There was no support for this hypothesis. Contrary to predictions, none of the belief dimensions correlated significantly with experience of physical sexual offending. In other words, females with a traditional orientation on belief dimensions were no more likely to experience physical sexual offending than females with a non-traditional orientation on belief dimensions.

Hypothesis 4: This hypothesis stated that females who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females with a non-traditional

orientation on style dimensions. Little support was found for this hypothesis. Of the 22 dating style variables, FSTEADY, SEXPART and WASASKED were the sole correlates of experience with physical sexual offending, and while significant, the correlations were all quite low. For this sample, it seems, then, that females who do not go steady, who date for sex partners, and are asked out are more likely, albeit to a limited extent, to experience physical sexual offending on dates than females who score on the opposite end of these items.

Hypothesis 5: Contrary to predicted expectations, the data did not substantiate this hypothesis. For this sample, males who subscribed to traditional dating beliefs were not more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than were males with a non-traditional orientation.

Hypothesis 6: This hypothesis was concerned with the relationship of dating style with the use of gameplaying strategies. It was predicted that males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to employ gameplaying strategies (verbal coercion) to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation. With respect to the dependent measure, UMANIPUL, several dating style variables were found to be significantly correlated with this measure (PICUPDT, SEXPART, DRUGS, ALCOHOL, WASASKED, SHAREDEC, and DTPAYALL). The use of drugs or alcohol or attending events where there was drinking, a preference for pick-up dates, dating mainly to find sex partners and rarely sharing in decision-making seemed to influence the use of gameplaying strategies, by males. Regression analysis offered further support for this hypothesis. Once again, PICUPDT, DTPAYALL and SEXPART were predictors of gameplaying, with



PICUPDT the strongest predictor.

Hypothesis 7: This hypothesis was found not to be statistically significant. It was predicted that males who subscribe to traditional dating beliefs are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than males with a non-traditional orientation. None of the belief dimensions correlated significantly with UFORCE.

Hypothesis 8: This hypothesis was not substantiated by the data. None of the 22 style variables offered support for the contention that males who engage in a traditional dating style are more likely to use physical force to obtain sexual compliance from their dates than are males with a non-traditional orientation.

### Limitations

Before a discussion of the results and conclusions of this investigation can be undertaken, or its implications for future research be considered, a review of its limitations is necessary. This will be done to qualify inferences made from the results, and to alert the reader to those aspects of the study that need further attention in subsequent research.

First of all, a word of caution is necessary relative to the interpretation of findings derived from the factor analysis. Whenever variables are combined into summary measures, some information is lost. There is some danger, then, that incorrect or misleading interpretations may result, particularly when differences at the item level have been ignored, and some information may have been sacrificed by using factor analysis. In addition, the decision on number of factors

to rotate and to interpret ultimately rests solely with the investigator.

Secondly, at the risk of sounding overly cautious, it should be kept in mind that the findings derive from the respondents' self reports of their own behaviors, and thus may be subject to the typical respondent perceptual biases inherent in any survey research effort. And because of the especially sensitive nature of some of the material, respondents may have been reluctant to respond honestly. For example, some students may have been reluctant to report having used physical force as a means of obtaining sexual compliance. Be that as it may, it seems clear that such survey self-reporting techniques have more than adequately demonstrated their value as evaluative research tools in the past.

Finally, caution should be taken in the sort of inferences one makes from these data given the nature of the research design employed. Because purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling method, was used, there is a potential lack of representativeness among these individuals which may lend inferences doubtful. For this reason, the results of this study cannot be generalized without hesitation to other college populations. They can merely be suggestive of relationships which may exist on other college campuses. Generalizability, however, was not the major intent of this study. The main goal of this investigation was to explore some fundamental relationships among important variables dealing with the dating event. And the statistical analyses of these data, do provide for greater insight into the data and various relationships.

### Discussion

Despite data limitation, this study did provide a greater understanding of the dating interaction. Several dating belief and style dimensions were identified and statistical analyses showed that there seemed to be a relationship between some dimensions, particularly style dimensions, and the use of or experience with gameplaying strategies on dates. However, there was no relationship between belief or dating style dimensions and the use of or experience with physical sexual offending on dates, in other words, physical force. This lack of an effect may be due, however, to the low incidence of physical force reported by this sample. The small sample size ( $n=241$ ) and the disproportionate number of males in the sample (70 males compared to 170 females), may have influenced this finding.

Contrary to expectations, traditional beliefs about the dating event did not appear to play a large part in the dating interaction, at least, not for this sample of college students. There may be two possible explanations, however, for a lack of association: (1) the belief dimensions derived from the factor analysis are not adequate measures, and (2) there were few traditional students in the sample with respect to beliefs or attitudes about dating and sex roles in general. However, a fairly large percentage of these students did date in a traditional way. This discrepancy in beliefs and behavior seems to agree with the contention of Kaats and David (1970) that in spite of more liberal attitudes, dating couples still experience a double standard in actual behavior.

More generally, the findings point to the substantially greater involvement of style dimensions in the dating interaction. For

example, there was a strong relationship between pick-up dates and both use of gameplaying strategies to obtain sexual compliance on dates and being in situations where dates used gameplaying tactics to win sexual compliance. The data suggests that males who go out on pick-up dates are more likely to use verbal coercion than males who go out on pre-arranged dates, who date fewer different individuals, and who date one person steadily. Likewise, females who go out on pick-up dates are more likely to be victimized than females who go out on pre-arranged dates, who date fewer different individuals, and who date one person steadily. Furthermore, an analysis of specific belief items, reveals that a sizeable percentage of students in this sample adhered to stereotypes about pick-up dates, suggesting that beliefs about certain dating interactions, may indeed be related to dating behavior, in this case verbal aggression.<sup>1</sup> For example, close to half of the sample, 45 percent, agreed with the statement that "it's normal to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on "pick-up" dates." And another 19 percent were "undecided" on this measure. Twenty-one percent agreed that "a woman should be expected to be more sexually liberal on a "pick-up" date," and 12 percent agreed with the statement "if a woman accepts a drink from someone in a bar and later accepts a ride or walk home, she should be expected to at least "make-out" for awhile." Finally, 15 percent agreed with the statement "it's all right for males to be sexually aggressive on "pick-up" dates."

---

<sup>1</sup> As mentioned earlier, one of the problems with factor analysis is that there is a chance that pertinent information will be lost. This seems to be the case here, especially when dealing with the belief dimensions. Even though four dimensions surfaced, the information on pick-up dates was buried in one or more dimensions.

Thus, while the belief factor variables did not appear to show a relationship between pick-up dates and verbal aggression, frequencies to specific items suggest that stereotypes about pick-up dates may be related to verbal aggression.

In addition to pick-up dates, alcohol, drugs, and dating for sex partners were found to be associated with verbally offensive behavior. It is not surprising that these factors would contribute to a situation where one would be in a position to be manipulated. Nor is it surprising that an individual influenced by drugs or alcohol or attending an event where there was drinking or out looking for sex partners would be prone to using gameplaying strategies to obtain sexual compliance.

What is surprising, however, is that females who made sure they carried money or credit cards with them and made sure that they had a way home in an emergency, were also likely to experience verbal manipulation. But this may indicate that multiple strategies are needed to avoid coercion. In other words, in addition to carrying money and credit cards, for example, females should also avoid certain situations, namely pick-up dates. And they should participate more in the responsibility for the date and so on. The meaning of these findings is unclear, however, and once again, effects may be due to statistical manipulation. Clearly further research is needed.

In sum, the factor analysis was beneficial in that it helped understand the dating event as a complex interaction--one composed of several dimensions. Further research, however, is suggested to clarify these dimensions and their relationship to verbal and physical sexual

offending. Furthermore, while statistical analyses failed to provide strong relationships between many of the belief and style variables with verbal and physical offending measures, the goal in defining new variables was met. This study provided an important first step in understanding the dating relationship.

### Implications for Theory

The present study was designed as an exploratory study of the dating interaction and its relationship to date assault. An important goal of this study was to test the utility of using a symbolic interactionist perspective for understanding the dating event. Attempts to answer the question of whether or not these data are consistent with theory in the tradition of symbolic interactionism follow.

According to this perspective, individuals carry into interactions beliefs or expectations about what will happen. These beliefs and expectations, in turn, may influence actual behavior. These data seem to indicate that dating participants carry into the dating relationship stereotypical ideas of male and female sexual behavior, ideas which may lead to conflicts concerning sexual activity. Belief dimensions in this study did not seem to have much influence on dating behavior, specifically verbal and/or physical offending, but a lack of relationship may have been an artifact of the research design and/or the statistical methods used, as mentioned earlier. An analysis of specific belief items, however, strongly suggests that beliefs or expectations about the interaction, may indeed influence behavior in the interaction. The relationship of pick-up dates to verbal aggression

is illustrative.

Almost half of the respondents in the sample adhered to one or more stereotypes about pick-up dates--for example, that "women should be expected to be more sexually liberal on pick-up dates," that "it's 'normal' to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on "pick-up dates," and that "it's all right for males to be sexually aggressive on pick-up dates." Furthermore, a strong association was found for pick-up dates and the use of verbal offending by males in the sample. Moreover, study females were more likely to experience verbal coercion on pick-up dates. All of which, appears to be supportive of the above proposition. A more rigorous exploration of the nature of pick-up dates especially, may supplement and extend the literature on symbolic interactionism as well as that on sex-role socialization, even further.

Symbolic interactionism also proposes that individuals carry into an interaction roles society has taught them to play. An interaction, then, takes place between role-carriers. Students in this sample, appeared to be dating in a traditional manner, in other words, males and females were behaving in accordance with sex-role socialization. For this sample, males tended to assume the responsibility for the dating interaction and overall were the more dominant and aggressive participants, while females in the sample tended to fulfill the passive role. This is not to say, there were no non-traditional daters in the sample, only that the tendency for this group was to mimic traditional social roles.

To further illustrate this point, females in this study were the

most likely to be coerced verbally or physically (OFFENDING and GAMEPLAY), while males in the sample were more likely to use verbal or physical coercion (UMANIPUL and UFORCE) to manipulate their dates. It must be repeated here that because few males reported using force and few females reported being forced, these dimensions were eliminated from rigorous analysis. Nonetheless, while the numbers were small, when use of physical force was reported, mostly males responded, and only females reported being physically forced to take part in sexual activity on dates. This behavior is consistent with sex-role socialization. Therefore, these data offer further evidence of role perpetuation--males are doing the manipulation and females are being manipulated. Males have been taught to apply pressure to overcome resistance on the part of females with regard to sexual activity and females have been taught to accept this behavior as a normal part of the dating event. These data further suggest that adherence to traditional sex roles and to stereotypes about dating, especially about pick-up dates, may lead to a potentially volatile situation.

The present investigation is unique in attempting to understand the dating event from a symbolic interactionist perspective. While various authors, have suggested its utility, this author is unaware of actual research using the dating event and its possible relationship to date assault as a way of testing its propositions. Thus, while these findings may not present conclusive support for this perspective, they do encourage further use of this particular theoretical model for understanding the relationship of date assault to the dating interaction. It most certainly does not discourage or refute its applicability.



### Considerations for Future Research

One important aim accompanying this research effort was to identify issues crucial for future research concerning the dating interaction and its relationship to sexual assault. This section will identify some important themes for further inquiry based upon a consideration of the results of this study. These include:

- (1) Future research in this area should include probability samples which may provide more definite results than the present study allows.
- (2) The population of this study consisted primarily of lower class students, especially freshmen. It may be beneficial for future research to expand this population and examine dating behavior of upper level college students as well as additional categories of dating individuals.
- (3) Future research should consider the implementation of follow-up and longitudinal analyses in order to determine changes in dating cognitions as well as in dating behavior.
- (4) A more comprehensive study should be undertaken in the future that would include a replication of this study across comparable groups.
- (5) A refinement of the survey instrument is suggested. Even though the instrument had been pretested, students had difficulty responding to some of the items as was mentioned in the text. The length of the questionnaire may also have biased results as some students, impatient about finishing, hurried through the final questions, casting doubts on the credibility of responses to those items.

- (6) While this study did not attempt to explore causal relationships, future research efforts might be directed to exploration of a link between gameplaying and physical force. In other words, does verbal coercion lead to physical offending? Path analyses are suggested.
- (7) Future research might consider a design that incorporates survey data with personal interviews.
- (8) Finally, because the data from this study suggest a strong relationship between pick-up dates and verbal aggression, it is suggested that future research explore this connection more fully. Perhaps, date assault occurs more frequently on pick-up dates, where there is verbal manipulation.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

## QUESTIONNAIRE

You are being asked to participate in a study concerned with the dating attitudes and dating experiences of college students who have dated someone of the opposite sex during the past year. Although participation is voluntary, your answers are very important for this study. It should take about 30-40 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME on the attached questionnaire or answer sheet; your answers are completely confidential. We are interested in overall patterns and not in any particular individual.

### INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please read the questions carefully and answer them as frankly and as honestly as you can. Always try to select the answer which you think comes closest to fitting your case even though sometimes no one answer fits exactly. Whether or not the results of this study give a true picture, will depend on your answers.
2. PLEASE DO NOT SKIP QUESTIONS. It is better to guess, for skipped questions will make data analysis difficult.
3. Use the attached answer sheet to record your answers. Mark only in the appropriate response circles using a No. 2 pencil. DO NOT USE INK PENS, BALLPOINT PENS, OR FELT-TIP MARKERS.
4. Make heavy, black marks that fill the circle completely. Do not make stray marks on the answer sheet and erase completely when necessary.
5. Please mark only one response for each statement or questions.

- - - - -

If you choose to not participate in this study, please circle one of the numbers below that best describes your reason for not filling out the questionnaire.

1. I am married
2. I haven't dated anyone of the opposite sex during the past year.
3. I prefer to not participate
4. Other reason

3159

The statements listed below describe beliefs or attitudes that different people have about dating. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (0) agree strongly, (1) agree mildly, (2) are undecided, (3) disagree mildly, or (4) disagree strongly with each statement.

PLEASE PUT YOUR ANSWERS ON THE ANSWER SHEET, NOT ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. DARKEN THE CIRCLE OF THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION. MARK ONLY ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

<u>Dating Beliefs</u>	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MILDLY	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE MILDLY	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1. A man should always ask the woman out.	0	1	2	3	4
2. If a person doesn't want to engage in some level of sexual activity, he or she shouldn't date.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Women should share equally in the expense of a date.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Men should always be the ones to initiate sexual activity on dates.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Women should take the responsibility for seeing that sexual activity doesn't go too far on a date.	0	1	2	3	4
6. It is perfectly all right for women to ask men out.	0	1	2	3	4
7. It's all right for men to test their dates to see how far they can get them to go sexually.	0	1	2	3	4
8. It is normal for males to be sexually aggressive on dates.	0	1	2	3	4
9. A woman who goes with a man alone to his room, apartment, or home on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.	0	1	2	3	4
10. It's normal to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on dates with a steady boyfriend or girlfriend.	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Beliefs (cont'd.)

11. Sexual aggression is something women must put up with if they go out with men.	0	1	2	3	4
12. Dating should be primarily a social event not a sexual one.	0	1	2	3	4
13. Women should share in the responsibility for providing the transportation for the date.	0	1	2	3	4
14. If a man pays for the date, his date should expect to sexually go along with his wishes.	0	1	2	3	4
15. Men should always pay for the date.	0	1	2	3	4
16. Women have as much right as men to initiate sexual activity on a date.	0	1	2	3	4
17. Women who consider themselves liberated are usually eager to experiment sexually.	0	1	2	3	4
18. The person who pays for the date should have the most say over what happens sexually.	0	1	2	3	4
19. It's the man's responsibility to plan the date (e.g., decide what to do or where to go).	0	1	2	3	4
20. When there is disagreement over sexual activity, the man should keep trying until his date gives in.	0	1	2	3	4
21. It's all right for males to be sexually aggressive on "pick-up" dates.	0	1	2	3	4
22. It should be the man's responsibility to provide the transportation for the date.	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Beliefs (cont'd.)

23. If a woman engages in sexual activity and lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sexualintercourse on her.	0	1	2	3	4
24. A woman who has been drinking on a date should be expected to be more agreeable to having sex.	0	1	2	3	4
25. Dating is more fun when sexual activity isn't involved.	0	1	2	3	4
26. The longer and more frequently a woman dates a man, the more sexual intimacy she should allow.	0	1	2	3	4
27. On dates, men are usually out for only one thing--sex.	0	1	2	3	4
28. A woman who initiates sexual activity will probably have sex with anyone.	0	1	2	3	4
29. A woman should be expected to be more sexually liberal on a "pick-up" date.	0	1	2	3	4
30. When a person spends a lot of money on a date, he or she should be able to expect more than a handshake at the end of the date.	0	1	2	3	4
31. It is the man's responsibility to help his date overcome her sexual inhibitions.	0	1	2	3	4
32. Women often pretend to not want to have sex, when they really want to.	0	1	2	3	4
33. If a female is on the "pill" she is usually eager to have sex with anyone.	0	1	2	3	4



Dating Beliefs (cont'd.)

34. Men are biologically driven by sexual desires and once they reach a certain level of sexual excitement, they can't stop themselves.	0	1	2	3	4
35. It is perfectly all right for a person to use a "line" to get his/her date to have sex (e.g., telling a date you love him or her when you really don't mean it).	0	1	2	3	4
36. Most women are sexually available, a man just has to be persistent enough.	0	1	2	3	4
37. Women should participate in the planning of a date (e.g., what to do or where to go).	0	1	2	3	4
38. If a woman accepts a drink from someone in a bar and later accepts a ride or walk home, she should be expected to at least "make out" for a while.	0	1	2	3	4
39. If a woman pays for the date, her date should expect to sexually go along with her wishes.	0	1	2	3	4
40. It's all right for a man to physically force his date to have sexual intercourse, if she participated in sexual activity that got his sexually excited.	0	1	2	3	4
41. When women say no to sexual activity on a date, they really mean no.	0	1	2	3	4
42. It's the man's responsibility for seeing that sexual activity doesn't go too far on a date.	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Beliefs (cont'd.)

43. Just because a woman has engaged in necking or petting with her date, it doesn't mean that she has committed herself to engage in sexual intercourse.	0	1	2	3	4
44. When sexual aggression does occur on dates, it's usually because the female was "asking for it."	0	1	2	3	4
45. A man is never justified in using physical force to get his date to have sex with him against her will.	0	1	2	3	4
46. Sexually experience women shouldn't mind being forced to have sex; one more act shouldn't matter.	0	1	2	3	4
47. Neither men nor women should feel obligated to have sex with their dating partners.	0	1	2	3	4
48. Women often want a certain degree of forcefulness in lovemaking.	0	1	2	3	4
49. If a woman participates in necking and petting and gets her date sexually excited, she should then be expected to have sexual intercourse if he wants to.	0	1	2	3	4
50. Males can clearly control their sexual urges whenever they choose.	0	1	2	3	4
51. Males and females should share in the responsibility for setting sexual limits.	0	1	2	3	4
52. It's normal to expect some kind of sexual activity to occur on "pick-up" dates.	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Beliefs (cont'd).

53. When women say no to sexual activity, they usually don't mean it and would feel offended if their dates didn't push the issue.	0	1	2	3	4
54. A man is justified in physically forcing sex on his date, if they have been going together for a long time and she is still saying no.	0	1	2	3	4
55. Dating is more fun when it includes some form of sexual activity.	0	1	2	3	4
56. Both men and women should be allowed to say no to sexual activity on dates and to have their dates take them seriously.	0	1	2	3	4
57. If a woman initially says yes to sexual intercourse, but later changes her mind, her date is justified in forcing her to have sex.	0	1	2	3	4
58. Each level of sexual activity on a date (e.g., necking, petting, and intercourse) should be mutually agreed upon by both people.	0	1	2	3	4

Next, we would like to ask you questions about your actual dating experiences DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS. REMEMBER TO PUT YOUR ANSWERS ON THE ANSWER SHEETS.

Dating Experiences

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MILDLY	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE MILDLY	DISAGREE STRONGLY
59. During the past year, the main reason you dated was to find someone to eventually marry.	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Experiences (cont'd).

60. During the past year, you weren't really interested in marriage, but dated mainly because you wanted to develop or have a meaningful relationship with someone.

0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

61. During the past year, you weren't really interested in having a relationship and dated mainly for the fun of it.

0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

62. During the past year, you dated mainly because you were interested in finding one or more sexual partners.

0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

63. During the past year, about how many times a week did you date?

0 LESS THAN ONCE A WEEK	4 FOUR TIMES A WEEK
1 ONCE A WEEK	5 FIVE TIMES A WEEK
2 TWICE A WEEK	6 SIX TIMES A WEEK
3 THREE TIMES A WEEK	7 MORE THAN SIX TIMES A WEEK

64. During the past year, about how many different people did you date?

0 ONLY ONE	4 FIVE	8 NINE
1 TWO	5 SIX	9 MORE THAN NINE
2 THREE	6 SEVEN	
3 FOUR	7 EIGHT	

65. During the past year, have you been involved in a steady relationship with one person?

0 NO
1 YES, OFF AND ON
2 YES, MOST OF THE YEAR
3 YES, ALL YEAR

Of all the dates you have had during the past year,

	NONE	A FEW (ABOUT 25%)	HALF (ABOUT 50%)	MOST (ABOUT 75%)	ALL
66. About how many were "pick-up" dates (e.g., leaving a social event with someone you just met there)?	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Experiences (cont'd.)

67. About how many involved leaving a party with someone you had just met there?	0	1	2	3	4
68. About how many involved leaving a bar with someone you had just met there?	0	1	2	3	4
69. About how many were <u>pre-arranged</u> dates with someone you already knew (e.g., planning ahead of time to go to a movie later in the week)?	0	1	2	3	4
70. About how many were <u>pre-arranged</u> dates but with someone you didn't know (e.g., a blind date)?	0	1	2	3	4
71. About how many were <u>spur-of-the moment</u> dates with someone you already knew (e.g., a last-minute decision to go out for pizza)?	0	1	2	3	4
72. About how many involved going to a room, apartment, or home alone with a date?	0	1	2	3	4
73. About how many involved going with a date to a party where there was drinking?	0	1	2	3	4
74. About how many involved going with a date to a bar?	0	1	2	3	4
75. About how many involved going out with other couples or mutual friends as part of the date (i.e., a double date)?	0	1	2	3	4
Of <u>all</u> the dates you had in the last year?	NEVER	A FEW TIMES	ABOUT HALF THE TIME	MOST OF THE TIME	ALL OF THE TIME
76. How often did you take the first step and ask the other person out?	0	1	2	3	4
77. How often were you the one who was approached and asked out?	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Experiences (cont'd.)

78.	How often did you let your date decide where to go or what to do?	0	1	2	3	4
79.	How often did you make the decision on where to go or what to do on the date?	0	1	2	3	4
80.	How often did you share in the decision-making on where to go or what to do?	0	1	2	3	4
81.	How often did you let your date pay all of the expenses?	0	1	2	3	4
82.	How often did you pay all of the expenses for the date?	0	1	2	3	4
83.	How often did you share the expenses for the date?	0	1	2	3	4
84.	How often did your date provide the transportation?	0	1	2	3	4
85.	How often did you provide the transportation for the date?	0	1	2	3	4
86.	How often did a date initiate some level of sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4
87.	How often did you initiate some level of sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4
88.	How often did you carry money or credit cards with you to handle unexpected situations that might have come up while on a date?	0	1	2	3	4
89.	How often did you have a way to get home on your own, if something had happened to your date?	0	1	2	3	4
90.	When dating during the past year, did you ever feel like you were playing a game, where you had to outsmart your date(s) to get what you wanted?	0	1	2	3	4

Dating Experiences (cont'd.)

91. When dating during the past year, how often did you feel like you were the weaker or more subordinate person on the date?	0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---	---

92. When dating during the past year, how often did you feel like you were the stronger or more dominant person on the date?	0	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---	---

When dating during the past year,	NO NEVER	YES BUT RARELY	YES ABOUT HALF THE TIME	YES MOST OF THE TIME	YES ALWAYS
-----------------------------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

93. Did you ever drink alcoholic beverages?	0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---	---

94. Did you ever get really high on alcohol?	0	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---	---

95. Did you ever use drugs?	0	1	2	3	4
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

96. Did you ever get really high on drugs?	0	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---	---

97. Did you ever have friends question you about sexual activity after a date?	0	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---	---

98. Did you ever have friends pressure you to have new sexual experiences?	0	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---	---

99. Were you ever in a situation where you felt uneasy or uncomfortable because you didn't really want to engage in sexual activity, but you knew that your date did?	0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---	---

When dating during the past year,	NO NEVER	YES, ONCE	YES, TWICE	YES, 3-5 TIMES	YES, 6-8 TIMES	YES, 9 OR MORE TIMES
-----------------------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

100. Did you ever have a date misinterpret something you said or did as an invitation to sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Dating Experiences (cont'd.)

101. Did you ever feel sexually intimidated by a date, but hesitated to say or do anything because you didn't want to offend him/her?	0	1	2	3	4	5
102. Were you ever in a situation where your date misinterpreted the level of sexual intimacy you desired?	0	1	2	3	4	5
103. Did you ever go home alone or end a date because your date was being sexually offensive and pressuring you to participate in sexual activity when you didn't want to?	0	1	2	3	4	5
104. Were you ever in a situation where you initiated sexual activity, not because you wanted to, but because you felt your date expected you to?	0	1	2	3	4	5
105. Did you ever attempt to get a date intoxicated or high hoping that he/she would then take part in sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4	5
106. Did you ever engage in kissing or petting with a date even though you really didn't want to?	0	1	2	3	4	5
107. Did you ever have sexual intercourse with a date even though you really didn't want to?	0	1	2	3	4	5
108. Did you ever find yourself in a situation where you felt that you couldn't really say no to sexual demands because your date paid for everything (e.g., movie, dinner, etc.)?	0	1	2	3	4	5
109. Did a date ever try to convince you to have sex with him/her because you had dated that person several times?	0	1	2	3	4	5



Dating Experience (cont'd.)

110. Were you ever in a situation where you became so sexually aroused that you felt you really couldn't stop yourself?	0	1	2	3	4	5
111. Did you ever have a date that became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to try and stop him/her even though you didn't want to participate in sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4	5
112. Did a date ever try to convince you that you had to go along with sexual activity because you got him/her so sexually excited that he or she couldn't stop?	0	1	2	3	4	5
113. Did you ever say things you really didn't mean to get a date to participate in sexual intercourse with you (i.e., telling your date that you loved him/her when you really didn't mean it)?	0	1	2	3	4	5
114. Did a date ever try to get you to participate in sexual intercourse by saying things he/she really didn't mean?	0	1	2	3	4	5
115. Were you ever in a situation where a date actually obtained sexual intercourse with you by saying things he/she really didn't mean?	0	1	2	3	4	5
116. Did you ever use continual arguments as a way of pressuring a date into participating in sexual activity with you.	0	1	2	3	4	5
117. Did a date ever use continual arguments to pressure you into participating in sexual activity?	0	1	2	3	4	5

Dating Experience (cont'd.)

118. Were you ever in a situation where you finally gave in and actually had sexual intercourse with a date because you were tired of being pressured by arguments?	0	1	2	3	4	5
119. Did you ever threaten to end a relationship because your date didn't want to have sexual intercourse?	0	1	2	3	4	5
120. Did a date ever threaten to end your relationship unless you had sexual intercourse?	0	1	2	3	4	5
121. Were you ever in a situation where you actually had sexual intercourse with a date because she/he threatened to end your relationship otherwise?	0	1	2	3	4	5
122. Did you ever threaten to use some degree of physical force to get a date to have sexual intercourse with you?	0	1	2	3	4	5
123. Did you ever have a date threaten to use physical force if you didn't cooperate to get you to have sexual intercourse, but for various reasons sexual intercourse didn't occur?	0	1	2	3	4	5
124. Did you ever have sexual intercourse, even though you didn't want to, because your date threatened to use physical force?	0	1	2	3	4	5
125. Did you ever use some degree of physical force (i.e. twisting an arm, holding the other person down, etc.) to get a date to take part in kissing or petting?	0	1	2	3	4	5

Dating Experiences (cont'd.)

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 126. Did you ever use some degree of physical force to try and get a date to have sexual intercourse with you?  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 127. Did a date ever use some degree of physical force to try and make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn't want to?  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 128. Did a date ever use some degree of physical force to try and get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn't really want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse didn't occur? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 129. Were you ever in a situation where you actually had sexual intercourse with a date because you were physically forced?   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 130. Were you ever in a situation where you wanted a date to physically force you to have sex, because you were afraid of making the first move?  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Finally, we would like to ask a few questions about yourself that will help interpret the results of this study. Remember, DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE ANSWER SHEET. We are interested in statistical trends only.

Background information

131. What is your sex?

- 0 MALE  
1 FEMALE

132. What is your present age?

- |   |    |   |       |
|---|----|---|-------|
| 0 | 17 | 5 | 22    |
| 1 | 18 | 6 | 23    |
| 2 | 19 | 7 | 24    |
| 3 | 20 | 8 | 25    |
| 4 | 21 | 9 | OTHER |

Background Information (cont'd.)

133. In what year of college are you now

- |   |           |   |                               |
|---|-----------|---|-------------------------------|
| 0 | FRESHMAN  | 4 | GRADUATE STUDENT              |
| 1 | SOPHOMORE | 5 | OFF-CAMPUS/LIFELONG EDUCATION |
| 2 | JUNIOR    | 6 | OTHER                         |
| 3 | SENIOR    |   |                               |

134. What is the college of your major preference?

- |   |                                 |   |                |
|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 0 | AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES | 5 | ENGINEERING    |
| 1 | ARTS & LETTERS                  | 6 | HUMAN ECOLOGY  |
| 2 | BUSINESS                        | 7 | HUMAN MEDICINE |
| 3 | COMMUNICATION ARTS & SCIENCES   | 8 | JAMES MADISON  |
| 4 | EDUCATION                       | 9 | NONE OF THESE  |

135. If your major college was not listed above, please identify which of the following is your major college. (Please fill in #7, "NONE OF THESE," if your major college was given above.

- |   |                      |   |   |
|---|----------------------|---|---|
| 0 | NATURAL SCIENCE      | 5 | NO PREFERENCE--UNDERGRADUATE<br>UNIVERSITY DIVISION |
| 1 | NURSING              | 6 | UNCLASSIFIED  |
| 2 | OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE | 7 | NONE OF THESE                                       |
| 3 | SOCIAL SCIENCE       |   |   |
| 4 | VETERINARY MEDICINE  |   |   |

136. Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 0 | BLACK/NEGRO/AFRO-AMERICAN                       |
| 1 | HISPANIC/PUERTO RICAN/CUBAN/MEXICAN/LATIN       |
| 2 | WHITE/CAUCASION                                 |
| 3 | AMERICAN INDIAN                                 |
| 4 | ORIENTAL/ASIAN/CHINESE/JAPANESE/KOREAN/FILIPINO |
| 5 | OTHER   |

137. When you were growing up, what was your religious preference?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 0 | CATHOLIC                                  |
| 1 | JEWISH                                    |
| 2 | BAPTIST/BIBLE/NAZARENE/PENTECOSTAL/GOSPEL |
| 3 | METHODIST/EPISCOPAL/PRESBYTERIAN/LUTHERAN |
| 4 | SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST                     |
| 5 | INTERDENOMINATIONAL/NON-DENOMINATIONAL    |
| 6 | CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST                       |
| 7 | JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES                       |
| 8 | OTHER                                     |
| 9 | NONE                                      |

Background Information (cont'd.)

138. During the past 12 months, where did you live MOST of the time?

- 0 IN DORMITORY
- 1 IN SORORITY
- 2 IN FRATERNITY
- 3 OFF CAMPUS, WITH PARENTS, GUARDIAN, OR OTHER RELATIVE(S)
- 4 OFF CAMPUS, ALONE IN A ROOM, APARTMENT, OR HOME
- 5 OFF CAMPUS, IN A ROOM, APARTMENT, OR HOME WITH ONE OR MORE ROOMMATES OF THE SAME SEX
- 6 OFF CAMPUS, WITH STEADY BOYFRIEND
- 7 OFF CAMPUS, WITH STEADY GIRLFRIEND
- 8 OTHER

139. Have you taken any women's studies courses?

- 0 NO
- 1 YES

140. Have you participated in any rape awareness programs?

- 0 NO
- 1 YES

THE END

We would like to thank you for taking the time to answer this questionnaire. As mentioned earlier, your responses will remain completely confidential.

If you would like a one-page summary of the results of this study, please give me your name and address on a separate sheet of paper. I would also welcome any comments you might have about the questionnaire.

Thank you.

Shari Cisco  
224 S. Kedzie Hall

## APPENDIX B

### EIGENVALUE TABLES

TABLE 1B.--Eigenvalues for 53 Dating Belief Variables.

Variable	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. of Var.	Cum. Pct.
BELIEF 1	1	9.77167	16.8	16.8
BELIEF 2	2	4.22667	7.3	24.1
BELIEF 3	3	2.64267	4.6	28.7
BELIEF 4	4	1.99633	3.4	32.1
BELIEF 5	5	1.84315	3.2	35.3
BELIEF 6	6	1.78470	3.1	38.4
BELIEF 7	7	1.70080	2.9	41.3
BELIEF 8	8	1.53139	2.6	44.0
BELIEF 9	9	1.48023	2.6	46.5
BELIEF 10	10	1.47120	2.5	49.1
BELIEF 11	11	1.38377	2.4	51.5
BELIEF 12	12	1.27290	2.2	53.6
BELIEF 13	13	1.23948	2.1	55.8
BELIEF 14	14	1.18745	2.0	57.8
BELIEF 15	15	1.12855	1.9	59.8
BELIEF 16	16	1.05002	1.8	61.6
BELIEF 17	17	1.04365	1.8	63.4
BELIEF 18	18	.98742	1.7	65.1
BELIEF 19	19	.91966	1.6	66.7
BELIEF 20	20	.89358	1.5	68.2
BELIEF 21	21	.87752	1.5	69.7
BELIEF 22	22	.83905	1.4	71.2
BELIEF 23	23	.82829	1.4	72.6
BELIEF 24	24	.79711	1.4	74.0
BELIEF 25	25	.78010	1.3	75.3
BELIEF 26	26	.76647	1.3	76.6
BELIEF 27	27	.74537	1.3	77.8
BELIEF 28	28	.73421	1.3	79.2
BELIEF 29	29	.70591	1.2	80.4
BELIEF 30	30	.66643	1.1	81.6
BELIEF 31	31	.65216	1.1	82.7
BELIEF 32	32	.60256	1.0	83.7
BELIEF 33	33	.57647	1.0	84.7
BELIEF 34	34	.55378	1.0	85.7
BELIEF 35	35	.53463	.9	86.6
BELIEF 36	36	.51113	.9	87.5
BELIEF 37	37	.50127	.8	88.3
BELIEF 38	38	.46932	.8	89.1
BELIEF 39	39	.45922	.8	89.9
BELIEF 40	40	.44970	.8	90.7
BELIEF 41	41	.42427	.7	91.4
BELIEF 42	42	.41170	.7	92.2
BELIEF 43	43	.40020	.7	92.8
BELIEF 44	44	.38628	.7	93.5
BELIEF 45	45	.37673	.6	94.2

TABLE 1B. (cont'd.)

BELIEF 46	46	.35965	.6	94.8
BELIEF 47	47	.34729	.6	95.4
BELIEF 48	48	.32655	.6	95.9
BELIEF 49	49	.30936	.5	96.5
BELIEF 50	50	.29704	.5	97.0
BELIEF 51	51	.27615	.5	97.5
BELIEF 52	52	.25589	.4	97.9
BELIEF 53	53	.24242	.4	98.3
BELIEF 54	54	.22545	.4	98.7
BELIEF 55	55	.21056	.4	99.1
BELIEF 56	56	.18966	.3	99.4
BELIEF 57	57	.18176	.3	99.7
BELIEF 58	58	.16424	.3	100.0

---



TABLE 2B.-- Eigenvalues for First Dating Style Subset, 10 Variables.

Variable	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. of Var.	Cum. Pct.
DATEWEEK	1	2.87901	28.8	28.8
DIFFDATE	2	1.69956	17.0	45.8
STEADY	3	1.15682	11.6	57.4
PICKUPDT	4	.91188	9.1	66.5
PICUPPTY	5	.82935	8.3	74.8
PICUPBAR	6	.81869	8.2	83.0
PREARRDT	7	.58073	5.8	88.8
BLINDDAT	8	.48678	4.9	93.6
SPURMOMT	9	.35639	3.6	97.2
DOUBLEDT	10	.28080	2.8	100.0

TABLE 3B.-- Eigenvalues for Second Dating Style Subset, 6 Variables.

Variable	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. of Var.	Cum. Pct.
PREPTYDT	1	2.95801	49.3	49.3
PREBARDT	2	1.17642	19.6	68.9
DRKBOOZ	3	.89873	15.0	83.9
HIBOOZ	4	.49039	8.2	92.1
USEDUGS	5	.34536	5.8	97.8
HIDRUGS	6	.13009	2.2	100.0

TABLE 4B. -- Eigenvalues for First Subset of Dependent Measures,  
8 Variables.

Variable	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. of Var.	Cum. Pct.
PLAYGAME	1	1.92338	24.0	24.0
UGOTDTHI	2	1.31991	16.5	40.5
USAYTHNG	3	.96845	12.0	52.5
UARGUMTS	4	.91817	11.5	64.0
UTHRETRS	5	.87373	10.9	74.9
UTHRETFC	6	.82830	10.4	85.3
UPFORCKP	7	.64976	8.1	93.4
UPFORCSI	8	.52629	6.6	100.0

TABLE 5B. -- Eigenvalues for Second Subset of Dependent Measures,  
24 Variables.

Variable	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. of Var.	Cum. Pct.
UNCOMFBL	1	7.99381	33.3	33.3
DTMISINT	2	2.56818	10.7	44.0
USEXINTM	3	1.76584	7.4	51.4
MISLEVSX	4	1.51205	6.3	57.7
ENEDDT	5	1.18516	4.9	62.6
UBGNSXDW	6	1.00089	4.2	66.8
KISPETDW	7	.83743	3.5	70.3
HADSIDW	8	.82359	3.4	73.7
CUZDTPAY	9	.75990	3.2	76.9
CUZDLOTS	10	.66147	2.8	79.6
USXARDCS	11	.64786	2.7	82.3
DSXARDCS	12	.60900	2.5	84.9
DCONVCS	13	.54447	2.3	87.1
DSAYTHNG	14	.47821	2.0	89.1
UGAVINTG	15	.45869	1.9	91.0
DARGUMTS	16	.37151	1.5	92.6
UGAVINAR	17	.35389	1.5	94.0
DTHRETRS	18	.30419	1.3	95.3
UGAVINTH	19	.26334	1.1	96.4
DTHRETFC	20	.21700	.9	97.3
UGAVINTF	21	.21521	.9	98.2
DTFORCKP	22	.18972	.8	99.0
DFORCNSI	23	.15747	.7	99.7
RAPE	24	.08112	.3	100.0

## LIST OF REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Applebome, Peter, "Dating Game and the Check: Who Pays", The New York Times, p. 15, January 27, 1986.
- Amir, Menachem, "Victim Precipitated Forcible Rape," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 58(4):493-502, 1967.
- Amir, Menachem, Patterns in Forcible Rape, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Babbie, Earl R., Survey Research Methods, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 1973.
- Balswick, Jack O. and James A. Anderson, "Role Definition in the Unarranged Date," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31(4):776-778, November 1969.
- Barrett, Karen, "Date Rape: A Campus Epidemic?", Ms, pp. 48-51 & 130, September 1982.
- Bart, Pauline B., "A Study of Women Who Both Were Raped and Avoided Rape," Journal of Social Issues, 37(4):123-137, 1981.
- Becker, Judith V. and Gene G. Abel, "Men and the Victimization of Women," In Chapman, Jane Roberts and Margaret Gates (eds.), The Victimization of Women, pp. 29-52, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.
- Becker, Judith V., Abel, Gene G. and Linda J. Skinner, "The Impact of a Sexual Assault on the Victim's Sexual Life," Victimology, 4(2):229-235, 1979.
- Berger, Ronald J., Searles, Patricia, Salem, Richard G. and Beth Ann Pierce, "Sexual Assault in a College Community," Sociological Focus, 19(1):1-26, 1986.
- Bode, Janet, Fighting Back: How to Cope with the Medical, Emotional and Legal Consequences of Rape, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1978.
- Bowker, Lee H., "The Criminal Victimization of Women," Victimology, 4(4):371-384, 1980.
- Bowker, Lee H., "Rape and Other Sexual Assaults," In Bowker, Lee (ed.), Women and Crime in America, New York: Macmillan, pp. 180-189, 1981a.

- Bowker, Lee H., "Women as Victims: An Examination of the Results of L.E.A.A.'s National Crime Survey Program," In Bowker, Lee (ed.), Women and Crime in America, New York: Macmillan, pp. 158-179, 1981b.
- Bradburn, Norman M. and Seymour Sudman, Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Brodsky, Stanley L., "Prevention of Rape: Deterrence by the Potential Victim," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley L. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, 1976a.
- Brodsky, Stanley L., "Sexual Assault: Perspectives on Prevention and Assailants," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley L. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, 1976b, pp. 1-7.
- Brownmiller, Susan, Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape, Bantam Books, 1975.
- Burgess, Ann Wolbert and Lynda Lytle Holmstrom, "Coping Behavior of the Rape Victim," American Journal of Psychiatry, 133(4):413-437, 1976.
- Burt, Martha R., "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33(2):217-230, 1980.
- Calhoun, Lawrence G., Selby, James W. and Louise J. Warring, "Social Perception of the Victim's Causal Role in Rape: An Exploratory Examination of Four Factors," Human Relations, 29(6):517-526, 1976.
- Calvert, Catherine, "Is Rape What Women Really Want?" Mademoiselle, pp. 134-135, 187-194, March 1974.
- Chapman, Jane Roberts and Margaret Gates, The Victimization of Women, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.
- Chappell, Duncan, "Forcible Rape and the Criminal Justice System: Surveying Present Practices and Projecting Future Trends," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley J. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, 1976.
- Christopherson, Chris, "Sex: How to Handle a 'No'," The State News (East Lansing, MI), p. 12, Friday, May 6, 1983.
- Clark, Lorene, M.G. and Debra J. Lewis, Rape: The Price of Coercive Sexuality, Toronto: The Women's Press, 1977.
- Cohen, Murray L., Garofalo, Ralph, Boucher, Richard and Theoharis Seghorn, "The Psychology of Rapists," Seminars in Psychiatry, 3(3):307-327, 1971.

- Croake, James W. and Barbara James, "A Four Year Comparison of Premarital Sexual Attitudes," Journal of Sex Research, 9(2):91-96, May 1973.
- Csida, June B. and George Csida, Rape: How to Avoid It and What to do About It If You Can't, Chatsworth, California: Books for Better Living, 1974.
- Curran, James P. Neff and Steven Lippold, "Correlates of Sexual Experience among University Students," Journal of Sex Research, 9(2):124-131, May 1973.
- Curtis, Lynn A., "Present and Future Measures of Victimization in Forcible Rape," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley L. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, pp. 61-68, 1976.
- Davis, Angela, "Joanne Little: The Dialectics of Rape," Ms, 3(June): 74-77, 106-8, 1975.
- Dillman, Don A., Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, New York: Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- D'Augelli, Judith Frankel and Herbert J. Cross, "Relationships of Sex Guilt and Moral Reasoning to Premarital Sex in College Women and in Couples," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43(1):41-47, 1975.
- Dowd, Maureen, "Rape: The Sexual Weapon," Time, 122(10):27-29, September 5, 1983.
- Driscoll, Richard H. and Keith E. Davis, "Sexual Restraints: A Comparison of Perceived and Self-Reported Reasons for College Students," Journal of Sex Research, 7(4):253-262, 1971.
- Falbo, Tone and Letitia Anne Peplau, "Power Strategies in Intimate Relationships," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38(4):618-628, 1980.
- Feild, Hubert S., "Attitudes toward rape: A Comparative Analysis of Police, Rapists, Crisis Counselors and Citizens," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(2):156-179, 1978.
- Gager, Nancy and Cathleen Schurr, Sexual Assault: Confronting Rape in America, New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1976.
- Geis, Gilbert and Robley Geis, "Rape in Stockholm: Is Permissiveness Relevant?" Criminology, 17(3):311-322, 1979.
- Gibbons, Don, Society, Crime, and Criminal Careers (3rd ed.), New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1977.

- Ginsberg, George L., "Effects on Men of Increased Sexual Freedom for Women," Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 17(2):66-89, 1973.
- Goodchilds, Jacqueline D. and Gail L. Zellman, "Sexual Signaling and Sexual Aggression in Adolescent Relationships," In: Malamuth, Neil M. and Edward Donnerstein (eds.), Pornography and Sexual Aggression, pp. 233-243, New York: Academic Press, 1984.
- Griffin, Susan, Rape: The Power of Consciousness, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979.
- Groth, A. Nicholas and H. Jean Birnbaum, Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender, New York: Plenum Press, 1979.
- Groth, A. Nicholas, Burgess, Ann Wolbert and Lynda Lytle Holmstrom, "Rape: Power, Anger, and Sexuality," In Bowker, Lee H. (ed.), Women and Crime in America, New York: Macmillan, pp. 212-223, 1981.
- Hilberman, Elaine, The Rape Victim, New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Hindelang, Michael J., Criminal Victimization in Eight American Cities: A Descriptive Analysis of Common Theft and Assault, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.
- Hindelang, Michael J. and Bruce J. Davis, "Forcible Rape in the United States: A Statistical Profile," In Chappell, Duncan, Geis, Robley, and Gilbert Geis (eds.), Forcible Rape: The Crime, the Victim and the Offender, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 87-186, 1977.
- Holliday, Christopher, "The Elusive Victim: Conceptual Orientations," In Scherer, Jacqueline and Gary Shepherd (eds.), Victimization of the Weak: Contemporary Social Reactions, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, pp. 213-231, 1982.
- Holmstrom, Linda Lytle and Ann Wolbert Burgess, "Rape and Everyday Life," Society, 20(5):33-40, 1983.
- Holmstrom, Lynda Lytle and Ann Wolbert Burgess, The Victim of Rape: Institutional Reactions, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1983.
- Hursch, Carolyn J., The Trouble with Rape, Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1977.
- Jackson, Stevi, "The Social Context of Rape: Sexual Scripts and Motivation," Women's Studies Int. Quarterly, 1:27-38, 1978.
- Jurich, Anthony P., "The Effect of Cognitive Moral Development Upon the Selection of Premarital Sexual Standards," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36(4): 736-741, 1974.

- Kaats, Gilbert R. and Keith E. Davis, "The Dynamics of Sexual Behavior of College Students," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32(3): 390-399, 1970.
- Kammeyer, Kenneth, "Birth Order and the Feminine Sex Role Among College Women," American Sociological Review, 31(4):508-515, 1966.
- Kanin, Eugene J., "Male Aggression in Dating-Courtship Relations," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII(2):197-204, 1957.
- Kanin, Eugene J., "An Examination of Sexual Aggression as a Response to Sexual Frustration," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29(3):428-433, 1967.
- Kanin, Eugene J. and Stanley R. Parcell, "Sexual Aggression: A Second Look at the Offended Female," Archives of Sexual Behavior, 6:67-76, 1977.
- Katz, Sedelle and Mary Ann Mazur, Understanding the Rape Victim, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford and Eugene Kanin, "Male Sex Aggression on a University Campus," American Sociological Review, 22(1):52-58, 1957.
- Klemmack, Susan H. and David L. Klemmack, "The Social Definition of Rape," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley L. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, pp. 135-147, 1976.
- Knox, William E. and Harriet J. Kupferer, "A Discontinuity in the Socialization of Males in the United States," Merrill Palmer Quarterly: Behavior and Development, 17(3):251-261, 1971.
- Komarovsky, Mirra, Dilemmas of Masculinity: A Study of College Youth, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1976.
- Koss, Mary P., "The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal, and Situational Characteristics," Paper presented at American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., (grant MH-31618: National Center for the Control and Prevention of Rape), August, 1982.
- Koss, Mary P. and Cheryl J. Oros, "Sexual Experiences Survey: A Research Instrument Investigating Sexual Aggression and Victimization," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59(3):455-457, 1982.
- Krulowitz, Judith E., "Sex Differences in Evaluations of Female and Male Victims' Responses to Assault," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11(5):460-474, 1981.



- Krulowitz, Judith E. and Janet E. Nash, "Effects of Rape Victim Resistance, Assault Outcome, and Sex of Observer on Attributions about Rape," Journal of Personality, 47(4):557-574, 1979.
- Krulowitz, Judith E. and Elaine Johnson Payne, "Attributions about Rape: Effects of Rapist Force, Observer Sex and Sex Role Attitudes," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8(4):291-305, 1978.
- LaFree, Gary D., "Official Reactions to Social Problems: Police Decisions in Sexual Assault Cases," Social Problems, 28(5):582-594, 1981.
- Largen, Mary Ann, "History of Women's Movement in Changing Attitudes, Laws, and Treatment toward Rape victims," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley L. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, 1976.
- Lauer, Robert H. and Warren H. Handel, Social Psychology: The Theory and Application of Symbolic Interactionism (2nd ed.), New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- Lott, Bernice, Reilly, Mary Ellen and Dale R. Howard, "Sexual Assault and Harrassment: A Campus Community Case Study," Signs, 8(3):296-819, 1983.
- MacDonald, John M., Rape: Offenders and Their Victims, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.
- MacKellar, Jean, Rape: The Bait and the Trap: A Balanced Humane, Up-to-Date Analysis of its Causes and Control, New York: Crown Publishers, 1975.
- Manhart, Mary Ann and Florence Rush, Rape: The First Sourcebook for Women, New American Library, 1971.
- Mauss, Armand L. and Julie Camille Wolfe, This Land of Promises: The Rise and Fall of Social Problems in America, Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1977.
- Medea, Andra and Kathleen Thompson, Against Rape, New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1974.
- Metzger, Deena, "It is Always the Woman Who is Raped," American Journal of Psychiatry, 133(4):405-408, April 1976.
- Miller, Delbert C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (3rd ed.) New York: Longman, 1977.
- Mithers, Carol Lynn, "Date Rape: When 'Nice Guys' Won't Take NO for an Answer," Mademoiselle, pp. 210-211, 269, November 8, 1980.

- Molmen, Marcia E. M., Avoiding Rape: Without Putting Yourself in Protective Custody, North Dakota: The Athena Press, 1982.
- Notman, Malkah T. and Carol C. Nadelson, "The Rape Victim: Psychodynamic Considerations," American Journal of Psychiatry, 133(4):408-412, 1976.
- Offir, Carole Wade, "Don't Take it Lying Down," Psychology Today, p.33, January 1975.
- Peters, Joseph J., "The Philadelphia Rape Victim Project," In Chappell, Duncan, Geis, Robley and Gilbert Geis (eds.), Forcible Rape: The Crime, the Victim and the Offender, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 339-355, 1977.
- Pritchard, Carol, Avoiding Rape on and off Campus, Wenonah, N.J.: State College Publishing Company, 1985.
- Reiss, Ira L., The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Resick, Patricia A., Calhoun, Karen S., Atkeson, Beverly and Elizabeth M. Ellis, "Social Adjustment in Victims of Sexual Assault," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49(5):705-712, 1981.
- Riger, Stephanie, Gordon, Margaret T. and Robert LeBailly, "Women's Fear of Crime: From Blaming to Restricting the Victim," Victimology, 3 (3-4): 274-284, 1978.
- Rose, Vicki McNickle, "Rape as a Social Problem: A Byproduct of the Feminist Movement," Social Problems, 25(1):75-89, October, 1977a.
- Rose, Vicki McNickle, "The Rise of the Rape Problem," In Mauss, Armand L. and Julie Camille Wolfe (eds.), This Land of Promises: The Rise and Fall of Social Problems in America, pp. 167-195, Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1977b.
- Rosenkrantz, Paul, Bee, Helen, Vogel, Susan, Broverman, Inge and Donald M. Broverman, "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(3):287-295, 1968.
- Sanday, Peggy Reeves, "The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-Cultural Study," Journal of Social Issues, 37(4):5-27, 1981.
- Sanders, William B., Rape and Woman's Identity, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980.
- Schafer, Stephen, The Victim and His Criminal: A Study in Functional Responsibility, New York: Random House, 1968.

- Scherer, Jacqueline, "The Myth of Passion: Redefinition of Rape," In Scherer, Jacqueline and Gary Shepherd (eds.), Victimization of the Weak: Contemporary Social Reactions, pp. 153-171, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1982.
- Schiff, Arthur F., "A Statistical Evaluation of Rape," Forensic Science, 2(3):339-349, 1973.
- Schiff, Arthur F., "Statistical Trends in Rape," Journal of Forensic Science and Sociology, 19(2):95-106, 1979.
- Schlegel, Alice, "Toward a Theory of Sexual Stratification," In Schlegel, Alice (ed.), Sexual Stratification: A Cross-Cultural View, pp. 1-40, New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- Schneider, D. Jean, "Some Factors for Analysis in Sexual Assault," Social Science and Medicine, 15A(1):55-61, January 1981.
- Schram, Donna D., "Rape," In Chapman, Jane Roberts and Margaret Gates (eds.), The Victimization of Women, pp. 53-79, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.
- Schwartz, John, Goldberg, Karen, Nomani, Asra and Irene Tucker, "'Acquaintance Rape' Comes into the Open," Newsweek on Campus, pp. 12, 14-15, February, 1986.
- Schwendinger, Julia R. and Herman Schwendinger, "Rape Myths: In Legal, Theoretical and Everyday Practice," Crime and Social Justice: A Journal of Radical Criminology, Vol. 1(Spring/Summer):18-26, 1974.
- Scroggs, James R., "Penalties for Rape as a Function of Victim Provocativeness, Damage, and Resistance," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6(4):360-368, 1976.
- Seligmann, Jean, Huck, Janet, Joseph, Nadine, Namuth, Tessa, Prout, Linda R., Robinson, Tracey L. and Ann L. McDaniel, "The Date Who Rapes," Newsweek, pp. 91-92, April 9, 1984.
- Selkin, James, "Rape," Psychology Today, pp. 31-32, 34-35, January 1975.
- Selkin, James, "Protecting Personal Space: Victim and Resister Reactions to Assaultive Rape," Journal of Community Psychology, 6(3):263-268, 1978.
- Shepard, Gary, "Victims, Values and the Social Structure of Everyday Life," In Scherer, Jacqueline and Gary Shepherd (eds.), Victimization of the Weak: Contemporary Social Reactions, pp. 232-248, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1982.

- Sheppard, David I., Giacinti, Thomas and Claus Tjaden, "Rape Reduction: A Citywide Program," In Walker, Marcia J. and Stanley J. Brodsky (eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist, Massachusetts: Lexington, 1976.
- Sherman, Beth, "The New Realities of 'Date Rape'," The New York Times, pp. 17, 19, October 23, 1985.
- Singlemann, Peter, "Exchange as Symbolic Interaction: Convergences Between Two Theoretical Perspectives," American Sociological Review, 37(August): 414-424, 1972.
- Spence, Janet T. and robert Helmreich, "The Attitudes Toward Women Scale: An Objective Instrument to Measure Attitudes toward the Rights and Roles of Women in Contemporary Society," Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2(66), 1972.
- Spence, Janet T., Helmreich, Robert and Joy Stapp, "A Short Version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS)," Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2(4):219-220, 1973.
- Stone, Robin, "Considering the Awful 'if' of rape and whether to Resist or Give In," State News, (East Lansing, MI), p. 3, July 25, 1983.
- Storaska, Frederic, How to Say No to a Rapist and Survive, New York: Random House, 1975.
- Stryker, Sheldon, Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version, Menlo Park: Benjamin/Cummings, 1980.
- Sutherland, Sandra and Donald J. Scherl, "Patterns of Response Among Victims of Rape," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40(3):503-511, 1970.
- Taylor, Stuart P. and Ian Smith, "Aggression as a Function of Sex of Victim and Male Subjects Attitude Toward Women," Psychological Reports, 35(3):1095-1098, 1974.
- Thio, Alex, Deviant Behavior, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983.
- Ullman, Laura, "Will You Go Out With Me?", Newsweek on Campus, p. 32, April, 1984.
- von Hentig, Hans, The Criminal and His Victim: Studies in the Sociology of Crime, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.
- von Hentig, Hans, "The Sex Ratio," Social Forces, Vol. 30, pp. 443-449, 1951.
- Vorce, Chris, "Giddings to Decide on 'gang rape' ruling," State News (East Lansing, MI), p. 3, July 27, 1983.

- Wagner, Helmut R., "Signs, Symbols, and Interaction Theory," Sociological Focus, 7(2):101-111, Spring 1974.
- Waller, Willard, "The Rating and Dating Complex," American Sociological Review, 11(1-6):727-734, 1937.
- Weis, Kurt and Sandra S. Borges, "Victimology and Rape: The Case of the Legitimate Victim," Issues in Criminology, 8(2):71-115, 1973.
- West, D.J., Roy, C. and Florence L. Nichols, Understanding Sexual Attacks: A Study Based upon a Group of Rapists Undergoing Psychotherapy, London: Heinemann, 1978.
- Wheelwright, J.B. and Harrison P. Eddy, Sex and the College Student: A Developmental Perspective on Sexual Issues on the Campus: Some Guidelines for Administrative Policy and Understanding of Sexual issues, New York: Atheneum, 1966.
- Williams, Joyce E. and Karen A. Holmes, The Second Assault: Rape and Public Attitudes, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Wilson, Kenneth, Faison, Rebecca and G.M. Britton, "Cultural Aspects of Male Sex Aggression," Deviant Behavior, 4(3-4):241-255, 1983.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 00990 0105